

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

“We Are Not to Grow Wild”: Seventeenth-Century New England's
Repudiation of Anglo-Indian Intermarriage

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6620x5gh>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Smits, David D.

Publication Date

1987-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

“We Are Not to Grow Wild”: Seventeenth-Century New England’s Repudiation of Anglo-Indian Intermarriage

DAVID D. SMITS

To the student of Anglo-Indian relations in seventeenth-century New England the absence of interracial marriage is a subject whose depth and breadth remain largely unexplored. The familial nature of English immigration and the relatively balanced sex ratio in the emergent Bible commonwealths have long been offered as explanations for the New Englanders’ failure to intermarry with the American Indians. Propounded too, are the differences of religion, culture, and education which, to the Puritans especially, constituted formidable barriers to interracial marriage. Finally, the New England natives’ precipitate population diminution and relative inaccessibility have been advanced as reasons for the lack of Anglo-Indian intermarriage.¹

Undeniably, such explanations have considerable merit. Unfortunately, their self-evident importance and general acceptance have discouraged further research into an intriguing question that reveals much about the dynamics of interracial relations in seventeenth-century New England. The purpose of this essay is

David D. Smits, Ph.D., is associate professor of history at Trenton State College in New Jersey.

“To Roger Nichols and the participants in his National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar for College Teachers held at the University of Arizona in 1988, to whom a preliminary version of this essay was presented, I am much indebted.”

to re-examine the standard explanations and to shed new light on the reasons why seventeenth-century New Englanders were unwilling to intermarry with their Native American neighbors.

From New England's founding by the Pilgrims "men greatly outnumbered women among the first waves of settlers," observes historian John Demos. The scarcity of prospective English wives in the Plymouth Colony is evident from the average age at which its men married. Demos has shown that this age ranged downward from about twenty-seven years at the time of settlement to a little under twenty-five by the 1680s. The downward trend of the surprisingly high initial average age reveals the gradual balancing of the colony's sex ratio.² Plymouth Colony men could have married earlier in life had they not been averse, for reasons examined later, to marrying Indian women.

Virginia Dejohn Anderson's recent study of seven passenger lists, which together include the names of 693 migrants to New England from 1630 to 1640, reveals that 43.2 percent were women and girls. Anderson concludes that such a high proportion of females assured New England's unmarried men greater success than their Virginia counterparts in finding English spouses. Anderson's conclusion is undoubtedly correct, but the sex ratio of 132 for the emigrant group is still notably unbalanced. Although family groups predominated within the emigrant population, Anderson points out that "many" individuals other than servants came to New England on their own. Among these solitary travelers, men outnumbered women ten to one. Unfortunately, the extant records do not reveal how many of these unaccompanied men were already married. Servants, presumably unmarried, formed 17 percent of the emigrants studied and most were males (80 of 114).³

Surviving records indicate that Boston's adult male population circa 1637 was 360. Of this number 126 (35 percent) were unmarried.⁴ Impressionistic evidence also suggests that unmarried men were indeed numerous in infant Massachusetts. Nathaniel Ward, in 1635, bemoaned the presence of "multitudes of idle and profane young men, servants and others, with whome we must leave our children, for whose sake and safty we came over."⁵ Leaders of the various New England colonies regarded stray bachelors as a problem serious enough to warrant laws placing all single men under family supervision.⁶ By contrast, the lack

of single English women was disconcerting enough for Thomas Morton to complain in 1634 that "but a handful of weomen landed" in New England in the first decade and a half.⁷ Internal migration within New England tended to raise the ratio of single males in frontier regions where Indian communities were more accessible.⁸ For example, of the forty-four male settlers initially granted lands in the frontier town of Sudbury, Massachusetts, only sixteen were married.⁹

Despite the scarcity of prospective English brides the historical record reveals no legal marriage between a New England male and an Indian woman in the seventeenth century. It goes without saying that the record discloses no legal marriage of a colonial woman to a native man. Given the prevailing colonial attitudes toward the Indians, the absence of intermarriage is hardly surprising. To the Puritans, who viewed themselves as God's chosen people and the Indians as barbarous heathens,¹⁰ interracial marriage implied an inconceivable equality of status.

By contrast, the historical record indicates that New England's Algonquians were quite prepared to marry Europeans. Phinehas Pratt, a Wessagusett settler, recounted that a Frenchman shipwrecked in Massachusetts Bay shortly before the Pilgrims' arrival was given a wife by his Indian master, a Massachusetts tribesman.¹¹ Several Abenaki women also married Frenchmen during the seventeenth century.¹² Colonial English accounts likewise refer to at least two cases in which Algonquian women married New England males (William Baker and Joshua Tift), evidently under tribal law, in the seventeenth century.¹³ These Anglo-Indian conjugal unions, none of which was made formal under English law, strengthen the impression that Algonquian women had no aversion to English men as husbands. That race-mixing with the English was not repugnant to the northeastern Algonquians is also suggested from an incident reported by Thomas Morton, a pioneer settler at Mount Wollastan. Morton, upon encountering a gray-eyed Indian infant, informed the child's father, a Massachusetts tribesman, that his son was a bastard. Morton's disclosure did not in the least diminish the Indian father's pride in his child with "English mens eies."¹⁴

Furthermore, New England's Algonquians were accustomed to sealing politico-military alliances through intermarriage. Edward Winslow reported in 1646 that Miantonomo, sachem of the

Narragansetts, "would have married *Uncas* [chief of the Mohegans] daughter, and since *Pessachus* that succeeded him [Miantonomo] would have married *Woosamequins* [Massasoit's] daughter, and in all a policy to take them off from us."¹⁵

Unlike the Virginia colony, where starving Englishmen had no attraction as prospective husbands to Indian women who reportedly esteemed good providers,¹⁶ the Pilgrims, after enduring two lean years, subsequently became self-provisioning. The 1623 harvest brought "plenty"; William Bradford, writing at mid-century, maintained that "any general want or famine hath not been amongst them since [1623] to this day."¹⁷ Indeed, the Wampanoags, their subsistence pattern disrupted by a catastrophic decline in population following the epidemics of 1615–1619, sought sustenance from the Pilgrims. Deacon Robert Cushman in 1621 noted that "when any of them are in want, as often they are in the winter, when their corn is done, we supply them to our power, and have them in our houses eating and drinking, and warming themselves."¹⁸ Although the Puritan colonists also endured hunger until their fields became fruitful, it appears that their native neighbors, especially those devastated by the small pox scourge of 1633–1634, were even hungrier. Captain Edward Johnson observed that "the Indians came commonly to them [the Bay colonists] at those times, much hungry belly (as they used to say)" for provisions.¹⁹

There is some evidence to indicate that Algonquian women found English males quite appealing. John Brereton, who chronicled Bartholomew Gosnold's voyage to New England's southeastern coast in 1602, wrote that the Wampanoag (Pokanoket) women were "fat, and very well favoured, and much delighted in our companie."²⁰ Gabriel Archer, an English gentleman who also sailed with Gosnold, confirmed Brereton's impressions. Witnessing a visit by an Indian man, together with his wife and daughter, Archer described the women as "clean and straight-bodied, with countenance sweet and pleasant." These comely creatures behaved with "much familiarity" toward the English, "although they would not admit of any immodest touch."²¹ Englishmen's trade goods immeasurably enhanced their appeal to Algonquian women. On one visit to the Massachusetts a Pilgrim contingent returned to their shallop accompanied by native women eager to barter. So irresistible was English merchandise

to these women that they "sold their coats from their backs, and tyed boughes about" themselves "with great shamefastnesse."²²

If William Wood may be trusted, Indian women found Englishmen estimable for reasons other than their possession of food and alluring trade goods. Wood, a New England resident from 1629-1633, argued that Indian women envied the indulgent affection that English husbands bestowed on their wives. Based on other comments made by Wood, Algonquian men would have been less disposed than tribal women to entertain thoughts of marrying an English spouse. Wood alleged that colonial women would have made undesirable wives for Indian males who "do condemn the English for their folly in spoiling good working creatures [wives]."²³ It should be noted, however, that the colonists had practical motives for encouraging the Indians to believe that English women were too slothful to make good wives. Fostering such a belief among Indians might discourage them from taking colonial women captive in wartime. Thus during the Pequot War Lieutenant Lion Gardiner tried to dissuade the Pequots from attacking settlements in Connecticut by arguing that the plunder would be only horses, cattle, and women "who would do them no good, but hurt, for English women are lazy and can't do their work."²⁴

