Negative microfilm
received from
university

Mic 60-1770

HITEN, Stephen Stegmann. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE ELECTION SERMON AND A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF FIVE SERMONS DELIVERED IN MASSACHUSETTS BETWEEN 1754 AND 1775.

University of Michigan, Ph. D., 1960
Speech-Theater

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE ELECTION SERMON AND A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF FIVE SERMONS DELIVERED IN MASSACHUSETTS BETWEEN 1754 and 1775

By
Stephen Stegmann Hiten

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1959

Committee in charge:

Professor William M. Sattler, Chairman
Professor Gail E. Densmore
Associate Professor Frank Grace
Assistant Professor L. LaMont Okey
Associate Professor Howard H. Peckham

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I INTRODUCTION

Chapter — Page

I. INTRODUCTION 2

Explanation of the Election Sermon
The Purposes of the Investigation
Significance of the Investigation
Other Studies Related to Election Sermons
Source Materials
Procedure of this Study

PART II BACKGROUND OF ELECTION SERMONS

II. THE ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT, AND TEXT OF MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION SERMONS 12

English Roots of the Election Sermon
Election Sermons in Early Massachusetts Records
Selecting the Preacher of the Election Sermon
The Printing of the Election Sermon
The Election Sermon under the Old and the New Massachusetts Charters
The End of the Massachusetts Election Sermon
Election Sermons in the Other American Colonies
The Text of the Election Sermons
Availability of the Printed Copies
Summary

III. THE TRAINING, SOCIAL STATUS, AND POLITICAL INTERESTS OF THE NEW ENGLAND CLERGY . . 29

Rhetoric, Logic, and Homiletics Studied by Massachusetts Ministers
The Prestige and Influence of the Congregational Clergy in New England
The Political Interests of the New England Clergy
Summary

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
IV.	ELECTION SERMONS: THE OCCASION AND THE AUDIENCE	61
	The Occasion The Audience Summary	
	PART III ANALYSES OF SELECTED SERMONS 1754-1775	
V.	JONATHAN MAYHEW'S ELECTION SERMON - 1754 . .	78
	Biographical Sketch The Political Situation in 1754 Précis of the Sermon Analysis of the Sermon The Sermon and Later Developments Summary	
VI.	ANDREW ELIOT'S ELECTION SERMON - 1765 . .	113
	Biographical Sketch The Political Situation in 1765 Précis of the Sermon Analysis of the Sermon The Sermon and Later Developments Summary	
VII.	SAMUEL COOKE'S ELECTION SERMON - 1770 . .	143
	Biographical Sketch The Political Situation in 1770 Précis of the Sermon Analysis of the Sermon The Sermon and Later Developments Summary	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter — Page

VIII. GAD HITCHCOCK's ELECTION SERMON - 1774 . . 179

Biographical Sketch
The Political Situation in 1774
Precis of the Sermon
Analysis of the Sermon
The Sermon and Later Developments
Summary

IX. SAMUEL LANGDON'S ELECTION SERMON - 1775 . . 206

Biographical Sketch
The Political Situation in 1775
Precis of the Sermon
Analysis of the Sermon
The Sermon and Later Developments
Summary

PART IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

X. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 234

Summary
Conclusions

APPENDICES 250

A. Libraries Holding Election Sermons
B. Massachusetts Election Sermons, 1634-1775
C. Andrew Eliot's Election Sermon

BIBLIOGRAPHY 276

PART I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Explanation of the Election Sermon

The election sermon is a discourse which was delivered before the New England General Courts on the day on which the annual election of the Governor's Council took place. In eighteenth century Massachusetts the Council consisted of twenty-eight men who "acted for the governor as advisory cabinet, with the assembly as upper house of a bicameral legislature, and again with the governor as highest provincial court of appeals in civil cases. . . ."[1] Because of the power invested in the Council its election was a weighty matter for which the members of the General Court felt the need of divine guidance. The custom of having an election sermon had its origin in Boston during the governorship of John Winthrop (1630-1638), the second governor of Massachusetts Bay, and it was observed until 1884.

Traditionally the election sermon included a discussion of the origin and purpose of government, the rights of the governed, and the prerogatives of the rulers. Moreover, advice was offered to the legislators on important current

---

[1]Clinton Rossiter, Seedtime of the Republic (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953), p. 15.

political problems, and of course particular attention was paid to the coming election. In Massachusetts the charter provision for an annual election of the governor's council was a unique right vouchsafed the province by William III in 1691, and it was always construed to constitute a guarantee by Britain of the liberties and privileges of the colony. Few election sermons failed to refer to the importance of this symbolic function of the annual election.

Natural law and the concomitant doctrine of government based upon compact, concepts by means of which John Locke justified the English Revolution of 1688, are usually advocated in the pre-Revolutionary election sermon. There is therefore probably some truth in the statement that "to the pulpit, the Puritan pulpit we owe the moral force which won our independence."[1] The significance of the relation of the election sermon to the Revolution is further stressed in the following statement:

> The thundering pulpit, which through at least half the colonial period had been the only significant agency of communication, continued to reach tens of thousands who had not time or urge to read pamphlets or newspapers. . . . The theory of the Revolution had its broadest appeal in New England towns, and the eloquence of the clergy was more instrumental than the writings of Otis and the Adamses in bringing this about. At the same time, the printed sermon competed with the political pamphlet and newspaper article for first place in patriot affections. The annual election sermon in Connecticut and Massachusetts took on new meaning in these years of crisis.[2]

---

[1]John Wingate Thornton, The Pulpit of the American Revolution (Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1860), p. xxxviii.

[2]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 330.

Election sermons can be characterized as religio-political discourses: religious in that they are based upon the Bible and seek to edify, encourage, and comfort the people; political because they are concerned with burning national issues and matters of political expediency. This religio-political duality is one of the distinguishing features of these sermons.

The Purposes of this Investigation

The main purpose of this study is to discover the rhetorical techniques employed in the election sermons delivered by Jonathan Mayhew (1754), Andrew Eliot (1765), Samuel Cooke (1770), Gad Hitchcock (1774), and Samuel Langdon (1775).[1] A clear understanding of the sermons also necessitated gaining some knowledge concerning the preachers as a class, the nature of the audiences which attended the election services, and the speaking occasion. The investigation therefore seeks:

1. To trace the origin and development of the Massachusetts election sermon, and to arrive at a conclusion regarding the authenticity of the sermon texts.
2. To become acquainted with the training, social status, and political interests of the election sermon preachers.
3. To gain an understanding of the nature of the occasion, and the composition of the audiences which attended the election services.

---

[1]These five sermons were selected for investigation because they were delivered in times of political crises. The specific crises pertaining to each is described in conjunction with the analysis of the individual sermons.

4. To discover by means of analysis of the sermons:

   a. Whether the speakers recognized and addressed themselves to the pressing problems of the day.
   b. Whether the sermon texts and the themes of the sermons were adapted to the current political situations.
   c. The means employed by the speakers to amplify their ideas and support their propositions
   d. What emotional appeals and stylistic devices were used to reinforce courses of political action proposed in the sermons.
   e. Whether subsequent events in Massachusetts or elsewhere give evidence of political foresight on the part of the preachers.

Significance of the Investigation

The fact that the speakers selected for this study occupied positions of importance in both Church and State in Massachusetts makes a rhetorical analysis of their utterances a worthwhile project.

The election sermons are, furthermore, a part of the stream of indigenous American literature. For a considerable period in colonial New England, published sermons were the most important form of current reading matter available to the people. The election sermons enjoyed added popularity because, besides being productions of considerable literary merit, they were in the nature of key-note speeches addressed to the General Court at the opening of the legislative year. This was particularly true of the sermons preached during the twenty-five years preceding the Revolution.

Election sermons have been recognized as constituting a significant part of the American literary heritage and have become valued and expensive book collectors' items. In the libraries where they are available for study these sermons

are to be found only in the rare book collections.

Other Studies Related to Election Sermons

The most comprehensive history of election sermons published to date is an essay by Lindsay Swift which appeared in Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Volume I, under the title, "The Massachusetts Election Sermon." The article was written shortly after the Massachusetts General Court had voted to discontinue the practice of opening the legislative year with a religious service. The essay briefly traces the history of the sermons, and succinctly discusses many of the preachers and their messages.

Two check lists of the sermons have been published. The first by Charles E. Grinnell, and the other by Robert William Glenroie Vail. These compilations give the dates upon which the sermons were preached, their titles, and their texts in the case of the former. In addition Vail indicates in which libraries copies of the sermons may be found.

A doctoral dissertation by Martha Louise Counts for Columbia University in 1956 with the title "The Political Views of the Eighteenth Century New England Clergy as Expressed in their Election Sermons," considers the sermons in three periods: 1710 to 1749 when the clergy spoke of the rulers as a highly privileged class, 1750 to 1783 when the will of the people was in the ascendency, and 1784 to 1810 when once again the prerogatives of rulers are emphasized. The work ably discussed the political doctrines believed by the clergy as they are revealed in election sermons preached

in all New England colonies.

A rhetorical thesis by Dean Arthur Gilgust, for the M. S. (Speech) degree at the University of Wisconsin, briefly reviews the history of the election sermon and describes the contents of thirteen of them.

Works in which election sermons are discussed to some extent are Alice M. Baldwin's The New England Clergy and the American Revolution, Joel Tyler Headley's The Chaplains and Clergy of the American Revolution, John Wingate Thornton's The Pulpit and the American Revolution, Edward Frank Humphrey's Nationalism and Religion in America, 1774-1789, and Claude Van Tyne's "The influence of the Clergy and the Religious and the Sectarian Forces in the American Revolution," which appeared in The American Historical Review of 1913.

Source Materials

Newspapers

Boston newspapers provided information regarding the actions of the General Court with respect to the choice of the election sermon preachers and descriptions of the ceremonies connected with the elections. The Boston Athanaeum holds a fine collection of pre-Revolutionary newspapers. Those published during the years preceding the delivery of the sermons examined in this study were carefully scrutinized for related news items and comments. References to such items were found in the following journals:

The Boston Evening Post
The Boston Gazette
The Massachusetts Gazette
The Boston Chronicle
The Massachusetts Gazette and Boston Post-Boy

Biographical Material

An excellent source of biographical data on the election sermon preachers of Massachusetts is John Langdon Sibley's Harvard Graduates. Volumes eight and nine cover three of the preachers considered in this study. William Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, in two volumes, is a valuable source of information in which is included biographies of two of the preachers. Jonathan Mayhew is treated exhaustively in a biography by Alden Bradford with the title, Memoirs of the Life of Jonathan Mayhew. The Dictionary of National Biography and the Dictionary of American Biography are important and reliable sources in which biographical data were found regarding Mayhew and Langdon.

Histories of many of the New England towns have been published, and because the clergy were prominent citizens their careers are often sketched in these works. Some data for this study were gathered from such works. Funeral services preached for ministers are sometimes useful sources, and information of a contemporary nature regarding Jonathan Mayhew was found in Charles Chauncy's Funeral Sermon for Jonathan Mayhew (1766). Notes on Gad Hitchcock were discovered in the Congregational Library, Boston, in the form of an unpublished manuscript by Emerson Davis, entitled "Biographical Sketches of the Congregational Pastors of New England."

Sermon Texts

The hand-written manuscripts for the sermons investigated for this study do not appear to be extant. Printed copies, published shortly after delivery of the sermons, were examined in:

American Antiquarian Society
Boston Anthanaeum
Boston Public Library
Essex Institute
Library of Congress
William L. Clements Library

Most of the research for this investigation was done first in the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan. A fair number of sermons are available for study here including the first published election sermon, that of John Higginson, 1663. Useful historical source material was also located in Clements Library.

The remaining research was done in the Library of Congress which holds a wide variety of sermons and other valuable books and pamphlets related to this study.

Procedure of this Study

The remainder of this study is divided into three major sections. Part Two, which is composed of Chapters Two, Three, and Four, inquires into the origin, early development, and textual authenticity of Massachusetts election sermons; considers the New England clergy with regard to their training for public speaking, the prestige they enjoyed in their parishes, and the political ideas they were exposed to; and gives a general review of the type of audience which ordinarily attended election services, the nature of the ceremonies

connected with the election, and the general atmosphere which prevailed in Boston on election day.

Part Three of the dissertation beginning with Chapter Five, consists of the analysis of the five selected sermons. One chapter is devoted to each sermon and includes:

1. A brief biographical sketch in order to orient the reader regarding the personality and qualifications of the preacher.

2. A review of the current political situation to facilitate comprehension of allusions made in the sermons.

3. A precis of the sermon in order to orient the reader regarding the message of the sermon.

4. The analysis of the sermon. For reasons explained in Chapter Three the analysis was done under the following sub-heads:
   a. Invention, which includes:
      (1) The Bible text.
      (2) Opening of the text.
      (3) Drawing of the doctrine or theme of the sermon.
      (4) A statement of the main divisions of the sermon.
   b. The arrangement or development of the theme, which includes:
      (1) Exposition and argument.
      (2) Applications to the audience.

5. The language of the sermon is investigated in relation to clarity, forcefulness, and impressiveness.

Part Four of the study, Chapter Ten, consists of a brief general summary and a setting forth of conclusions arrived at as a result of the investigation.

PART II

BACKGROUND OF ELECTION SERMONS

CHAPTER II

THE ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT, AND TEXT OF MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION SERMONS

It has been three quarters of a century since the last election sermon was preached before the General Court of Massachusetts in Boston. Today very few are aware of the fact that in pre-Revolutionary days election sermons constituted an integral part of legislative procedure and an influence in the affairs of the state. It is therefore the purpose of this chapter to trace briefly the origin and history of Massachusetts election sermons and to examine the authenticity and accuracy of the sermon texts.

The most useful source materials for this chapter were John Winthrop's Journal, Lindsay Swift's essay, "The Massachusetts Election Sermons," and Robert W. G. Vail's Check List of New England Sermons.

This brief survey includes a consideration of the following factors related to the history of the sermons:

1. English roots of the election sermon.
2. Early Massachusetts Bay records of the sermon.
3. The selection of the election sermon preachers.
4. The printing of the sermons.
5. The effects of the change from the old to the new Massachusetts charter.
6. The election sermon in the other American colonies.

The chapter concludes with an examination of the text of the

sermons in order to determine their accuracy and authenticity.

English Roots of the Election Sermon

At about the time when the first British settlers migrated to America it was customary in England to open Parliament with a sermon. On the appointed day the sovereign would attend divine service in Westminster Abbey before proceeding to the House of Lords to open the new session. Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603) attended such a service on January 12, 1562.

> . . . In which order Her Majesty proceeded to the North Door of the Church of West Minster, where the Dean there, and the Dean of the Chappell met her, and the whole Chappell in Copes: . . . Then the Quire sung the English Procession; which ended, Mr. Noell Dean of Pauls began his Sermon, and first made his Prayer orderly for the Queen's Majesty, and the Universal Church, and especially for the Honourable Assembly of three Estates there present, that they might make such Laws, as should be to God's Glory and the good of the Realm.
>
> The Sermon being ended, and a Psalm sung, Her Majesty and the rest orderly on foot proceeded out of the South Door . . . into the Parliament Chamber.[1]

This pious English practice was probably adopted by the first Massachusetts Bay settlers when organizing their General Court in 1630, for

> Having fled across the ocean to secure religious freedom, it was natural they should consider it to be the chief end and purpose of all government. Hence all rules, regulations, and laws for their government, were, figuratively speaking, first baptized before they were allowed to become a part of the civil system.[2]

---

[1]Sir Simons D'Ewes, A Complete Journal of the Votes, Speeches and Debates Both of the House of Lords and House of Commons Throughout the Whole Reign of Queen Elizabeth of Glorious Memory (London: Printed by J. S. and sold by Jonathan Robinson, 1708), p. 59. D'Ewes also mentions services attended in 1571 and 1585.

[2]J. T. Headley, The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution (New York: Charles Scribner, 1864), p. 16.

Election Sermons in Early Massachusetts Bay Records

The first record of a sermon delivered before the General Court of Massachusetts Bay is found in the Journal of Governor John Winthrop under the date May 14, 1634:

> At the General Court, Mr. Cotton preached, and delivered this doctrine, that a magistrate ought not to be turned into the condition of a private man without just cause, and to be publicly convicted, no more than the magistrate may not turn a private man out of his household, etc., without like public trial, etc. This falling in question in the court, and the opinion of the rest of the ministers being asked, it was referred to further consideration.
>
> The court chose a new governor, viz., Thomas Dudley Esq., the former deputy. . . .[1]

The Reverend John Cotton appears to have given a political bias to his sermon in an effort to persuade the freemen to re-elect Winthrop as governor. As indicated by the diarist, the electors were not persuaded.

The second reference to an election-day sermon occurs in the same diary under the year 1637:

> . . . And Mr. Shepherd, preaching at the day of election, brought yet nearer, so as, except men of good understanding, and such as know the bottom of the tenets of those of the other party, few could see where the difference was; and indeed it seemed so small, as (if men's affections had not been formerly alienated, when the differences were formerly stated as fundamental) they might easily have come to reconciliation.[2]

The way Winthrop here refers to the election sermon seems to indicate that the practice of opening the annual session of the General Court with a sermon had already become an established custom.

---

[1]John Winthrop, The History of New England (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1853), I, 157.

[2]Ibid., p. 264.

It will be observed that Winthrop does not use the qualifying term "election" when referring to the sermons preached on election day. This is not strange inasmuch as the sermon's English prototype certainly was not related to a parliamentary election. In Massachusetts, however, the sermons were delivered just prior to and in preparation for the annual election of the members of the Governor's Council, a circumstance which doubtless led to the adoption of the descriptive designation "election sermon."

Selecting the Preacher of The Election Sermon

The evolution of the Massachusetts legislature from an administration by the officials of the Massachusetts Bay Company in 1630 to a bicameral General Court in 1644, led to a heated controversy regarding the appointment of the election sermon preachers.

In 1630 the legislative body was composed of a governor, a deputy governor, and up to eighteen assistants or magistrates. Known as the General Court, this body was elected by the freemen or stockholders of the Massachusetts Bay Company in terms of the charter granted by Charles I when the Company transferred to America in 1629. Soon, however, the non-freemen settlers of the colony began agitating for a voice in the government and presented to Governor Winthrop a petition requesting an extension of the franchise. The petition was granted and in 1631 one hundred and eighteen settlers were admitted to freemanship. At this time it was also agreed that

the election of all government officials was to take place annually, and that the governor was to be elected from among the magistrates.

A further important development of the legislature took place in 1644 when a bicameral form of government was instituted as a result of public pressure. The reconstituted General Court consisted of a lower house composed of two representatives elected by the freemen of each town of the colony, and an upper house composed of the governor, the deputy governor, and eighteen assistants or magistrates.

Before the formation of the bicameral General Court the election sermon preacher was selected annually by the governor and assistants in council. When the legislature was reconstructed, however, the lower house assumed the responsibility of appointing the speaker for the year 1645. The governor, not being aware of this action by the House of Representatives, also appointed a preacher for the same occasion. When this embarrassing situation was discovered the matter was taken under advisement by the Council, but "being unwilling 'to have any fresh occasion of contestation with the deputies,' yielded, though some judged it 'a betraying, or, at least, weakening, the power of the magistrates, and a countenancing of an unjust usurpation.'"[1] Thus the preacher of the 1645 election sermon was the appointee of the lower house, the Reverend John Norton, and the upper house's appointee, the Reverend Edward Norris of Salem, took the

---

[1]Thornton, op. cit., p. xxiv.

service the following year. Thereafter the two houses selected the preacher on alternate years.