It should not be assumed that a lack of sexual attraction to Algonquian women deterred English males from intermarriage, for by and large colonial observers considered native women physically appealing. The Anglican minister William Morrell extolled in verse the charms of native females:

Besides, their women, which for th' most part are
Of comely forms, not blacke, nor very faire:
Whose beautie is a beauteous black laid on
Their paler cheeke, which they most doat upon:
For they by nature are both faire and white,
Inricht with graceful presence, and delight;²⁵

No Englishman was more enchanted by Algonquian women than John Josselyn, who made at least two voyages to New England in the seventeenth century. To Josselyn "many" Indian "squaws" had "very good features; seldome without a come-to-me, or *cos amoris*, in their countenance; all of them black-eyed; having even, short teeth, and very white; their hair black, thick,

and long; broad breasted; handsome, streight bodies, and slender, . . . their limbs cleanly, straight, and of a convenient stature,—generally as plump as partridges; and, saving here and there one, of a modest deportment.”²⁶

But though Algonquian women aroused the carnal interest of many New England males, colonial English men were almost never prepared to entertain thoughts of *de jure* marriage to Indian women. Scriptural injunctions against marriage to unbelievers loomed large among the discouragements to such thoughts.²⁷ John Rolfe’s famous marriage to Pocahontas merits attention because it represents a rare case in which a Calvinist Puritan discussed the thorny question. Before proposing marriage Rolfe agonized over “the heavie displeasure which almightie God conceived against the sonnes of Levie and Israel for marrying strange wives.” Rolfe ultimately became persuaded that the union’s potential benefits to God, England, Virginia, himself, and Pocahontas outweighed the risks involved. Among those risks, in Rolfe’s mind, were “the frailty of mankinde, his prones [proneness] to evil, his indulgencie of wicked thoughts, with many other imperfections wherein man is daily ensnared, and often times overthrowne, and them compared to my present estate.”²⁸ Rolfe concluded that his “present estate” as a civilized Christian would not be endangered by marrying the adaptable Pocahontas. But the Virginian’s soul-searching reflects a deep-rooted and long-standing English fear that, through biological amalgamation, English men would adopt the manners, customs, and language of colonized regions inhabited by “savage” peoples.

New Englanders were predisposed to expect that many of their people would assimilate their behavior to the New World’s “savage” peoples. The history of England’s territorial expansion had demonstrated the proclivity of Englishmen to degenerate when in contact with “uncivilized” foreign women. England’s “conquest” of the Irish, to whom American Indians were commonly likened,²⁹ had witnessed many of the victors’ succumbing to the customs and the women of the vanquished. To forestall English acculturation to the Gaelic Irish, the Statutes of Kilkenny were enacted by a parliament there in 1366. Because, the statutes read, “many English” in Ireland were known to “live and govern themselves according to the manners, fashion and language of the Irish enemies, and also have made divers marriages and

alliances between themselves and the Irish enemies," all sexual unions between the two peoples were prohibited. The statutes "ordained and established that no alliance by marriage, gossipred, fostering of children, concubinage or amour or in any other manner be henceforth made between the English and the Irish."³⁰

Fynes Moryson, secretary to Lord Mountjoy, England's viceroy in Ireland (1600–1606), noted his superior's efforts to prevent English soldiers "from making affinity by marriage with the neighbouring Irish." These efforts were part of an official strategy to segregate the English from the Irish. In addition, the English took "great care" that the colonies in Ireland "should consist of such men who were most unlike to fall to the barbarous customs of the Irish, . . . so as no less cautions were to be observed for uniting them and keeping them from mixing with the other than if these new colonies were to be led to inhabit among the barbarous Indians."³¹

The fate of an imagined Welsh outpost in America also reminded English promoters of colonization of their countrymen's tendency to assimilate themselves to colonized peoples. Among the curious but expedient notions entertained by English expansionists was that America, as the younger Richard Hakluyt put it, "was by Britaines discovered long before Columbus led any Spanyards thither." This convenient proposition, advanced to strengthen English claims to American realms, held that a Welsh prince named Modoc discovered the New World in 1170 and soon founded a settlement there. Hakluyt theorized that the Welsh colonists had "followed the manners of the land which they came unto, & used the language they found there."³² In English minds, then, fellow Britons had once before lost their "civility" in the wilds of America. Samuel Purchas found the Indianization of Modoc's followers entirely believable in view of how Englishmen had affected the manners of Ireland while civilizing few Irishmen:

But he which seeth how some of our English in small time have growne wilde in Ireland, and become in language and qualities Irish, few of whom doe in exchange become civilized and English . . . will not wonder that in so many Ages the halfe civilized Welsh

amongst Barbarians, without succession of Priests and entercourse of these parts might wholly put on feritie.³³

English retrogression in Ireland and the Welsh colony's dissolution, both presumably the result of biological and cultural fusion with indigenes, were cogent reasons for New Englanders to avoid racial amalgamation and its predictable apostasy. The Pilgrims brought to the New World a haunting fear of their own potential for moral and civil retrogression. William Bradford, Nathaniel Morton, and Edward Winslow each recounted that the Pilgrims had left their congregation in Leyden, Holland, out of fear that their children would lose their moral and cultural standards.³⁴ As Bradford phrased it, "they saw their posterity would be in danger to degenerate and be corrupted."³⁵

From the time that these Puritan Separatists conceived their visionary project of establishing a beachhead of sanctity in America, they recognized that community cohesiveness was imperative for their survival and moral transcendence. Pastor John Robinson and William Brewster wrote from Holland in 1617, describing to Sir Edwin Sandys the solidarity of their godly little band: "We are knit together as a body in a most strict and sacred bond and covenant of the Lord, of the violation whereof we make great conscience, and by virtue whereof we do hold ourselves straitly tied to all care of each other's good and of the whole, by everyone and so mutually."³⁶ Such a close-knit fellowship would not readily suffer the intrusion of their non-Separatist countrymen, much less heathen "savages."

Familiar association with New England's aboriginals was considered inimical to religious orthodoxy and English standards of civility. Pilgrim leaders were unmistakably anxious about the possibility of cultural deterioration in "a hideous and desolate wilderness, full of wild beasts and wild men." For Governor Bradford the "mighty ocean" constituted a "main bar and gulf" that isolated his adherents "from all the civil parts of the world."³⁷ Old World allegations that the Pilgrims had fallen from rectitude exacerbated their fears and provoked strident refutations born of nagging doubts. In 1621 Robert Cushman was moved to "testify to our Christian countrymen, who judge diversely of us, that though we be in a heathen country, yet the grace of Christ is not quenched in us."³⁸

The fate of Thomas Weston's settlement at Wessagusset furnished immediate alarming proof of Englishmen's capacity to "turn savage."³⁹ After exhausting their transported provisions, the sixty unmarried men who had settled at Wessagusset in 1622 scattered among the Massachusetts searching for food. Aware of the dire straits of these starving men, Bradford denounced them for squandering their stores on Massachusetts "squaws." Plymouth settlers accused John Sanders, governor at Wessagusset, of "keeping Indian women."⁴⁰ Winslow ascribed the "overthrow and bane" of Weston's plantation to irresponsible promoters who sent to America men "endued with bestial, yea, diabolical affections."⁴¹ As Bradford saw it, their thievery and promiscuous sexual relations with Indian women had made Weston's "lusty men" odious to the Massachusetts.⁴² The misconduct of the Wessagusset traders and fishermen gave rise to an alleged Massachusetts' conspiracy to destroy English settlements that was snuffed out by the preventive reprisals of Captain Miles Standish. Thereafter Weston's men abandoned their beleaguered outpost. The Wessagusset affair reinforced the Pilgrims' fear that civil order might disintegrate in New England's wilds and that sexual contacts with Algonquian women promoted that disintegration.