The identity of the appointing body for a particular sermon may be determined from the resolution of thanks passed by the responsible house. This resolution was usually printed on the flyleaf of the sermon brochure. The distinguishing terms are underlined in the following examples:

> Province of Massachusetts-Bay
> In Council, May 27, 1773
>
> Ordered, That James Otis and William Sever, Esquires, be a committee to wait on Rev'd Mr. Charles Turner, with the Thanks of this Board for his Sermon preached Yesterday, before His Excellency the Governor, and the General Assembly, being the Day for the Election of His Majesty's Council: and to desire a Copy for the Press.[1]

> The House of Representatives
> May 26, 1744
>
> Resolved, that Mr. Turner, Major Morey and Doctor Holton, be and hereby are appointed to return the Thanks of this House, to the Reverend Mr. Gad Hitchcock, for the discourse delivered by him Yesterday, being the day of the Election of the Counsellors; and to desire a copy of the same for the Press.[2]

A further way of identifying the appointing body is by the title of the printer. The printer of Turner's sermon is "Richard Draper, Printer to His Excellency the Governor and the Honorable His Majesty's Council"; Hitchcock's printer is "Edes and Gill, Printers to the Honorable the House of Representatives."

---

[1]Charles Turner, Election Sermon (Boston: Richard Draper, 1773), flyleaf.

2. Gad Hitchcock, Election Sermon (Boston: Edes and Gill, 1774), flyleaf.

The Printing of the Election Sermon

English Puritans were assiduous preachers and printers of their sermons long before the first Puritans emigrated to Massachusetts Bay. William Perkins (d. 1602) whose

> pen was as diligent and as skillful as his tongue . . . kept the university (Cambridge) printer busy while he lived, and after his death his disciples . . . gathered up for publication or republication three tall volumes of his polemics, treatises and sermons.[1]

John Gouge, another great Puritan preacher, wrote in 1626:

> What privately I first digested in mine owne meditation and then publickly delivered by word of mouth . . . is now thorow (sic) God's gracious providence so published as it may be reviewed so often as you please.[2]

The New England clergy followed the example of their English colleagues and were thereby responsible for the fact that "sermons, especially election sermons, constituted a large part of the literary diet of the people."[3] The first colonial printing press in New England began operating in Massachusetts in 1639.

According to Cotton Mather the first election sermon to be printed was delivered by John Higginson in 1663.[4] Actually a sermon delivered two years before Higginson's was also printed, but only in 1664.[5] After 1663 all Massachu-

---

[1]William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938), p. 65.

[2]Ibid., p. 172.

[3]Max Savelle, The Foundations of American Civilization (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1942), p. 323.

[4]Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana (London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1702) Book III, p. 38.

[5]This sermon was preached by John Norton in 1661.

setts election sermons were printed with the exception of isolated cases when the preachers were unwilling to accede to the request of the General Court to provide copy, or on some occasions when the message of the sermon was not to the liking of the legislators.[1] In the 250 year period in which the sermons were preached present records indicate that a total of 208 were printed.[2]

The cost of printing the sermons was borne, for the most part, by the General Court, at least in the eighteenth century. Baldwin observes that

> There seems to have been some question as to the frequency of their publication at the expense of the General Court. . . . Joseph Belcher's Election Sermon of 1704 was printed by order and 500 copies distributed among the towns. . . . In 1775 Mr. Langdon's sermon was printed and a copy sent to each minister and member of Congress. (Swift, p. 426)[3]

Another study bears out Baldwin's finding and brings out a further interesting observation regarding printing costs:

> Although these Election sermons were printed by the government printer, they were, with a few exceptions, billed to government not by the printer but by the bookseller who published them.[4]

Lindsay Swift feels, on the other hand, that the cost of printing was probably not borne by the General Court:

---

[1]This happened to Charles Chauncy's election sermon in 1747. Cf. A. B. Ellis, History of the First Church in Boston, 1630-1880 (Boston: Hall and Whiting, 1881), p. 189.

[2]For a list of Massachusetts election sermons delivered between 1634 and 1775 see Appendix B.

[3]Alice M. Baldwin, The New England Clergy and the American Revolution (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1928), p. 5.

[4]Rollo G. Silver, "Government Printing in Massachusetts Bay, 1700-1750," published in Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, Vol. 68, pt., 1 (Worchester, Mass: The Society 1958), p. 144.

> Permission by the Court to print was not a simple act of courtesy, for it is well understood that there was a censorship of the press (cf. Mass. Colony Records, lv, Part ii, p. 424). . . . Furthermore the expense of printing was probably not borne by the public.[1]

The Election Sermon under the Old And the New Massachusetts Charters

Under the first charter granted to Massachusetts by Charles I in 1629, the colonial leaders established a theocratic form of government in which the clergy would of necessity have considerable political influence. Some of the first laws passed by the General Court were intended to establish the authority of the Congregational Church, and, therefore, of the clergy:

> The law of 1631, restricting the franchise to church members, and the law of 1635, making the attendance at church compulsory upon all, were followed in 1636 by a law requiring the approval of magistrates and elders before a new church could be set up, and in 1638 by the institution of a system of state support for the ministers.[2]

Another source of power and influence for the clergy was the doctrine of the covenant or contract with which the first Puritans were obsessed. In terms of this concept "God promises true happiness to man, and man engages himself by promise for performance of what God requires,"[3] whether in religious or secular affairs. Consequently all calamities or reverses

---

[1] Swift, op. cit., p. 393.

[2] Vernon L. Parrington, The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800 (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954), p. 24.

[3] John Preston, quoted by Perry Miller, The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 376.

suffered by the elect of God were said to be divine chastisements inflicted because the covenant had been violated. It was then the task of the ministers to discover what the violations were and what the people should do to regain the divine favor. In order to facilitate this function of the clergy, the state would appoint days of fasting upon which the people gathered in the churches, and the ministers preached sermons designed to bring about a reconciliation with God. In time, as the population increased, the preachers found many things to condemn and their sermons became veritable "jeremiads" in which long lists of public and private sins were detailed.

The annual election sermons, for the most part, soon took on the mold and tone of the "jeremiad" and

> . . . the General Court regularly listened to a sermon which, under the circumstances, was bound to be more a review of recent afflictions than an exposition of doctrine; ministers chosen for the occasion could try then to be their most impressive. Thus they developed, amplified, and standardized a type of sermon for which the rules were as definite as for the ode. . . . A minister's reputation for eloquence came to be based upon the skill with which he could devise prognostications of mounting disaster with which the present suffering dwindled into mere annoyance.[1]

The sermon under the new charter

The first Massachusetts charter was annulled by England's Court of Chancery on June 21, 1684, because of reported acts of disloyalty and religious intolerance. Seven years later William III granted the colony a new charter in

---

[1]Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1953) p. 29.

which the following provision modified the special status of the clergy by abolishing the church-membership limitation of the franchise:

> PROVIDED always that no Freeholder or other Person shall have a Vote in the Election of Members (of the General Court) . . . who at the time of such Election shall not have an estate of Freehold in Land within our said Province or Territory to the value of Forty Shillings per Annum at the least or other estates to the value of Forty Pounds Sterling.[1]

The new charter also dealt a fatal blow to the compact doctrine by its insistence upon tolerance for non-Congregationalists, by providing for a governor to be appointed by the crown, and by making the election of the Council subject to the veto of the governor. These provisions virtually ended the theocracy and thus altered the status of the clergy of the heretofore state church. Though they found ways of continuing to preach the "jeremiad" type of sermon for some decades, the ministers learned to place decreasing reliance in their preaching upon the theocratic covenant concept, and to make increasing use of appeals to such secular motivations as civil liberties, the rights of Englishmen, the security of property, and other related political ideas propounded by John Locke. Early in the provincial period little change is discernible in the election sermons, but in the eighteenth century, and particularly in the third quarter of the century, secular appeals became bolder and increasingly insistent.[2]

---

[1]William MacDonald, (ed.), Documentary Source Book of American History (New York: Macmillian Company, 1937), p. 87.

[2]The effects of Puritan political philosophy on New England preaching before and after the promulgation of the Massachusetts charter of 1691 are ably discussed by Perry Miller in his New England Mind: From Colony to Province, especially Chapters II and XXII.

The End of the Massachusetts Election Sermon

Exactly two hundred and fifty years after John Cotton preached the first election sermon before Governor John Winthrop and his primitive General Court in 1634, the last sermon was preached in the State Capitol. In June, 1884, the Honorable John Foster Andrew "made a motion to abolish the custom of preaching, which was favorably acted upon by the legislature."[1] This step was taken in pursuance of the policy of separating church and state. Thus after many vicissitudes through a long history this colorful American tradition came to an end.

Election Sermons in Other American Colonies

The custom of opening the legislative year with a sermon was not peculiar to Massachusetts. In Connecticut the plan was followed from 1674 to 1830. With certain years excepted New Hampshire had election sermons from 1784 to 1831. The New Plymouth Colony which existed from 1620 to 1691 had, as far as is known, only two election sermons, in the years 1669 and 1675. In Vermont the custom was observed from 1777 to 1834, and from 1856 to 1858. Thus Massachusetts had by far the longest and most consistent record of election sermons. None of the other American colonies ever had election sermons.

---

[1]E. M. Wheelwright, "Memoirs of the Honorable John Foster Andrew," published in the Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, vol. III, Transactions 1895-1897 (Boston: The Society, 1900), p. 352.

The Text of the Election Sermons

The original hand-written manuscripts of the sermons to be examined in this study do not appear to be extant. This raises the question of the accuracy of the available printed texts. Do they represent the actual language in which the preachers expressed themselves? An absolute answer cannot, of course, be given, but some helpful clues are obtained by examining the preachers' methods of preparing their sermons, their manner of delivery, and the formalities connected with the printing of the sermons.

Preparation and Delivery of Election Sermons

The Massachusetts General Court usually appointed the preacher some time during its January session.[1] The sermon was delivered, in terms of the charter, on the last Wednesday of May. The preacher had, therefore, almost four months to prepare the sermon, which was ample for careful composition and memorization. That the election sermons were probably delivered from memory can be deduced from the fact that this form of delivery was customary with Congregational clergymen;[2] that Harvard graduates were taught that important sermons should be written out in full and memorized;[3] that the nature of the occasion, and the fact that

---

[1]Cf. Boston Evening Post, February 4, 1765; Feb. 1, 1773; Boston Gazette, Feb. 4, 1765; Jan. 25, 1768; Feb. 14, 1774.

[2]Cotton Mather, Ratio Disciplinae Fratum (Boston: S. Gerrish, 1726), p. 61.

[3]Frazer Mitchell, English Pulpit Oratory From Andrewes to Tillotson (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932) pp. 19-20; Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana, III, 121.

the sermons were to be printed and widely distributed, demanded the most careful preparation and masterful delivery.

Formalities Connected with Printing the Sermons

Beginning with the year 1663 the Massachusetts sermons were printed by legislative order, and it was customary for the official order to be printed on the flyleaf of the sermon brochure.[1] These notices indicate that the vote requesting the sermon manuscript for the printer was usually taken on the day following the delivery of the sermon.[2] The Court apparently expected the manuscript to be ready at that time.

Further evidence that the manuscripts were ready at the time the sermons were delivered lies in the fact that many of the sermons have footnotes for the benefit, no doubt, of the reader; in some cases the footnotes must have taken considerable time to prepare, more time than was at the disposal of the minister between the delivery of the sermon and the visit of the committee delegated by the General Court.[3]

Some sermons have a note on the title page to the effect that certain paragraphs had been omitted in the delivery for lack of time, thus indicating that the sermons had not only been written out in toto, but that the preachers were also aware of the fact that the listeners would note the dis-

---

[1]For examples cf. supra, p. 17.

[2]On several occasions the vote was taken on the same day as the delivery of the sermon.

[3]Andrew Eliot's sermon has seven footnotes one of which fills two pages and has extensive statistics.

crepancy between the printed page and the orally delivered version.[1]

Availability of the Printed Copies

Copies of the election sermons appear to have been made available to all the members of the General Court, and to the clergy. Extra copies were sometimes available for further distribution; at one time as many as 500 extra copies were ordered by the Court for this purpose.[2] Many of these copies are now to be found in the rare book divisions of a number of American libraries.[3]

Summary

1. The custom of opening the Massachusetts General Court with divine worship may have been patterned after the practice of the British Parliament. Queen Elizabeth I attended such services in Westminster Abbey in the late sixteenth century. In Boston John Cotton is reported to have preached a sermon for such a service in 1634, and Governor Winthrop refers to the sermon preached before the General Court in 1637 as if it were an established procedure.

2. When the Massachusetts General Court was first established election sermon preachers were appointed by the governor and his board of assistants. In 1644, however, when

---

[1]One example is Samuel Phillips' election sermon preached in 1750.

[2]Baldwin, op. cit., p. 5.

[3]For a list of these libraries see Appendix A.

the General Court was reconstituted in the form of a bicameral house, it was decided that the upper and the lower houses should select the speaker on alternative years.

3. The first Massachusetts election sermon to be printed was preached by the Reverend John Higginson in 1663. Thereafter the General Court voted each year to print the sermons, a practice which was probably both a courtesy and an official permission to print, at least during the seventeenth century when the press was censored.

4. Under the charter granted to Massachusetts by Charles I in 1629, the colony established a theocratic form of government in which the state church and the generally accepted doctrine of the covenant influenced the clergy to develop a specific type of sermon, called by one historian the "jeremiad," for fast and election days. In terms of the new charter granted by William III in 1691, however, the church-membership limitation of the franchise was removed, the governor became a crown-appointed official, and the election of the council was made subject to the veto of the governor. Thus the theocracy was ended, and the covenant doctrine lost some of its meaning. These factors appear to be responsible for the changed emphasis in the election sermons from largely religious appeals to predominantly secular and political motivations.

5. The traditional practice of opening the Massachusetts legislative year with an election sermon was ended in 1884, as a part of the campaign to effect a complete separa-

tion of church and state. This took place exactly 250 years after John Cotton preached the earliest recorded election sermon. Other American colonies which had election sermons for varying periods were Connecticut, New Hampshire, Plymouth, and Vermount.

6. Though few original hand-written election sermon manuscripts are extant, it seems reasonably certain that the printed copies now available in many American libraries correctly represent the language used by the preachers. It was the accepted practice to write out sermons and deliver them from memory, and doubtless this was done for an occasion as important and highly formal as was the annual election sermon.

CHAPTER III

THE TRAINING, SOCIAL STATUS, AND POLITICAL INTERESTS OF THE NEW ENGLAND CLERGY

The purpose of this chapter is to review the training in rhetoric, logic, and homiletics received by the New England clergy, and to note the effect of this training on the form of the election sermon; to gain an understanding of the ethical appeal of these ministers as revealed by the social position they held in their communities, and by their functions as spiritual leaders; to investigate their political interests, some of the general reasons for their concern regarding provincial political affairs, the political philosophies to which they subscribed, and their general attitude towards the War of Independence.

Information regarding the training Harvard College students received in rhetoric and logic, at about the time the subjects of this study were in attendance (ca. 1735-1745), was gained from a perusal of the Harvard "Body of Laws" in operation at that time, and from an examination of the textbooks used.

An appreciation of the social status of the clergy was gained from M. Dexter's description of the procedure followed by Congregational churches when calling and installing

young pastors. Various histories provided material regarding the social status and prestige of the pastors of New England churches. A study of their political interests and activities involved an investigation of the currently accepted political theories for which numerous works are available.

Rhetoric, Logic, and Homiletics Studied By Massachusetts Ministers

Harvard College, founded by a vote of the General Court of Massachusetts in 1636, constituted the training center for the Congregational clergy of the colony. This purpose is emphasized in an account of the college written in 1643:

> After God had carried us safely to New-England, and wee had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our livli-hood, rear'd convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civill government: One of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to Posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate Ministry to the Churches, when our present Ministers shall lie in the Dust.[1]

The college was situated in Newtowne, a village near Boston which was later renamed Cambridge in honor of the English university, the alma mater of many of the pioneers in the colony.

Rhetoric at Harvard College

To achieve the purpose of training ministers at Harvard College, studies were arranged with the following objectives in view:

---

[1]*New England's First Fruits* (London: Printed by R. O. and G. D., for Henry Overson, 1643), p. 12. (Author unknown.)

1. The practice of piety.
2. The study and analysis of the Bible.
3. The study of the principles of divinity and Christianity.
4. The mastery of the languages necessary to read the Bible in the original tongue.
5. The study of auxiliary subjects necessary to the correct interpretation of the Bible -- arts, philosophies, histories, and politics.
6. The study and exercise necessary to an effective exposition and defence of one's interpretation -- rhetoric, declamation, repetition of sermons, and commonplaces.[1]

The last point is, of course, the special concern of this study. The manner in which this objective was implemented is outlined in a "Body of Laws" for the college, dated 1734. The material relevant to this investigation is extracted:

Chapter 3 Concerning Scholastic Exercises

4. The undergraduates shall in their course declaim publicly in the Hall, in one of y^{e} three learned languages.
5. The Senior Sophisters shall dispute publicly in the Hall once a week, till the tenth of March and the Iunior Sophisters, after the same manner twice a week during the y^{t} term, and once a week afterwards.
6. Resident Bachelours shall dispute in the Hall once a fortnight . . . on such questions as the President directs to.[2]

Thus each of the four college classes spent one entire school day on rhetoric each week. Besides, each student gave a Latin oration once a month, and "public Exercises of oratory in the mother tongue."[3]

---

[1]Orlo Arthur Norton, "Harvard Textbooks and Reference Books of the Seventeenth Century," in Colonial Society of Massachusetts Publications (Boston: The Society, 1953), XXVIII, 361-364.

[2]Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, vol. XV, Collections (Boston: The Society, 1925), p. 134, ff.

[3]Samuel Morison, The Puritan Pronaos (New York: New York University Press, 1936), pp. 159-160.

Further information regarding education in rhetoric at Harvard is to be found by examining the textbooks used by the students. A document drawn up by the college instructors at the request of the Overseers of Harvard refers to textbooks used probably as late as 1750:

> A Particular Account of the Present
> Stated Exercises Enjoyned the Students
>
> The first year the Freshman recite the Classic Authors Leran't at School viz Tully Virgil Isocrates Homer and the Greek Testa't & Greek Catechism and Dugards or Farnaby's Rhetoric and the latter part of the year the Hebrew Grammer & Psalter Ramus's Burgesdius's Logick.
>
> The second year the Sophomores recite Dugestius's Logick and a manuscript called the New Logick Extracted from the Legrand and ars Congitandi Wollegius on Saturdays and in the latter part of the year. Herebords Maletemata continuing still most of the year recitations in the forementioned greek and Hebrew books and dispute on logical questions twice a week.
>
> The third year the Iunior Sophisters recite Herebords Melletemata Mr. Nortons Physicks Wollebius's Divinity on Saturdays and dispute twice a week on Physical and Metaphysical & Ethical questions.
>
> The Fourth year the Senior Sophisters recite Alsted's Geometry Cassindius's Astronomy goe over the arts viz Grammar Logick & Natural Phylosophy Ames Medulla & dispute once a week on Phylosophical & Astronomical questions.[1]

From the information in this document and from old textbooks donated to Harvard Library by former students after the old library had been destroyed by fire, Orlo A. Norton complied a catalogue of the textbooks used in 1723. The rhetoric and declamation texts are listed and annotated here:

Audomari Talaei, Rhetorica et P. Rami Praelectionibus Observata (Frankfort, 1579).