Nor was Wessagusset the first English plantation to be disrupted by the enticements of Indian women and by Englishmen's proclivity for backsliding. As early as 1608 Sir Ferdinando Gorges complained that Sagadahoc's planters had divided "into factions, each disgracing the other, even to the savages . . . whose conversation and familiarity they have most frequented." The English fishermen and traders at this colony in Maine were rumored to be "worse than the very Savages, impudently and openly lying with their Women, teaching their Men to drinke drunke, to sweare and blaspheme the name of GOD, and in their drunken humour to fall together by the eares."⁴³

Of New England's early settlers, none were more hateful and frightening to the Pilgrims and subsequently to the Bay colonists than Thomas Morton's unruly crew of revelers at "Merry-mount." Morton, a free-spirited trader and sometimes lawyer, came to New England in 1622, and again in 1625 with Captain Wollaston to help found a plantation near the abandoned village of Wessagusset. When Wollaston and many of his followers left

for Virginia in 1626, Morton assumed leadership of the struggling colony, renaming it Ma-re-Mount. The Pilgrim fathers reviled Morton and his fellow-traders for selling guns and rum to the Massachusetts and for falling into "great licentiousness" with Indian women. An outraged Bradford castigated Morton, the "Lord of Misrule," and his "School of Atheism," for erecting a Maypole and "drinking and dancing about it many days together, inviting the Indian women for their consorts, dancing and frisking together like so many fairies, or furies rather; and worse practices."⁴⁴

The Merrymount traders' sale of muskets to the Indians was the most terrifying of their misdeeds to Plymouth's residents. But Merrymount's carnal attractions, not the least of which were compliant native women, also threatened to lure indentured servants and sundry malcontents away from neighboring English settlements. In 1628 Bradford wrote in alarm to the Council for New England, venting his dread that Morton and those of his ilk would multiply until "we should not be able to restrain his inordinariness when we would, they living without all fear of God or common honesty, some of them abusing the Indian women most filthily, as it is notorious."⁴⁵ To Plymouth's patriarch, interracial sexual relations were contributing to the disintegration of New England's precarious moral and civil life. Small wonder that no hint of a willingness to promote Anglo-Indian intermarriage appears in the historical record of Plymouth's infancy.

To Morton and his cohorts, Indian women were nothing more than extramarital sexual partners and companionable diversions. As they danced about the Maypole, Morton's rum-fortified crew sang with gusto: "Lasses in beaver coats come away, yee shall be welcome to us night and day." Morton insisted that the gamblers' paeans to "Hymens joyes" were merely "harmelless mirth made by younge men, (that lived in hope to have [English] wives brought over to them, that would save them a labour to make a voyage to fetch any over,). . . ." Plymouth's "precise Seperatists," wrote Morton, troubled "their braines more then reason would require about things that are indifferent [inconsequential]."⁴⁶

Ironically, though Morton was enormously fond of the Massachusetts and thought them "more full of humanity then the Christians," he, no less than New England's oligarchy, was committed to English predominance over the natives. Anglo-Indian

peace was contingent upon English ascendance. In Morton's view, "for a Christian to submit to the rule of a Savage, . . . is both shame and dishonor: at least it is my opinion, and my practise was accordingly, and I have the better quarter by the meanes thereof."⁴⁷ This characteristic Anglo imperiousness was hardly conducive to interracial marriage, which implied Anglo-Indian equipose or, more ominously in colonial minds, English submission to savagery.

Another trader whose intimacies with and assimilation to Indians agitated Pilgrim fathers was a renegade named Edward Ashley. Sent out in 1630 by Isaac Allerton to manage Plymouth's incipient fur-trading operations at the mouth of Maine's Penobscot River, Ashley came to be regarded as a "profane young man." For Bradford he furnished additional evidence of an Englishman's capacity to become thoroughly Indianized. The young trader, the governor complained, "had for some time lived among the Indians as a savage and went naked amongst them and used their manners, in which time he got their language." Once again the attractions of savagery that had ensnared Ashley included Indian women with whom "he had committed uncleanness."⁴⁸ Thus, it appeared to New England authorities that their most disorderly, anarchic, and retrograde sons of Adam flourished in the company of Indian seductresses. Stigmatized as instruments of English waywardness, native women could not easily be regarded as suitable marriage partners.

Generally apathetic about their missionary responsibilities, the Pilgrims nonetheless imposed on their Algonquian neighbors strict standards of sexual conduct designed not so much to save their souls as to discourage interracial sexual unions. Isaack De Rasieres, a New Netherlander who visited Bradford around 1628, was amazed at New Plymouth's exacting standards of prenuptial chastity and marital fidelity, even for Indians. "They have made stringent laws and ordinances upon the subject of fornication and adultery," wrote the Dutchman, "which laws they maintain and enforce very strictly indeed, even among the tribes which live amongst them. They speak very angrily when they hear from the savages that we live so barbarously in these respects, and without punishment."⁴⁹ The angry reactions alluded to evince more than just the Pilgrims' moral outrage at Dutch sinners of the flesh. Fellow Europeans turned barbarous in America's wilderness were disquieting exhibits of what Englishmen

might also become. Moreover, it was acutely galling to have Indians call attention to the sexual transgressions of civilized people.

Despite Plymouth's efforts to enforce its rigid code of sexual morality, the Pilgrims proved to be altogether human. Illicit sexual relations with Indians are documented, albeit infrequent, in Plymouth's surviving legal records. Although Indians were typically defendants in Plymouth courts, colonial males were normally the accused in cases involving interracial sexual offenses.⁵⁰

Like their Pilgrim forerunners, the Massachusetts Bay settlers encountered docile Indians whose friendly reception obviated the need for alliances sealed by intermarriage as a means of ensuring non-aggression. The plague-devastated Massachusetts around Boston received the numerically preponderant Puritans as protectors. "The demographic disparity," states historian Neal Salisbury, "enabled the [Massachusetts Bay] colony to acquire its dominant role without exercising any real initiative."⁵¹ The Puritans were not, however, disposed to entrust their security to the lasting amity of Indians deemed the "bond-slaves of Satan."⁵² No trust could be placed in the Algonquians' cordial overtures, which were regarded as the stratagems of an inherently treacherous people. So in 1631, when a sachem invited John Winthrop to send colonists to settle the Connecticut River Valley, the governor, suspecting treachery, refused.⁵³

Winthrop, typifying New England's civil and religious hierarchs, believed that the survival and well-being of the fledgling plantations depended upon the preservation of cohesive and religiously unalloyed communities of the proper faithful. Dispersion of settlers would weaken the collectivism of the parent communities and subject the scattered individuals to undue physical and moral hazards. In 1642, with disgruntled Bay colonists returning to England or leaving for the West Indies or New Netherland, Winthrop poured out his fears that his cherished Zion might collapse. Christians who had covenanted themselves in a civil and church fellowship had no right whatever to desert their brethren and pursue their individual interests. Winthrop's apprehensions, along with his scorn for New England's Indians, are exposed in his *Journal*:

For such as come together into a wilderness, where are nothing but wild beasts and beastlike men, and

there confederate together in civil and church estate, whereby they do, . . . bind themselves to support each other, and all of them that society, . . . whereof they are members, how they can break from this without free consent, is hard to find, so as may satisfy a tender or good conscience in time of trial. Ask thy conscience, if thou wouldst have plucked up thy stakes, and brought thy family 3,000 miles, if thou hadst expected that all, or most, would have forsaken thee there. Ask again, what liberty thou hast towards others, which thou likest not to allow others towards thyself; for if one may go, another may, and so the greater part, and so church and commonwealth may be left destitute in a wilderness, exposed to misery and reproach, . . .⁵⁴

Believing that their endurance depended upon the shared efforts of indivisible associations of reformed English Protestants, the Puritans advanced New England's frontier through strictly regulated group endeavors. Individuals were effectively discouraged from sallying forth on their own to carve out homes in Indian country. Furthermore, exclusiveness was a dominant feature of New England's Puritan communities. Historian Kenneth A. Lockridge has characterized the plantation of Dedham, Massachusetts, as "a Christian Utopian Closed Corporate Community." Dedham was "closed" insofar as "its membership was selected while outsiders were treated with suspicion or rejected altogether."⁵⁵ At its founding in 1636, Dedham's "proprietors" prepared a covenant setting forth their vision of an ideal Puritan settlement. The founders and all future townsmen pledged "that we shall by all means labor to keep off from us all such as are contrary minded, and receive only such unto us as may be probably of one heart with us."⁵⁶