This work was popular in England after it was translated in 1574, and until the Royal Society discouraged

---

[1]Norton, op. cit., pp 365-366.

the excessive use of tropes and figures. It continued to be popular at Harvard, however, for many more years.

William Dugard, Rhetorices Elementa (1648)

A textbook for grammar schools in the form of questions and answers. The work was thoroughly Ramist, being in fact a translation of Butler's Rhetoricae Libri Duo.[1]

Thomas Farnaby, Index Oratoriae (1629)

This excellent rhetoric is in the classical tradition, with only slight traces of Ramist influence.[2]

John Clarke, Formvlae Oratoriae (1629)

This work includes formularies of many types of speeches and formulas for introducing orations, for winning goodwill, for conciliation, and etc. It also includes a section in which epistles, themes, and declarations are classified and discussed, as well as a series of salutary, valedictory, and eristical orations.[3]

Harvard's interest in Ramus is evident and the significance of this predilection is discussed later in this chapter. It is sufficient to state here that Ramus revised classical rhetoric by transferring two of the five classical canons of rhetoric, invention and arrangement, to logic, and limited rhetoric to style and delivery. Ramus states his position on this matter as follows:

This is the true distinction between Dialectic and Rhetoric: For even if the oration be most illustrious or most ample, subtlety of invention in thinking the arguments, of truth in enunciation, of consequence in syllogism, and of order in method, is entirely, I say, a matter of dialectic and logic. But ornament and

---

[1]Wilbur Samuel Howell, Logic and Rhetoric in England 1500-1700 (Princeton: University Press, 1956), pp. 269-270.

[2]Ibid., 322-323.

[3]Ibid., 338-339.

> elocution in trope and figure, and pronunciation in voice and gesture is entirely a matter of rhetoric and completely pertaining to it even if the disputation itself be mostly philosophical.[1]

Logic at Harvard College

The science of logic was considered one of the most important areas of knowledge in seventeenth century colonial thinking. An authority in New England history states:

> Of equal importance with rhetoric for the training of the Puritan preacher was logic, the third subject of the medieval trivium. Grammer taught one to write and speak correctly; rhetoric to do it elegantly; and logic to do it reasonably. . . . Whether a sermon was expository, imprecatory, or polemic, the art of logic was required; and in the works of Peter Ramus, the great French reformer and teacher of the previous century, New England students had an excellent logical organon of which Milton's Ars Logicae was merely a digest.[2]

Miller concurs with the above authority in the opinion that Ramean logic enjoyed pre-eminence over classical logic in New England in the seventeenth century:

> The fundamental fact concerning the intellectual life of New Englanders is that they ranged themselves definitely under the banner of the Ramists. The Peripatetic system was indeed read at Harvard, but the Ramist was believed, and it exercised the decisive role in shaping New England thought.[3]

Norton's textbook list indicates that the following texts on logic were in the Harvard Library in 1723:

Peter Ramus, Praelectionibus Observata (1579).

---

[1]Peter Ramus, quoted by Perry Miller, The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century, p. 316.

[2]Morison, op. cit., p. 162.

[3]Miller, N. E. Mind: Seventeenth Century, p. 116.

This work was usually bound with Talaeus's Rhetorica. Ramus held the pre-eminent position in the field of logic at Harvard.[1]

William Ames, Demonstratio Logica Verae (1646)
_____, Theses Logicae (1646).

The first of these is made up of sixteen introductory and 129 later propositions, along with a conclusion, the whole being an explanation of Ramus' Dialecticae Libri Duo. The Theses Logicae is devoted to the same end, and it proceeds by setting forth a sequence of more than 350 short logical definitions, principles, and laws.[2]

France Burgersdicius, Institutionum Logicarium Libri Duo (1626)

It deals with the logical material of Aristotle's Oreganon. Thus he speaks of the predicaments, the predictables, the types of logical proposition, the four kinds of argument, the places, and the fallacies. Although he does not arrange these materials according to Ramus's theory of method, he does nevertheless show some inclination to follow Ramus as well as Aristotle.[3]

Adriaan Heereboord, Meletemata Philosophica (1659)

Heereboord's work was probably not used in this connection (in disputation) since it is devoted mainly to specimens of disputation in metaphysics, logic, ethics, and physics.[4]

Bartholomew Keckermann, System of Logic (1600)

Keckermann's work is a critical revision of Ramus's logic, largely in the Aristotelian tradition.[5]

William Brattle, A New Logic, or, Compendium Logicae Secundum Principia, D. Renati Cartesii Plerumque Efformatum et Catechistice Propositum (1689).

---

[1]Cf. Perry Miller, ibid., pp. 116.

[2]Howell, op. cit., pp. 210-211.

[3]Ibid., pp. 310-311.

[4]Miller, op. cit., p. 122.

[5]Ibid., pp. 283, 299f.

> Brattle was an instructor at Harvard and wrote his New Logic for use in his own classes. It was first published in 1758. Brattle's system is based on Descartes' divisions of logic -- perception, proposition, discourse, and method. "Yet even his innovations represent no radical break with Ramist methodology, for in the Compendium Brattle did not utterly discard Ramus but rather rewrote the system, . . . "[1]

All but one of these books is strongly Ramean, a fact which confirms the opinions of Morison and Miller concerning the pre-eminence of the Ramean system of logic at Harvard College.

Ramean logic.- Peter Ramus, a French teacher and philosopher, was born in 1515 and died in the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572. His Master's thesis questioned the infallibility of the Aristotelian dialectic which was accepted as authoritative in most European centers of learning at that time. In 1551 Ramus was appointed Professor of Rhetoric in the Royal College, Paris. His writings on grammar, logic, mathematics, and related subjects are numerous, and his teachings were widely adopted in Europe and the British Isles.

Ramus's logic postulated two main elements, invention and disposition. The term invention signifies "finding out" in classical rhetoric, whereas Ramus defined invention to be

> a declaring of the nature of several arguments after a general manner, by showing us the places, and heads whence we are to fetch the proofs, or declaration of things.[2]

---

[1]Miller, op. cit., p. 121.

[2]Pierre de la Ramée, The Art of Logic, tr., Anthony Wotton (London: Anthony Wotton, 1626), p. 4.

The second element, judgment (also termed disposition or arrangement), "is a part of logic touching the disposing of arguments, that we may judge well." "By judgment wee meane the doctrine, that teacheth us to dispose, or joyne together; whereas invention sheweth only the nature of them severally." Judgment, he adds, may consist of either axioms or "dionoecticall arguments."[1]

Ramus inserted a "Tabvla Generalis" in his Dialectica which clearly diagrams his scheme of logic:

Dialectic, the art of discussing well, consists of:

A. Invention, which is composed of:
   1. Artificial argument -- that which "argueth by itself."
   2. Inartificial argument, or testimony, which may be:
      a. Divine testimony -- the Bible.
      b. Human testimony.

B. Arrangement, or judgment, consisting of:
   1. The axiom, a proposition which commends itself to general acceptance.
   2. Dionoectical argument, or reason, consisting of:
      a. The syllogism.
      b. Method, or proper arrangement of the arguments.

Invention and arrangement are, of course, elements of the Aristotelian rhetoric: Ramus incorporated them into his logic because he sought to effect "a closer union between rhetoric and logic, between the art of exposition and the art of argumentation."[2]

---

[1]Pierre de la Ramée, op. cit., p. 113.

[2]The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: The Gilmary Society, 1911), vol. XII, art., Ramée, Pierre.

Homiletics in New England

In view of the esteem in which Ramus was held by by Puritans and at Harvard College, it was almost inevitable that the preaching of New England clergy would be based upon the Ramean logic and rhetoric. To determine whether this was true is the next step in this investigation.

Training in homiletics.- Professional studies of theology and the art of preaching in Massachusetts began after the bachelor's degree had been taken, and then by private study only. A ministerial candidate for the M. A. degree could choose either to remain at Harvard during the three years which were required to elapse before the degree could be conferred, or he

> only had to return to Cambridge (Massachusetts) before the Commencement in time to discuss a philosophical problem and give a "common place" (sample sermon), to hand in a synopsis of arts, and to reply to a question (prepared beforehand, and the subject matter printed) at Master's Commencement in the afternoon.[1]

That the prospective minister received no formal training in homiletics, either before or after taking his Bachelor's degree is confirmed by a competent authority:

> It is my impression, after working some thirty years in Harvard Colonial records, that the student received no formal instruction in homiletics whatever. . . . In the first place, I think students were expected to absorb this sort of thing by regular church attendance, and in the second place, it is the kind of professional education which was postponed until after taking the

---

[1]Samuel Morison, Three Centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), pp. 34-35.

> Bachelor's degree. The Hopkins scholars, who were graduate fellows working toward the ministry, had no formal instruction, each one reading as he wished.[1]

The following preaching manuals were available for use in the Harvard College Library and in private libraries. There may, of course, have been others.

> Bishop John Wilkins' On Prayer and Preaching (1718).
> St. Augustine's Operum Omnium (1634).
> William Perkins' Art of Prophecying (1631).
> John Wilkins' Of the Art of Preaching (1647)
> Richard Bernard's The Faithful Shepherd (1621).
> Bartholomew Keckermann's Rhetoricae Ecclesiasticae (1614)[2]

The Influence of Perkins' Art of Prophecying.- Of the works listed above, the manual by Perkins appears to have had the profoundest influence on Puritan sermon construction and preaching.