The Massachusetts General Court endorsed such exclusiveness; in May 1637 it forbade permanent residence in the Bay colony except with permission of the magistrates. Directed against Anne Hutchinson and her disciples, the order was vigorously defended by John Winthrop. "If we are bound to keepe off whatsoever appears to tend to our ruine or damage," reasoned Winthrop, "then we may lawfully refuse to receive such whose dispositions suitenot with ours and whose society (we know) will

be hurtful to us, and therefore it is lawfull to take knowledge of all men before we receive them."⁵⁷

New England's Algonquians had been victims of such exclusiveness from their first contact with the Puritans. In its 1629 instructions to John Endicott, the newly organized Massachusetts Bay Company advised that "for the avoyding of the hurt that may follow through over much familiaritie with the Indians, wee conceive it fitt that they bee not permitted to come to your plantation but at certain tymes and places to be appointed them."⁵⁸ Colonial officials quickly made systematic efforts to segregate the races. On March 1, 1631, the Court of Assistants, perturbed by the number of Indian servants employed in colonial homes, ordered that they be promptly discharged and "that noe person shall hereafter intertaine any Indian for a servant without licence from the court."⁵⁹ Even the lucrative fur trade was encumbered with regulations whose aim was to keep Indians away from English dwellings. On June 5, 1632, the Court of Assistants ordered "that there shalbe a trucking howse [trading post] appoynted in every plantacion, whither the Indians may resorte to trade, to avoide there comeing to severall howses."⁶⁰ These ordinances were not unusual; Alden T. Vaughan points out that "most Puritan governments passed laws forbidding Indians to 'hanker about' English homes."⁶¹ Colonial attempts to keep Indians at a distance were often effectively aided by Algonquian efforts to separate themselves from colonists whose cattle wreaked havoc upon unfenced Indian corn fields.⁶² Nor could the Algonquians have long remained oblivious to the stark reality that those who mingled with colonists incurred much higher mortality rates from strange diseases than those who distanced themselves from intruders who avowed that their god could visit disease upon their enemies.⁶³

Beyond the concern for their physical safety, the Puritans tried to segregate Indians in the belief that rectitude could be preserved only by avoiding the company of sinners. Accordingly, Richard Mather, Dorchester minister and the first of his eminent New England clan, cautioned his flock: "Let a man beware of his company. He that delights to walk and talk with them that have the plague, it is no marvel if he catch infection."⁶⁴ If Massachusetts' Cambridge congregation was representative of New

England, church members even shunned the parish at large. Thomas Shepard expressed the vexation of parishioners thus shunned: "Many complain that *New England* hath so little love, Non-members not visited not regarded . . . here they may live and never be spoken to, never visited."⁶⁵ More germanely, the company of Indian women had to be avoided, for they quickly became sinful distractions to Bay Englishmen. Winthrop noted in 1631 that "a young fellow was whipped for soliciting an Indian squaw to incontinency."⁶⁶ So grave was this offense to the Puritans that it prompted the Massachusetts General Court to consider "whether adultery, either with English or Indian shall not be punished with death."⁶⁷

Winthrop himself had a curious encounter with an Indian woman that unnerved the normally composed governor. Having gone out hunting wolves one evening, Winthrop lost his way home and was compelled to spend the night in the woods. Just before daybreak rain forced him to take shelter in a vacant Indian hut. That morning a native woman tried to enter the hut but Winthrop recounted that he "barred her out." Though she stayed "a great while" trying to get inside, the governor refused her entrance until "at last she went away, and he returned safe home."⁶⁸ In shrinking from contact with the Algonquian woman, Winthrop betrayed fear not for his physical safety—he did have a gun—but for his soul's welfare. Indian women had come to symbolize wilderness temptations and Winthrop well knew that he must wall himself off from such.

New Englanders did believe that their physical safety was compromised by an Englishman who lived with an Indian woman among her people. In 1637, Roger Williams agonized over the threat posed by William Baker, a renegade living with the Mohegans and Pequot fugitives. Baker had fled from Connecticut authorities "for uncleanness with an Indian squaw, who is now with child by him." Accommodating himself to native life, Baker acquired a second "squaw," learned to "speak much Indian," and, in William's words, "is turned Indian in nakedness and cutting of hair, and after many whoredoms, is there married." Williams implored Connecticut officials to seize Baker, a "fire brand" who "with those Pequots may fire whole towns." Finally on May 22, 1638, Williams wrote with immense relief to Winthrop that

Baker, "notorious in villainy, and strongly affected by those wretches [the Pequots]," had been captured, sent to Hartford, and whipped for his "uncleanness."⁶⁹

The dimensions of the problem of New Englanders' conversion to savagery is suggested by the Connecticut legislature's acknowledgement in 1642 that "diverse persons depart from amongst us and take up their abode with the Indians in a profane course of life." It could not have escaped the colonists' attention that the renegades' profaneness almost inevitably included cohabitation with Indian women, the embodiments of savage attractions. To prevent desertion, Connecticut legislated that runaways were to suffer imprisonment for at least three years and to "undergo such further censure by fine or corporal punishment" as was deemed appropriate.⁷⁰

In their wars with Indians New Englanders often killed and normally enslaved captured native women.⁷¹ To kill "squaws" was to destroy savagery's temptations; to enslave them symbolized the conquest of savagery. For the Puritans a "squaw" had two basic defects: her savagery and her sex. Seventeenth-century Englishmen tended to distrust women solely because of their sex. Character deficiencies were thought to be intrinsic to women's nature. "Necessary evils," "unclean vessels," and "Jezebels," were opprobrious terms commonly applied to women. The Reverend John Cotton's reproach of those who "despise and decry them [women], and call them a necessary Evil," draws attention to a prevailing attitude.⁷² Women were commonly regarded as base instruments for mankind's propagation and as the source of sin in the world through Eve's fall. In his *Matrimonial Honour* (1642), a popular treatise on marriage, the old England Puritan, Daniel Rogers, advised wives to remember that "thy sexe is crazy, ever since Eve sinned."⁷³ John Demos writes that "it was no coincidence that in both the Old and New World witches were mostly women."⁷⁴ An example of English mistrust of native women is found in an account of Martin Frobisher's arctic explorations (1576). Frobisher's crew seized an old aboriginal woman "whom divers of our Saylers supposed to be eyther a devill, or a witch, had her bu[ck]skins plucked off, to see if she were cloven footed, and for her ougly hew and deformity we let her goe."⁷⁵

Of course, Englishmen saw redeeming qualities in women of their own culture. An Englishwoman's virtues were largely those

related to her role as a civilizing agent. In a 1599 defense of women's worth, Anthony Gibson declared that men "could neither be gracious, courteous, or civil, but only by the society of women."⁷⁶ "Howses where no women bee, are lyke deserts or untilled land" was a popular proverb of the day.⁷⁷ But to the English, an Indian woman possessed the inherent disabilities of her sex without the compensation of being an agent of civility. European males who cohabited with "squaws" generally adapted to Indian life; children of these unions were normally enculturated in native ways by the mother. Without merit as a source of social refinement, Indian women were regarded primarily as enticements to cultural and moral retrogression.

Increase Mather, consumed with a representative clerical anxiety that New Englanders were "ready to run wild into the woods again and to be as Heathenish as ever,"⁷⁸ witnessed an English renegade who personified this retrogression during King Philip's War. Mather, as if to justify the incineration of Narragansett women and children in their wigwams by Josiah Winthrop's troops, pointed out that one of the prisoners taken was "a wretched Englishman that apostatized to the Heathen, and fought with them against his own Country-men."⁷⁹ Predictably, the turncoat, Joshua Tift by name, had married a native woman according to tribal practice and was thoroughly Indianized. When captured, Tift exhibited an Englishman's potential for backsliding; he had become "as ignorant as an Heathen" in matters of Christian doctrine.⁸⁰ For his apostacy Tift was condemned by a military court, hanged, and then quartered.

By the last quarter of the seventeenth century, Puritan apprehensions that the decline of religious zeal foreshadowed imminent divine chastisement were everywhere apparent. Benjamin Tompson, Yankee schoolmaster, physician, and poet, regarded King Philip's War as the unleashing of God's fury on saints fallen from grace. In his poem "New England's Crisis" (1676), Tompson reviled the Wampanoag rebel, King Philip, as a "greazy Lout" who fostered Anglo-Indian miscegenation. Philip, the incarnation of evil, was made to propose "Wee'l have their silken wives take they our Squaws."⁸¹

The Puritan penchant for decrying hateful antagonists as fornicators with Indian women surfaces again in their charges against Sir Edmund Andros. Detested because he administered James

II's attempt to centralize colonial government, Andros was the butt of hackneyed accusations: "And that there might be an universal hatred against him, it was whispered about, that the Governour . . . admitted the Squaws dayly to him; or else he went out and lodged with them."⁸²

Presumably Indian women could have been transformed into acceptable brides for Englishmen had they become civilized Christians. New Englanders surely paid lip service to their missionary duties but made only belated and half-hearted attempts to Christianize the Algonquians. The negligible number of Indians converted during the first quarter century of New England's history lends credence to this conclusion. Bay Company settlers could not rely on Christianized natives to assist proselytization, for the Pilgrims, as John White noted in 1630, were "not able to give account of any one man converted to Christianity."⁸³

Puritans themselves confessed their tardiness and meager achievements in propagating the Gospel. Edward Johnson acknowledged in 1651 that "very little was done" to convert the heathen savages until John Eliot began preaching to them in 1646.⁸⁴ Eliot, who often bemoaned the meager results of his missionary labors, provided one explanation for his difficulties: New England's Algonquians were supremely indifferent to Calvinism. In fact, when any colonist "began to speake of God, & heaven & hell, & religion unto them, they would presently be gone." It was well-known to the English that if the Indians "were burdensome and you would have them gone, speake of religion & you were presently rid of them."⁸⁵

The occasional Indian convert was apt to provoke the enmity of his own race. In 1648 John Cotton, eminent Boston divine, recounted how Sagamore John embraced the faith after the Reverend John Wilson had cured him of an illness. But the chief's "neighbor Indians Sagamores, and powwaws [medicine men] hearing of this, threatened to *cram* him (that is, to kill him) if he did so degenerate from his country gods, and religion, he thereupon fell off, and took up his Indian course of life again."⁸⁶ New England's Algonquians were far less receptive to the colonists' religion than to their material culture.

But Indian resistance only partially explains the tentativeness of the work of conversion. To be sure, the challenges of survival in a strange land demanded much of the first planters. Yet, as

their prompt construction of churches and the expeditious founding of Harvard in 1636 suggest, the Puritans attached overriding importance to their own spiritual well-being to the neglect of the Indians'.

The scant harvest of Indian souls was preeminently the product of Puritan revulsion with "savagery." Repelled by the natives' "wild and sinful courses" the Puritans could barely imagine such degraded humanity receiving the true faith.⁸⁷ John Wilson, minister of Boston, compared New England's aborigines to its "woody and rocky soile," and admitted that those who hoped to enlarge Christ's kingdom were initially "discouraged to put plow in such dry and rocky ground." Wilson, a supporter of proselytization, doubted that any "Nation of people ever so deeply degenerated since Adams fall as these Indians."⁸⁸

It is true that a few self-appointed missionaries, notably Eliot, Thomas Mayhew, junior, and his father, Thomas, senior, enjoyed modest success.⁸⁹ But these earnest men neither typified their calling nor their society. Rare indeed was the New Englander confident of the natives' imminent conversion. In 1671 a frustrated Eliot testified to his own faltering hopes: "I find few English students willing to engage in so dim a work as this is."⁹⁰ Puritan unwillingness or inability to regard Indians as prospective "saints" by and large accounts for the colonists' failure to propose intermarriage as an instrument for conversion.

There is no evidence whatever to indicate that the Puritans regarded the Indian converts who lived in "praying towns" as acceptable marriage partners. Nor did any Puritan missionary to the Algonquians advocate intermarriage in order to civilize or Christianize the natives. Eliot himself did not even favor the integration of Indian converts into Puritan congregations.⁹¹ Few New Englanders besides the missionaries were persuaded that the "praying Indians'" conversion was genuine. In 1652 John Brock, who ministered to fishermen on the Isle of Shoals, summed up the prevailing colonial view: "The professing Indians are not to be trusted."⁹² This distrust was, of course, most evident in times of Anglo-Indian tensions. Thus in 1653, with rumors flying of Dutch-Indian plots, Eliot reported that many colonists believed the praying Indians "were in a conspiracy with others . . . to doe mischief to the English."⁹³ New England's Christian Indians endured cruel persecution during King Philip's War. Hundreds

were driven onto the barren, wind-lashed islands of Boston Harbor, where they suffered from inadequate food, clothing, and shelter. A few praying Indians, including several women and a boy, were treacherously murdered by colonial vigilantes. Daniel Gookin, stout-hearted friend of the Christian Indians, wrote that during the war "the animosity and rage of the common people increased against them, that the very name of a praying Indian was spoken against, in so much, that some wise and principal men did advise some that were concerned with them, to forbear giving that epithet of praying." For tenaciously defending the Christian Indians, Gookin aroused hatreds so intense that he feared to walk the streets of Boston. Gookin's fears were justified; the Indian haters had actually conspired to murder him.⁹⁴

The early documentary record provides only one exasperatingly cryptic allusion to Anglo-Indian intermarriage. The minutes of the Massachusetts General Court for March 4, 1635, state that "the matter of marriage betwixte Englishe & Indeans is referd to after consideration."⁹⁵ There is no further mention of the subject in the records of Massachusetts or of any other New England colony in the seventeenth century. It is fitting that intermarriage was discussed in 1635, a time shortly before the Puritan churches were transformed into exclusive societies for "saints" and their children. By 1636, as Edmund S. Morgan has shown, the Puritans were restricting church membership to those who could furnish convincing evidence of having received saving grace.⁹⁶ This restriction constituted a formidable barrier to Indian membership and thereby substantially disqualified natives as prospective marriage partners.

It was not their race per se that rendered Indians unfit for saving faith in Puritan minds. Recent scholarship has demonstrated that seventeenth-century New Englanders did not view Indians as racially distinct from themselves.⁹⁷ Church membership was not limited to Whites; a Negro maid servant was admitted to the Dorchester Congregation in 1641. Cotton Mather, who championed the Christianization of Negro servants, exhibited his best instincts when he wrote: "The God who looks on the heart is not moved by the color of the skin, is not more propitious to one color than another."⁹⁸

But to exonerate the Puritans of racial discrimination is not to imply that they were free of vitriolic anti-Indian prejudices. Cotton Mather was not a racist, but he reviled the northeastern Al-

gonquians as "doleful creatures" who were "the veriest *ruines of mankind* which are to be found any where upon the face of the earth."⁹⁹ The learned Boston minister thought New England's "miserable savages" were Satan's minions. "The wilderness through which we are passing to the Promised Land is all over fill'd with fiery flying serpents," he wrote. "All our way to heaven lies by *dens of lions* and the *mounts of leopards*; there are incredible droves of *devils in our way*."¹⁰⁰ Hatreds spawned by religious fanaticism are no less venomous than conventional racism.