> Of the older type of preaching manuals, Perkins' "Art of Prophecying" is an outstanding example. Its influence and vogue were enormous, owing to the extraordinary contemporary reputation of the author, whose theological works were accorded a place alongside those of Calvin and Hooker. All through the seventeenth century, and among the dissenters in the following century this short work on preaching continued to be recommended and quoted.[3]

William Perkins of Warwickshire, England, entered Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1577, where he came under the influence of the Puritans. Perkins proved to be a profound

---

[1]Quoted from a personal letter by Clifford K. Shipton, Custodian of the Harvard University Archives. The letter is dated September 5, 1957.

[2]These titles are taken from the Harvard Library Catalogue of 1725. A photostat copy was examined for the purpose in the Harvard Library Archives.

[3]Mitchell, English Pulpit Oratory From Andrewes to Tillotson, p. 99.

scholar, and became an eloquent and popular preacher and a writer of note. "No books, it is fair to say, were more often to be found upon the shelves of succeeding generations of preachers, and the name of no preacher recurs more often in later Puritan literature."[1]

Perkins' Art of Prophecying appears to adapt Ramist logic to sermon construction[2] by dividing the sermon into two main parts roughly equivalent to Ramus' invention and judgment. Perkins gives the following main parts for a sermon:

A. "Of the interpretation of Scripture":
   1. Opening the text, by
      a. Description, definition, or division.
      b. Grammatical, logical, or rhetorical analysis.
   2. Expound the doctrine by means of:
      a. Analogical places (rules of invention and axiom).
      b. Rules of the syllogism for the cryptical and dark.

B. "Right cutting and dividing of the word (Bible)."
   1. Resolution or "twisting like a weaver's net into doctrine."
      a. By notation, when the doctrine is not clearly expressed in the text.
      b. By collection, when the doctrine is not clearly expressed. Causes, effects, subjects, adjuncts, dissentanies, comparisons, names, distribution, and definition.
   2. Applications, in "which doctrine is diversely fitted according as place, time, person doe require."
      a. Mental applications.
      b. Practical applications.[3]

---

[1]Haller, op. cit., p. 65.

[2]Miller argues this position convincingly (op. cit., pp. 335-340). Howell also supports Miller but adds that Perkins "is not a thoroughgoing disciple of that Master (Ramus). . . . He must be regarded as a traditionalist in respect to most of his subject matter, and as a Ramist only in respect to method of presentation. . . ." op. cit., pp. 206-207.

[3]William Perkins, The Art of Prophecying, tr. Thomas Tuke (London, 1631).

The Ramean definition of argument as used here by Perkins differs fundamentally from the classical concept of that process.

> He (Ramus) defined argument as "whatever is affected to the arguing of something else."
> . . . . . .
> an argument is "that which is destined and proper to declare something, and is a simple and single reason considered by itself, which is comprised and declared by some exterior word, which is the sign and note of the reason and argument"; thus in grammar an argument is a word, in rhetoric a trope, in dialectic the conception.[1]

Logic is therefore merely a means of classifying and arranging the arguments -- words, rhetorical devices, or concepts -- in support of a proposition.

In Puritan thinking Ramus' definition of argument was highly acceptable. Inasmuch as Bible truth was not debatable in the regular sense of the word, it was not the function of the preacher to establish the probability of a proposition, but merely to render the truth acceptable to his audience.

The invention of the sermon, designated by Perkins as the "interpretation of the Scripture," is that part which discovers or discloses the truth or doctrine contained in the text upon which the sermon is based. The term arrangement, or judgment, which constitutes the second major part of the sermon, does not refer to the general organization of the discourse as in classical rhetoric, but consists of the "dis-

---

[1]Perry Miller, op. cit., p. 124.

posing of arguments that we may judge well," or, as Perkins termed it, the "right cutting and dividing of the word." This is typically Ramean dichotomy, a system which is practiced throughout his scheme, as noted above.

The Form of the Election Sermon

The first printed election sermon, preached by John Higginson in 1663, followed the pattern set by Perkins. The similarities are indicated in square brackets in the following outline:

I. The Text: I Kings 8:57-59
II. The opening of the text (the invention or "interpretation of the Scripture).
  A. The narrative background of the text.
    1. The ark of God brought to Solomon's Temple.
    2. Solomon's prayer.
    3. Solomon exhorts the people.
  B. Doctrines drawn from the text:
    1. God's presence with the people establishes their welfare.
    2. God maintains the cause of His people at all times as required.
  C. Definitions:
    1. "The cause of His people."
    2. "The Lord's maintaining that cause."
  D. Theme of the sermon: "The times may be such, and the case may be such, as the maintaining of the cause of religion, may need and require more than ordinary help from the Lord himself."
III. Proof (judgment or "right cutting of the word - first part). There is a three-fold reason which may convince us of the truth of the doctrine:
  A. The weakness of man.
    1. Saints have weaknesses.
    2. Many people are hypocrites.
    3. Good men have sinful passions.
  B. From the malice of the devil.
    1. As in the case of Pharaoh.
    2. The case of Joshua the High Priest - Zechariah 3:1.
  C. From the providence of God.
    1. Daniel 2:21.
    2. Example from Roman history.
    3. Example of Jesus on Galilee.
IV. Applications (judgment or "right cutting" - second part).
  A. For the information of the judgment or reason.

B. Direction in point of practice.
V. Brief conclusion -- a summary.[1]

It will be observed that Higginson's sermon has no exordium or peroration. This omission is characteristic of Ramean rhetoric, probably because the applications are in effect a peroration.

As Perkins appears to have been the one who adapted Ramean rhetoric to Puritan preaching, so Bartholomew Keckermann seems to have been responsible for adapting classical rhetoric to Prostestant preaching.[2] The latter's system of sacred oratory is well illustrated in sermons preached by John Donne, the famous seventeenth century Dean of St. Paul's in London. Mitchell observes that:

> Donne's exegesis affords a particularly good example of Keckermann's treatment. First comes praecognitio textus, taking the place of the old exordium, with its often extraneous matter, succeeded by partitio et compositio -- division and enunciation of theme. Explicatio verborum follows, which occasionally resulted in intricate and ingenious attempts at "opening the sense" of the passage selected. Amplification could cover expatiation, where the subject chosen was an obvious one, or confirmation or confutation in the familiar sense. Application was more than a mere conclusion for although the word peroration still conveys the idea of a final stirring appeal, conclusions had come to be often only artistic endings, and the aim of the preacher was not how to conclude his address gracefully, but how to drive home his shafts to the hearts of his hearers.[3]

---

[1]John Higginson, Election Sermon (Boston: Samuel Green, 1663).

[2]Bartholomew Keckermann, Rhetoricae Ecclesiasticae (Hanover, 1606), Keckermann is discussed by Mitchell, op. cit., pp. 94-99.

[3]Mitchell, op. cit., p. 96.

Donne's sermon is not divided into two distinct parts, logical and emotional, but as the ideas are presented and developed they are accompanied with the desired emotional appeals. The application is brief, somewhat like the Perkins conclusion. Classical sermons had modified exordiums and perorations in contrast with the Puritan sermon structure. Thus the Ramean-Perkins sermon outline differed significantly from the classical - Keckermann pattern.

As late as 1663, or about twenty-nine years after the election sermon custom was instituted in Massachusetts, the Ramean form of outline was in vogue. An examination of sermons preached in 1690 (Cotton Mather), 1703 (Solomon Stoddard), 1706 (John Rogers), and 1718 and 1723 (Benjamin Coleman) reveals that still no appreciable change had taken place in the form of the election sermon. Thus at about the time that Mayhew and the other subjects of this study attended Harvard College, Ramean logic and rhetoric was being taught and used by preachers. It remains to be determined whether or not these men adhered to the same methods when they preached their election sermons more than a quarter of a century later.

The Prestige and Influence of the Congregational Clergy in New England

The purpose of investigating the extent of the prestige and social influence of the New England clergy was to gain an appreciation of the ethical appeal exercised by the preachers of the election sermons. Aristotle declared that

"there is no proof so effective as that of character," and conceived of ethos as being composed of good character, sagacity, and goodwill.[1] While these qualities may be determined from a study of the life of the preacher and from the sermon he preached, the respect shown to him by his congregation and the community is also an excellent index of his ethical appeal. The latter aspect of the New England minister's ethos is here investigated under three subheads: first, the call to a pastorate, since the care with which the prospective minister was called and installed by a congregation indicates that congregation's estimate of the extent of the responsibility, influence, and prestige of their pastor; second, the social status of the clergyman in his community; third, the functions of the minister in his community by virtue of his spiritual position.

The Call to a Pastorate

The individual Congregational Church was an autonomous body and therefore called its pastors directly rather than having them appointed by an ecclesiastical hierarchy as in other denominations. A Harvard College graduate was obliged to await a "call" from some needy congregation, but once accepted both the minister and the congregation signed a covenant which bound them for life. The process of examining and installing a pastor was as follows:

> 1. The church appointed a committee to interview the candidate and with him to choose an examining council and to set a day for the examination. On the appointed

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), p. 384.

day the council would scrutinize the various documents related to the "call," including church membership and his license to preach. The candidate had to testify orally regarding his religious experience, and submit to questioning concerning his literary acquisitions and theological views. Upon completion of this examination the council would retire for private consultation.