Puritan anti-Indian feelings were exacerbated in times of interracial warfare. Hence in the aftermath of the Pequot War, colonial vindictiveness bordered on genocide. Roger Williams described it:

How often have I heard both the English and Dutch (not onely the civill, but the most debauched and profane) say, These *Heathen Dogges*, better kill a thousand of them then that we *Christians* should be indangered or troubled with them; Better they were all cut off, & then we shall be no more troubled with them: They have spilt our *Christian* blood, the best way to make riddance of them, cut them all off, and so make way for Christians.¹⁰¹

People vilified as "heathen dogs" or, to use Edward Johnson's words, as "not only men but devils,"¹⁰² were not apt to be considered fit matrimonial prospects. Since even English sinners were deemed unsuitable as marriage partners for church members, heathen Indians were totally beyond the pale. This is not surprising, for Puritans considered marriage the most perfect relationship between humans and the nearest approximation to a saint's sacred covenant with God. Puritan ministers commonly equated this covenant to human marriage. "I say this is a totall union," wrote Thomas Hooker, "the whole nature of the Savior, and the whole nature of a believer are knit together; . . . the bond of matrimony knits these two together, . . . we feed upon Christ, and grow upon Christ, and are married to Christ."¹⁰³

Given the spiritual symbolism of marriage and the exclusiveness of church members, it follows that English sinners and heathen Indians would be proscribed as marriage partners for the elect. The proscriptions were formalized in the 1680 Synod of

Congregational Churches. This synod decreed that "it is the duty of Christians to marry in the Lord; and therefore, such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, papists, or other idolaters: Neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying such as are wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresie."¹⁰⁴

But what of the marital choices of unregenerate New Englanders who may have been a majority of the colonists even in the early years? A letter from Robert Stansby to the Reverend John Wilson in 1637 indicates that most of Massachusetts' founders were unable to provide proof of saving faith. "You are so strict in admission of members to your church," wrote Stansby, "that more then one halfe are out of your church in all your congregations."¹⁰⁵ The number of unregenerate persons in seventeenth-century New England was indeed sizeable, but the Puritan aristocracy of visible saints established New England's cultural patterns and dictated its fundamental moral outlook.

Because salvation mattered to those lacking saving grace and because they were politically powerless, there were cogent reasons why the unregenerate would strive for admission to the covenant. One means to facilitate admission was through matrimonial ties to a family of elected individuals. John Cotton advised that "if you be not in the Covenant, but your whole desire is, that you may, you must labour to bring yourselves into a good family."¹⁰⁶ True, marriages between persons with corrupt nature and saints were at first frowned upon and later explicitly prohibited, but they apparently occurred with disquieting frequency. "It may make us dread to think whats coming," wrote Increase Mather, "in that it is with us as it was with the old World, the Sons of God are marrying with the Daughters of Men."¹⁰⁷ For their spiritual good and for a voice in their own governance it was advisable for the unregenerate to aspire to marry a visible saint. No such advantages would accrue from marriage to an Indian.

As early as 1630 the Massachusetts General Court limited the rights to vote and hold office in the colony to those who were church members by virtue of experiencing saving grace. Among those denied the franchise and office-holding privileges were an undetermined number of presbyterians. In 1645 Robert Child together with six other men purporting to speak for "divers of our Countrymen," presented to the General Court a petition of pres-

byterian grievances. The petitioners demanded that Massachusetts "give liberty to the Members of the Churches of *England* not scandalous in their lives and conversations (as Members of those Churches) to be taken into your Congregations, and to enjoy with you all those liberties and ordinances Christ hath purchased for them." The petitioners were palpably embittered at the visible saints' galling indifference to distinctions among the persons who comprised the mixed multitude of unregenerate souls. Child and his fellow-petitioners considered themselves "in a worse case here, and lesse free, then the Natives amongst whom we live." The petition demanded that Massachusetts adhere strictly to the laws of England so as to ensure the "comfortable enjoyment of our Lives, Liberties and Estates, according to our due Naturall rights, as Free-born subjects of the English nation." The petitioners clearly tried to distinguish themselves from New England's disentitled Indians. "We and ours are *English*," avowed the disgruntled seven, implying that their rights as Englishmen had not been forfeited due to any form of amalgamation with Indians.¹⁰⁸ Thus, New Englanders lacking demonstrable sanctification had compelling motives to dissociate themselves from their Algonquian neighbors. Marriage to an Indian, the most intimate form of human association, would have diminished their chances to gain access to church membership and weakened their posterity's entitlement to the political rights and privileges claimed by simon-pure Englishmen.

Beyond the religious and political considerations that militants against Anglo-Indian intermarriage, there were social and economic considerations nearly as dissuasive. New Englanders of all religious persuasions regarded the ideal marriage as a union of persons of comparable social rank. Puritan ministers lectured their congregations that happy marriages yoked partners equal "in birth, education and religion."¹⁰⁹ The "well-known intermarriage of ministerial, mercantile and magisterial families in Massachusetts," to which English historian Roger Thompson alludes, focuses attention on the tendency of New Englanders to marry within their class, and even within their occupations.¹¹⁰ Wealth no less than social status was taken into account in arranging marriages. As a rule the Puritans viewed marriage less as a match of people in love than as a commercial arrangement between families. Parents of both bride and groom bargained artfully with

one another to win a handsome "portion" or dowry for their respective offspring. A chagrined Increase Mather wrote that "Church Members in disposing of their Children look more at Portion than at Piety."¹¹¹ No less vexed by the economic considerations that impinged upon marriage proposals was Cotton Mather, who lamented that "a *Woman* is often valued according to the *Silver* that she has to bring unto them that will call her their *Mistress*."¹¹² Such social and economic criteria for matrimony emphatically disqualified Indian women in English eyes.

The Puritan conviction that marriage bound husband and wife not only to each other but to each other's relatives was undoubtedly an added mental barrier to intermarriage. A Puritan spouse, Edmund Morgan has shown, acquired a whole new set of relations at marriage.¹¹³ Toward parents-in-law a good Puritan exhibited filial piety; other relatives by marriage were also owed dutiful respect and helpful assistance. To the Puritans, Indians deserved no such respect, and the extensive additional familial responsibilities would surely have been unwelcome burdens. And, apart from Indians engaged in the fur trade, New England's Algonquians were generally incapable of providing the kinds of commercial support and assistance that a Puritan spouse expected from relatives by marriage.

To conclude, then, seventeenth-century New Englanders had no compelling incentives to promote Anglo-Indian intermarriage and had many motives for eschewing it. For the colonists, the northeastern Algonquians represented neither a threat of sufficient magnitude to necessitate alliances sealed by intermarriage nor genuinely prospective recipients of reformed Protestantism to be converted through intermarriage. Scriptural prohibitions, fears of moral and cultural degeneration, social and religious exclusiveness, and acquisitive English standards for matrimony all militated against intermarriage. The most formidable barriers to Anglo-Indian marriage were intrinsic to seventeenth-century New England culture and demonstrate its ethnocentrism, exclusiveness, insecurity, and materialism. The cases of New England males who had extramarital sexual relationships with Algonquian women illustrate the unavailability of English women and the absence of the dominant preoccupation with establishing and preserving a religious utopia in the New World. These cases indicate that Englishmen had no racial aversion to Indian women,

or at least that such an aversion could be overcome by unfulfilled sex drives if no religious obsessions or fears about the resultant collapse of the social order intervened.

NOTES

1. Scholarly explanations for the absence of Anglo-Indian intermarriage in seventeenth-century New England have been many and varied. Alden T. Vaughan, *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675* (rev. ed.; New York, 1979), 209, regards differences of religion, culture, and education as major barriers, especially for Puritans. Vaughan adds that infant New England "enjoyed a fairly even balance of English men and women." Gary B. Nash, *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America* (2nd ed.; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1982), 274-275, maintains that Anglo-Indian sexual mixing was rare in early New England because of the availability of white women and the relative scarcity of Indians devastated by epidemics. H. C. Porter, *The Inconstant Savage: England and the North American Indian, 1500-1660* (London, 1979), 109-112, contends that English colonists in North America were discouraged from marrying Indians by scriptural prohibitions against mixed marriage. James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York, 1985), 304, observes that "intermarriage in the English colonies was nearly nonexistent, due largely to racial prejudice and early balanced sex ratios." William Christie MacLeod, *The American Indian Frontier* (New York, 1928), 359-360, pointed out that English settlers needed wives who knew the ways of European housekeeping and husbandry and thus rejected Indian wives for very practical reasons. I am indebted to all of these scholars, and to many others, but I have attempted to explore the subject at greater depth and breadth and to call particular attention to the New Englanders' exclusiveness, marital standards, and their fears that intermarriage would endanger their morality and their cultural heritage.

2. John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York, 1970), 151, 193.

3. Virginia DeJohn Anderson, "Migrants and Motives: Religion and the Settlement of New England, 1630-1640," *The New England Quarterly* 58 (September 1985): 344-355. From surviving lists of migrants to New England in 1637, T. H. Breen found fifty-six servants of whom thirty-six were males. See Breen's *Puritans and Adventurers: Change and Persistence in Early America* (New York, 1980), 49, 64.

4. Emery Battis, *Saints and Sectaries* (Chapel Hill, 1962), Appendix 5, 330-344.

5. *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, 4th ser., 7, 24-25.

6. J. H. Trumbull and C. J. Hoadly, eds., *Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut* (15 vols.; Hartford, 1850-90), 1, 8; Nathaniel B. Shurtleff et al., eds., *Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England* (5 vols.; Boston, 1855-61), 2, 223 (hereafter *New Plymouth Records*); *Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of Massachusetts Bay* (21 vols.; Boston, 1869-1922), 1, 538.

7. Thomas Morton, *The New English Canaan*, ed. Charles Francis Adams, Jr. (Boston, 1883), 265.

8. Roger Thompson, *Women in Stuart England and America* (London, 1974), 29.
9. Sumner Chilton Powell, *Puritan Village: The Formation of a New England Town* (Middleton, Connecticut, 1963), Appendix 6, 189–190.
10. [Edward Johnson,] *Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence*, ed. by J. Franklin Jameson (New York, 1910), 41.
11. Phinehas Pratt, "A Declaration of the Affairs of the English People that First Inhabited New England," *Massachusetts Historical Society Collection*, 4th ser., 4 (1858): 479.
12. Jean-Vincent d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin (1652–1707) married an Abnaki woman by whom he fathered a son who became both a French officer and an Indian chief. John Gyles, an English boy held captive by the Abnaki for six years (1689–95), was taken to the home of a Frenchman married to an Indian woman. See Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676–1724* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981), 183, 102. In 1689 Sir Edmund Andros, governor of the Dominion of New England, plundered the household and trade goods of a Frenchman at Penobscot who had married the daughter of an Abnaki sachem. Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers . . .* (4 vols.; Gloucester, Mass., 1963), vol. 4, no. 9, 40.
13. See *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams* (7 vols.; New York, 1963), vol. 6: 67, 85, 95; William Hubbard, *The Present State of New-England* (London, 1677), 59; [Nathaniel Saltonstall,] "A Continuation of the State of New England," in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., *Narratives of the Indian Wars* (New York, 1913), 67. For my thoughts on these colonial "renegades," and on many other subjects, I am deeply indebted to James Axtell. For an informed discussion of the distress that William Baker and Joshua Tift caused colonial authorities see Axtell's *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York, 1981), 279–281.
14. Morton, *New English Canaan*, 148.
15. Edward Winslow, *Hypocrisie Unmasked: A True Relation of the Proceedings of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Against Samuel Gorton of Rhode Island* (London, 1646), 86.
16. In the Virginia colony's infancy, Englishmen scarcely able to feed themselves without relying on Indian provisions were deficient in the very attribute that Powhatan women apparently valued most in a husband—namely, skill as a provider. If we may believe Virginia's colonial secretary, William Strachey, Powhatan men took great pride in their hunting and fishing prowess, for "thereby . . . they wyn the loves of their women who wilbe the sooner contented to live with such a man." See William Strachey, *The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania* [1612], eds. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund, *Works*, issued by the Hakluyt Society, 2nd ser., 103 (London, 1953): 83–84. For a discussion of the issues bearing upon Anglo-Indian intermarriage in seventeenth-century Virginia see David D. Smits, "'Abominable Mixture': The Repudiation of Anglo-Indian Intermarriage in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 95 (April 1987): 157–192.
17. William Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620–1647*, ed. Samuel Eliot Morison (New York, 1952), 132.
18. [Robert Cushman], "Cushman's Discourse," in Alexander Young, ed., *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers of the Colony of Plymouth from 1602–1625* (Boston, 1841), 259–260.

19. Johnson's *Wonder-Working Providence*, 92.
20. John Brereton, "Briefe and True Relation of the Discoverie of the North Part of Virginia in 1602," in Henry S. Burrage, ed., *Early English and French Voyages* (New York, 1906), 339.
21. Gabriel Archer, "The Relation of Captain Gosnold's Voyage to the North Part of Virginia . . .," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.* 3rd ser., 8 (1843): 77.
22. *Journall of the English Plantation at Plimoth* [Mour's Relation], [London, 1622] (reprint ed., Ann Arbor, Mich., 1966), 59. In a thoughtful recent article Christopher L. Miller and George R. Hamell have hypothesized that during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries imported copper goods and glass beads were assimilated into traditional native ideological systems alongside indigenous copper, crystals, and shells as material components of great ritual significance. It was their highly charged ideological and symbolic value that made European trade goods so enormously attractive to the Indians. The authors argue that "the perceived similarity between novel items and familiar ones permitted the Woodland Indians to incorporate, not just the trade goods, but also the people who bore them." See the authors' "A New Perspective on Indian-White Contact: Cultural Symbols and Colonial Trade," *Journal of American History* 73 (September 1986): 311-328.
23. William Wood, *New England's Prospect*, ed. by Alden T. Vaughan (Amherst, Mass., 1977), 115. Wood is generally a trustworthy commentator, but his flattering appraisal of New England husbands may have been a defensive reaction against the common Old English charge that colonial husbands, following the example of their Indian counterparts, overworked their wives. Actually, the colonial farmwoman's ceaseless chores were even more laborious than the ordinary household work of an Algonquian wife.
24. [Lion Gardiner,] "Leift Lion Gardener His Relation of the Pequot Warres," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd ser., 3 (1833): 146.
25. [William Morrell,] "Morrell's Poem on New England," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 1st ser., 1 (1792): 135.
26. John Josselyn, "New England's Rarities Discov'ered," in *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* 4 (1860): 231.
27. In the King James Version of the Bible the references prohibiting intermarriage include the following: Exod. 34:11-16; Numb. 36:6-7; Deut. 7:3-4; Ezra 9:1-2, 10:3, 10, 14; 2 Cor. 6:14-15, 17.
28. "Letter of John Rolfe [1614]," in Lyon Gardiner Tyler, ed., *Narratives of Early Virginia, 1606-1625. Original Narratives of Early American History* (New York, 1907): 240-241.
29. Wood, *New England's Prospect*, 111; John Josselyn, "An Account of Two Voyages to New-England," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3 ser., 3 (1833): 295. Nicholas P. Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-76* (New York, 1976), demonstrates that the English concept of barbarism was established by the Irish experience and subsequently applied to the American Indian.
30. *The Statutes of Kilkenny, 1366*, in Edmund Curtis, ed., *Irish Historical Documents, 1172-1922* (London, 1943), 52-53.
31. C. Litton Falkiner, *Illustrations of Irish History and Topography, Mainly of the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1904), 297-298.

32. Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation* . . . 12 vols., (Glasgow, 1903-5), vol. 7, 134.
33. Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas His Pilgrimes* . . . (1625; 20 vols.; Glasgow, 1905-7), vol. 14, 298-299.
34. Nathaniel Morton, *New England's Memorial* (6th ed.; Boston, 1855), 11-12; Edward Winslow, *Hypocrisie Unmasked*, 89.
35. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 25.
36. *Ibid.*, 33.
37. *Ibid.*, 62.
38. "Cushman's Discourse," in Young, ed., *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers*, 260.
39. Winslow, "Good News from New England," in Edward Arber, ed., *The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers, 1606-1623* (London, 1897), 564.
40. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 116.
41. Winslow, "Good News from New England," in Arber, ed., *Story of the Pilgrim Fathers*, 514-515.
42. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 118.
43. J. P. Baxter, ed., *Sir Ferdinando Gorges and his Province of Maine* (3 vols.; Boston, 1890), vol. 3, 161.
44. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 205.
45. [William Bradford,] "Governor Bradford's Letter Book," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 1st ser., 3 (1794): 62.
46. Morton, *New English Canaan*, 280.
47. *Ibid.*, 256-257.
48. Bradford, *Of Plymouth Plantation*, 219, 233.
49. "Letter of Isaak De Rasieres to Samuel Blommaert, 1628(?)," in J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York, 1909), 112.
50. See Shurtleff, ed., *New Plymouth Records*, vol. 3, 180; vol. 5, 31, 107, 255.
51. Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643* (New York, 1982), 184.
52. [John White,] "The Planters Plea, or the Grounds of Plantations Examined, and usuall Objections Answered," in Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papters* . . . (4 vols.; Gloucester, Mass., 1963), vol. 2, no. 3, 22.
53. [John Winthrop,] *Winthrop's Journal, "History of New England," 1630-1649*, ed. by James K. Hosmer (2 vols.; New York, 1908), vol. 1, 61.
54. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, 83-84.
55. Kenneth A. Lockridge, *A New England Town: The First Hundred Years* (New York, 1970), 16.
56. Quoted in *ibid.*, 5.
57. *Winthrop Papers, 1631-1637* [Massachusetts Historical Society] (5 vols.; Boston, 1943), vol. 3, 423.
58. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England* (5 vols.; Boston, 1853-1854), vol. 1, 394.
59. *Ibid.*, 83.
60. *Ibid.*, 96.
61. Vaughan, *New England Frontier*, 198.
62. Edward Winslow, "The Glorious Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd ser., 4 (1834): 81.