2. Should the young man be considered acceptable, an ordination service was arranged. Clergymen in the surrounding churches were invited to assist at this function. At the service the Moderator of the Society led the proceedings by making a statement. The scribe of the church then read the results of the council's examination. After an invocation and reading of the Scriptures an ordination sermon was preached. Next came the act of ordination followed by the ordination prayer, the charge, and the extending of the hand of fellowship by the visiting ministers. The new pastor then made an address followed by another prayer and the benediction which was pronounced by the newly ordained minister.[1]

At first glance the above procedures seem over-cautious, but in view of the great responsibility borne by a minister, the extended influence he exerted in the community, and the fact that the pastorate was a life-time appointment, the careful examination seems justified.

The Minister's Social Status

Before 1691 the Congregational Church was the State Church in Massachusetts, and the clergy occupied a privileged position: being state officials their salaries were paid out of taxes; socially they ranked with the members of the Governor's Council, and were entitled to be addressed as "mister."[2]

---

[1]This material is condensed from Henry M. Dexter's Congregationalism (Boston: Noyes, Holmes and Company, 1871).

[2]Justin Winsor, ed., The Memorial History of Boston (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1880), III, 487. See also Carl Bridenbaugh's Cities in the Wilderness (New York: The Ronald Press, 1938), p. 252.

The new charter of 1691 removed the church-membership limitation of the franchise and in this regard the status of the clergy was therefore affected. They continued, nevertheless, to enjoy the respect and love of the people because:

1. They travelled more than most of their parishioners.
2. They read widely, most of them having substantial libraries.
3. They kept up a considerable correspondence with other clergymen, business men, and professional men with whom they had become acquainted at Harvard.
4. They continued to represent the government in a sense, for they were required to read all official proclamations to their congregations.
5. In those days of few newspapers and little opportunity for diversion, especially on Sundays, the sermon was an important weekly occasion. Moreover the preacher often commented on current events.
6. Once a year he attended the ministers' convention held in Boston concurrently with the annual opening of the legislative year. The minister would return to his parish with news from his colleagues, and regarding the theological discussions that had taken place, the election, and other political developments.[1]

These advantages made the minister one of the most important persons in the community.

The Spiritual Functions of the Clergy

His spiritual duties also served to keep the minister in the public eye. Few matters of importance took place in the community without prayer and a sermon; besides the annual election sermons there were sermons at the annual election of the officers of the Artillery Company, on the fast and thanksgiving days, and even when convicted criminals were executed; funerals of prominent persons were important "social" events when the preacher's ability to deliver eulogistical

---

[1]Taken from Alice Baldwin, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

orations could be displayed to advantage.

The church, its theology, and its pastors dominated the lives of every person in the community. In both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries[1] the day of worship was literally a day of rest, enforced by law: no man was allowed to leave or enter the town, travelling was simply not countenanced, there was to be no strolling by the sea or on the common, gathering on the street corners for conversation was illegal. Moreover these regulations went into effect at sunset on Saturday night. One result was that:

> With this strict observance of Sunday went naturally a special respect for the clergy. They were an aristocratic order recognized by the people with an unhesitating loyalty, not so easily given to men of rank who were in government service. They were an order in part created and wholly sustained by the people; and the prerogative of the class was jealously maintained, as was also the privileges of the people in their relation to their spiritual advisers.[2]

With such recognition and influence it is not surprising that some of the ministers were rather autocratic in their attitudes and pronouncements. A biographer says of the Reverend Andrew Eliot that members of his congregation felt that he was domineering to the extent that they nicknamed him "Pope."[3] It is said that the Reverend Ebenezer Bridge, who was on intimate terms with Lieutenant Governor Thomas Hutchin-

---

[1]"The Puritan tradition, in the form of moral and intellectual tradition retained its influence in the intellectual life of New England for another century or more. . . ." Savelle, op. cit., p. 456.

[2]Winsor, op. cit., II, 470.

[3]William Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1859), II, 417-421.

son and the famous Oliver brothers, "was possessed of a high sense of the sacredness of his calling, and the reverence and submission due to that office, and that his humbler parishioners were overawed."[1] Some idea of the reverence and respect accorded to the ministers can be gathered from the following description of a Sunday scene; the minister involved is Jonathan French, pastor in Andover, Massachusetts, 1772 to 1809.

> The whole space before the meeting-house was filled with a waiting, respectful, and expecting audience. At the moment of service, the pastor issued from his mansion, with the Bible and manuscript sermon under his arm, flanked by his negro man on his side, as his wife was by her negro woman, the little negroes being distributed according to their sex, by the side of their respective parents. Then followed every other member of the family, according to age and rank, making often, with family visitants, somewhat of a formidable procession. As soon as it appeared, the congregation as if moved by one spirit, began to move towards the door of the church; and, before the procession reached it, all were in their places. As soon as the pastor entered the church the whole congregation rose, and stood until the pastor was in the pulpit, and his whole family seated, -- until which was done, the whole assembly continued standing. At the close of the service, the congregation stood until he and his family had left the church before any one moved toward the door. Forenoon and afternoon the same course of proceeding was had, expressive of the reverential relation in which the people acknowledged that they stood towards their clergy.[1]

While this was by no means a general practice in New England, it is nevertheless an indication of the high degree of ethos the clergy enjoyed in a public speaking situation.

The Political Interests Of the New England Clergy

Though the political power of the clergy was sacrificed to the new charter in Massachusetts, they continued,

---

[1]Sprague, op. cit., I, 48.

nevertheless, to exercise considerable political influence. This can be ascribed, at least in part, to the following facts: (1) the Congregational Church polity had strong political overtones, (2) many of the political struggles in Massachusetts had religious implications, (3) the clergy were diligent students of political theory and did not hesitate to propound their theories from the pulpit, and (4) the clergy took a prominent part, by precept and example, in the struggle for independence from Great Britian.

Political Implications of Congregational Church Polity

The first allegiance of a minister is, of course, to the church that ordained him, and when the governing principles of the church have political implications, religion and politics become closely related in his thinking. This was undoubtedly the case with Congregationalism in Massachusetts. "The cause of liberty and self-government was nourished by several Puritan principles":[1]

> The Puritan concept of covenant.- The covenant or agreement was thought to be basic in all human relationships. A church association was formed by a group of individuals who believed the same things. They covenanted to form a church. The minister was joined to his church by a covenant. The same principle was operative in forming towns in Massachusetts, and in theory, at least, governments were formed by a series of compacts. With a church compact as basic in their thinking, it was not difficult for the ministers to accept Locke's theory of government by compact.
>
> The Puritan belief in a "higher law."- In the minds of the clergy the higher, or natural law was equated with the ten commandments. The natural law concept had been postualted by political theorists since the earliest

---

[1]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 55. The following points are based upon pages 53-55.

> times as the law of common sense by which the rights of all creatures was determined. It is a law that can be appealed to against the arbitrariness of rulers. This idea was a useful tool during the Revolution of 1688, and was to be used again with telling effect to bring about the American Revolution.
>
> The doctrine of the individual.- "In challenging the claims of hierarchy (in England) the Puritans had to stress the competence of the individual, and in so doing they opened the door to political as well as religious equality. The uncompromising insistence of the eighteenth century liberal preachers on the 'right of private judgment' was the democratic fruit of the seeds of Puritanism.
>
> The insistence on piety, honesty, self-discipline, and morality.- These principles ever formed an important part of Puritan preaching. "Puritanism was the goad to the American conscience and insisted on communal responsibility before individual freedom, constitutionalism before democracy, and order before liberty."

Though religious liberty, tolerance, and the seperation of church and state were considered fundamental principles in eighteenth-century Massachusetts, it was felt, nevertheless, that there is basically an inseparable relationship between the church and state: the church insisted that it was the duty of a Christian state to make laws enforcing the moral principles advocated by the church; the citizens, on the other hand, were bound by their religious principles to support the government, and to be subservient to their rulers. In enunciating these principles, as they often did, the ministers were, in a sense both politicians and servants of the church.

Political Crises with Ecclesiastical Overtones

The French-Indian Wars (1741-1763).- War between France and England for the possession of the North American continent had been going on for more than a century before the climax was reached in the Seven Years' War of 1756-1763. Massachusetts

had always taken an active interest in these conflicts because her territory was contiguous to French Canada. Money, ships, and men were thrown into the struggle with a willingness that far exceeded that of the other American colonies. One of the arguments used to arouse enthusiasm for this participation in the war was that France was a Roman Catholic country, thus linking politics with religion.

Puritans had a deep-seated abhorrence of the Papal system and evidence of this feeling came to the surface from time to time. For example, the 1745 expedition against Fort Louisburg was thought of as a crusade. "On the flag was the motto, 'Nil desperandum, Christi duce.' One of the chaplains is said to have carried a hatchet to destroy images in Catholic churches. . . ."[1] Jonathan Mayhew, in his election sermon, appealed to the legislators to Christianize the Indians before the Roman Catholic missionaries won them to their "wicked religion," and then used them in a war against Great Britian.

The controversy over the Episcopacy.- Soon after the Puritan fathers landed in Massachusetts Bay, Bishop Laud, Primate of England, tried to establish an Anglican priest in the new colony, and to enforce the English ecclesiastical laws in America. Laud failed, but further efforts in this direction continued to be made from time to time up to the

---

[1]Claude H. Van Tyne, The Causes of the War of Independence (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1922), pp. 403-404.

Revolution. In 1701 an English missionary organization known as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was established in America. In due course the Society began to agitate for an American Bishop and three prominent Massachusetts ministers strongly opposed this move by means of a letter-and-pamphlet campaign. The strife was bitter and prolonged, but on the ecclesiastical level. After the passing of the Stamp Act, however, the Episcopacy question was brought into the political arena, for it was feared that the expense of supporting a bishop would tempt Britain to impose a tax for the support of the institution. Samuel Adams declared: "At this time when we are suffering from the restrictions on our trade are we to be involved in ecclesiastical bondage in the bargain; is this the time to think of episcopal palaces, of pontifical revenues, of spiritual courts, and of all the pomp, grandeur, luxury and regalia of an American Lambeth."[1] Dr. A. L. Cross, one of the best known authorities on the Episcopal controversy, feels that the controversy was a contributing cause of the Revolution.