63. Edward Winslow, *Good Newes from New England* (1624), in George F. Wil-lison, ed., *The Pilgrim Reader* (Garden City, N.Y., 1953), 176. An example of how epidemic diseases were ascribed by Indians to their associations with Euro-peans is the case of Canada's eastern Algonquians, who blamed the French for spreading sickness. In 1616 Father Pierre Biard, a missionary in eastern Canada, reported that the Micmacs "assert that, before this association and intercourse [with the French], all their countries were very populous, and they tell how one by one the different coasts, according as they have begun to traffic with us, have been more reduced by disease." See Biard's *Relation of New France* (1616), in Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (73 vols.; New York, 1959), vol. 3, 105.

64. Richard Mather, *The Summe of Certain Sermons* (Cambridge, 1652), preface.

65. Quoted in Samuel Eliot Morison, *Builders of the Bay Colony* (2nd ed.; Boston, 1958), 129-130.

66. *Winthrop's Journal*, vol. 1, 67.

67. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of Massachusetts Bay*, vol. 1, 91.

68. *Winthrop's Journal*, vol. 1, 68.

69. *Complete Writings of Roger Williams*, vol. 6: 67, 85, 95.

70. Trumbull, ed., *Records of Connecticut*, vol. 1: 78.

71. Writing in the late eighteenth century, Thomas Hutchinson, for a time the royal governor of the Massachusetts province, censured Connecticut set-tlers for murdering four captive Pequot women in 1637. See Thomas Hutch-inson, *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay*, ed. Lawrence Shaw Mayo (3 vols.; Cambridge, Mass., 1936), vol. 1: 70; Daniel Gookin re-counted how two Christianized Indian women were murdered by their English captors during King Philip's War. See Daniel Gookin, "An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England, in the Years of 1675, 1676, 1677," in *Transactions and Collections of the American Anti-quearian Society*, 2 (1836), 513-514.

72. Quoted in Edmund S. Morgan, "The Puritans and Sex," *The New En-gland Quarterly* 15 (December 1942): 591.

73. Daniel Rogers, *Matrimoniall Honor: or, the mutuall Crowne and comfort of godly, loyall, and chaste Marriage* (London, 1642), 281.

74. Demos, *A Little Commonwealth*, 83.

75. Dionise Settle, "The second voyage of Master Martin Frobisher, made to the West and Northwest Regions, in the yeere 1577," in Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations of the English Nation*, vol. 5 of *Hakluyt's Voyages*, ed. Ernest Rhys [Everyman's Library] (8 vols.; London, 1907), 145.

76. Anthony Gibson, *A Woman's Woorth, defended against all the men in the world* (London, 1599), quoted in Lu Emily Pearson, *Elizabethans at Home* (Stan-ford, Calif., 1957), 287.

77. Thompson, *Women in Stuart England and America*, 10.

78. Increase Mather, *A Discourse Concerning the Danger of Apostacy* (Boston, 1685), 104.

79. Increase Mather, *A Brief History of the War with the Indians in New-England* (Boston, 1676), 20.

80. William Hubbard, *The Present State of New-England* (London, 1677), 59; [Nathaniel Saltonstall,] "A Continuation of the State of New England," in Charles H. Lincoln, ed., *Narratives of the Indian Wars* (New York, 1913), 67.

81. Benjamin Tompson, "New-Englands Crisis," in Harrison T. Meserole, ed., *Seventeenth-Century American Poetry* (New York, 1968), vol. 2: 11, 37.
82. "A Particular Account of the Late Revolution, 1689," in Charles M. Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections* (New York, 1915), 197.
83. [White,] "The Planters Plea" in Force, *Tracts* 2, no. 3: 29.
84. *Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence*, 264.
85. Quoted in William Kellaway, *The New England Company, 1649-1776* (London, 1961), 82.
86. John Cotton, "The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared, 1648," in Larzer Ziff, ed., *John Cotton on the Churches of New England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 277.
87. Thomas Shepard, "The Cleare Sunshine of the Gospell Breaking forth upon the Indians in New-England," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd ser., 4 (1834): 38.
88. [John Wilson?,] "The Day-Breaking if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospell with the Indians in New England," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd ser., 4 (1834): 15, 17.
89. By 1685 the total number of New England's Indian converts approached 1500. But only a small proportion were fully accredited members of a Christian church. The 1439 Indian converts were "such as do, before some of their magistrates or civil rulers, renounce their former heatherish manners, and give up themselves to be praying Indians." See "Thomas Hinkley to William Stoughton and Joseph Dudley" (April 2, 1685), in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 4th ser., 5 (1861): 133-134.
90. *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues: A Study in Cultural Interaction*, eds. Henry W. Bowden and James P. Ronda (Westport, Conn., 1980), 59.
91. Edward Winslow, "The Glorious Progress of the Gospel, amongst the Indians in New England," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd ser., 4 (1834): 88.
92. Clifford K. Shipton, ed., "The autobiographical Memoranda of John Brock, 1636-1659," in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 53 (1943): 102.
93. John Eliot, "A Late and Further Manifestation of the Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New-England," in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd ser., 4 (1834): 270.
94. Daniel Gookin, "An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England in the years 1675, 1676, 1677," in *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* (1836), 2, 449: 513-519; Douglas Edward Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk* (New York, 1958), 145-154.
95. Shurtleff, ed., *Records of Massachusetts Bay*, 1, 40.
96. Edmund S. Morgan provides a splendid analysis of the concept of restricted church membership in chapter three of his *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea* (New York, 1963).
97. See Vaughan, *New England Frontier* 62; and Vaughan, "From White Man to Redskin: Changing Anglo-American Perceptions of the American Indian," *The American Historical Review* 87 (October 1982): 917-953.
98. Cotton Mather, "The Negro Christianized: An Essay to Excite and Assist that Good Work, the Instruction of Negro Servants in Christianity," in Alden T. Vaughan, ed., *The Puritan Tradition in America, 1620-1730* (New York, 1972), 270.

-
99. Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (2 vols.; Hartford, Conn., 1853), vol. 2: 558.
 100. *Ibid.*, 556; Cotton Mather, *The Wonders of the Invisible World* (Boston, 1693), 63.
 101. *Complete Writings of Roger Williams*, 7, 31.
 102. *Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence*, 165.
 103. Thomas Hooker, *The Soules Exaltation: A Treatise Containing the Soules Union with Christ, the Soules Benefit from Union with Christ, the Soules Justification* (London, 1638), 7-8.
 104. Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, 2, 202.
 105. "Robert Stansby to John Wilson" (April 17, 1637), in *Winthrop Papers, 1631-1637*, 3, 390.
 106. John Cotton, *The Covenant of Gods Free Grace* (London, 1645), 20.
 107. Increase Mather, "A Discourse concerning the Danger of Apostacy," in *A Call from Heaven* (Boston, 1685), 128.
 108. Force, ed., *Tracts* 4, no. 3: 8-14.
 109. Quoted in Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family* (rev. ed., New York, 1966), 55.
 110. Thompson, *Women in Stuart England and America*, 120.
 111. Increase Mather, *A Call from Heaven*, 128.
 112. Cotton Mather, *Ornaments for the Daughters of Zion* (London, 1741), 55.
 113. Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, 150-160.