The Quebec Act of 1774.-Another illustration of the close relationship between religion and politics in New England is to be found in the Quebec Act of 1774. The purpose of this act was to remove certain inequities which had been imposed upon the French Canadians by Great Britian in 1763, by granting the colony freedom in the exercise of religion. To the patriots and clergy of Massachusetts this act was evi-

---

[1]Quoted by Van Tyne, op. cit., pp. 353-354.

dence of a breakdown in British Parliamentary authority, a development which was interpreted as a serious threat to liberty and security. They saw visions of the return of Papal intolerance and persecution, and:

> It is not surprising therefore, that the favorite device on the banners carried by the Puritan mobs, after the Quebec Act, was the demand, "no popery," and that one of the motives animating the captives of Ticonderoga was to secure the colonies from the incursions of the Roman Catholics, "those children of darkness."[1]

It was natural that the clergy should take more than a passing interest in politics when religion became so closely intertwined with state affairs. But whether or not this investigation has found the real reasons for this interest, the fact remains that the clergy were not entirely otherworldly in their outlook. Their attitude towards political matters was, on the contrary, positive and active.

The Political theories of the New England Clergy

Political theorizing is an ancient occupation and a few New England clergymen, among them Thomas Hooker, Roger Williams, John Wise, and Jonathan Mayhew, contributed notably towards this field of knowledge.

While it has been given to few to make original or lasting contributions, many New England clergymen worked quietly but assiduously to spread democratic political ideas among the people, especially during the quarter of a century just preceeding the Revolution. The election sermon preachers

---

[1]Van Tyne, op. cit., pp. 403-404.

were particularly effective in this respect.

Theories of government.-Election sermon footnotes indicate that many of the preachers read widely regarding government and investigated all the important works on the subject. Among these are:

Sir Edward Coke's Institutes (London, 1628).
Jean Jacques Burlamaqui's Principles of Natural Law
_____ Principles of Political Law. (London, 1752).
Samuel Pufendorf's The Law of Nature and Nations (London, 1672).
John Milton's Aeropagitica (London, 1644).
John Locke's Two Treatises on Government (London, 1689).
James Harrington's Oceana (London, 1656).

Many of the election sermons devote considerable space to the discussion of the nature and purpose of government and the following generally accepted political doctrines:[1]

1. The state of nature.-In primitive times men lived together according to reason, without a common superior on earth, and with authority to judge between themselves. . . . There was no positive law, no formal government.

2. The law of nature.-Some thought this to be the law of God; others considered it to be a higher law discovered by reason rather than by revelation. A third group believed it to be a "higher law that limited political power and was simply an experience-proved boundary . . . beyond which it was not safe for government to go." The following features are characteristic of this law:

a. It is a set of moral standards governing private conduct.
b. It forms a system of abstract justice to which laws of men should conform.
c. It is a line of demarcation around the proper sphere of political activity.
d. It is the source of all natural rights.

3. The natural rights of men.- These are the rights that belong to man as man. They are absolute, eternal, and inalienable. They serve as the ultimate

---

[1]This material is summarized from Rossiter's excellent discussion of this subject, op. cit., pp. 363-398.

standards of human laws, and are the ultimate check upon arbitrary power. These rights are:

a. The right of life and self preservation.
b. The right of liberty and of migration.
c. The right to acquire and enjoy property.
d. Freedom of conscience.
e. The right to happiness.

4. The civil rights of colonists.-Civil liberty is the liberty of the natural state as modified and secured by the enactments of civil society. These liberties are:

a. Freedom of speech.
b. Freedom of the press.
c. The right of assembly and petition.
d. Civil supremacy (no standing army).
e. The right of resistance to arbitrary power.

5. The origin and basis of government.-By instinct men form themselves into societies, but nature being evil, the establishment of some form of government was found to be imperative. Such a government is

a. Formed by consent of the people.
b. Based upon compacts between the people and their chosen representatives.
c. Always answerable to the people.
d. Has no divinely prescribed form -- God originated government, but He rules mediately, not directly.
e. Should maintain the balance of power between the rulers and the representatives of the people.

The Clergy and the Struggle for Independence

It has been shown that the Massachusetts clergy were trained public speakers, that they were highly respected by the people, that they enjoyed considerable political prestige, and that they were keen students of politics. With such advantages they were in a position to exert considerable influence in the struggle for independence from Great Britain.

Year after year the people had listened to their pastors expound on natural rights and natural law in election sermons, and often in the weekly Sunday services. Though

impossible to measure, the cumulative effect of this constant indoctrination could not have been inconsequential. It was this type of political effort that prompted Thornton to declare, "To the pulpit, the Puritan pulpit we owe the moral force which won our independence."[1]

But the clergy did more than preach about the theory of government. John Adams refers to three ministers who were especially active in preparing the people for the Revolution: Samuel Cooper, Jonathan Mayhew, and Charles Chauncy.[2] The part played by these and other ministers was referred to by the Reverend William Gordon in his election sermon of 1775, as follows:

> As the patriots have prevailed, the preachers of each (election) sermon have been the zealous friends of liberty; and the passages most adapted to promote the spread and love of it have been selected and circulated far and wide by means of newspapers, and read with avidity and a degree of veneration on account of the preacher and his election to the service of the day. Commendations, both public and private, have not been wanting to help on the design. Thus by their labors in the pulpit, and by furnishing the prints with occasional essays, the ministers have forwarded and strengthened, and that not a little, the opposition to that parliamentary claim of right to bind the colonies in all cases whatever.[3]

Further contemporary evidence of the contribution of the New England ministry is implicit in the following communication addressed to the clergy of Massachusetts by the First Provincial Congress held in Watertown, during December, 1774:

---

[1]Thornton, op. cit., p. xxxviii.

[2]John Adams in The Works of John Adams, by Charles Francis Adams, 10 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1856), X, 288.

[3]Thornton, op. cit., p. xxvi.

> Reverend Sirs:- When we contemplate the friendship and assistance our ancestors, the first settlers of this province (while overwhelmed with distress), received from the pious pastors of the churches of Christ, who, to enjoy the rights of conscience, fled with them into this land, then a savage wilderness, we find ourselves filled with most grateful sensations. And we cannot but acknowledge, the goodness of heaven in constantly supplying us with preachers of the gospel, whose concern has been the temporal and spiritual welfare of this people.
>
> In a day like this, when all the friends of civil and religious liberty are exerting themselves to deliver this country from its present calamities, we cannot but place great hopes in an order of men who have ever distinguished themselves in their country's cause; and do, therefore, recommend to the ministers of the gospel in the several towns and other places of the colony, that they assist us in avoiding that dreadful slavery with which we are now threatened, by advising the people of their several congregations, as they wish their prosperity, to abide by, and strictly adhere to, the resolutions of the Continental Congress, as the most peaceable and probable method of preventing confusion and bloodshed, and of restoring that harmony between Great Britain and these colonies, on which we wish might be established, not only the rights and liberties of America, but the opulence and lasting happiness of the whole British Empire.
>
> Resolved, That the foregoing address be presented to all ministers of the gospel in the province.[1]

A careful modern historian has assessed the contribution of the clergy to the war effort against the British thus:

> The alliance of the ministers with the leaders of the agitation against England was one reason for its success. They were organized and could easily communicate with each other. They were able and zealous propagandists with a remarkable opportunity for reaching the people. All through the struggle they used every means at their disposal to present the old arguments with new force. No clever lawyer, no radical mechanic gave more warmth and color to the cause than did some of these reverend divines. With a vocabulary enriched by the Bible they made resistance and at last independence and war a holy cause. To have won their support was, so said their enemies, the master stroke of the politicians.[2]

---

[1] Thornton, op. cit., pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

[2] Baldwin, op. cit., p. 171.

Summary

1. Massachusetts ministers, most of whom were alumni of Harvard College, were trained in the theory and practice of public speaking as undergraduates. They were required to declaim and dispute on a specific day each week, and speeches of the great classical orators constituted required reading. Textbooks and various documents indicate that theoretical studies in rhetoric and logic were based on the teachings of Peter Ramus to a marked degree.

2. For his professional training the prospective minister studied privately. The most popular manual on preaching used in New England during the seventeenth century appears to have been The Art of Prophecying by William Perkins. Perkins adapted Ramus's peculiar interpretation of invention and arrangement to the form and method of development of a sermon. Election sermons follow this pattern quite closely until well into the eighteenth century.

3. The New England clergy exercised considerable social and political prestige even after the theocratic form of government was officially terminated by the new Massachusetts charter of 1691. Among the reasons for this prestige were the ministers' superior education, the wide range of their correspondence, their opportunities for travel, and the public functions they performed as ministers of the gospel. This prestige and influence assured the election sermon preachers of effective ethical appeal.

4. Congregational ministers were politically minded

men. Their church polity being closely interwoven with state aims and ideals made such an attitude virtually inevitable. Furthermore, some of the major political crises during the period under review had such strong ecclesiastical implications that the clergy were per force involved. Quotations and allusions in election sermons indicate a profound acquaintance with the literature dealing with theories of government. As the revolution against Great Britain approached, the clergy played an important part in preparing the people for the struggle, and once the war was in progress their contribution by voice, pen, and active participation was far from insignificant.

CHAPTER IV

ELECTION SERMONS: THE OCCASION AND THE AUDIENCE

A speaking situation is composed of four elements: the speech, the speaker, the occasion, and the audience. This preliminary investigation of the election sermon as a genre considered the first element in Chapter II under the title, "The Origin, Development, and Text of the Election Sermon." The speaker was taken up in Chapter III where his training, social status, and political interests were analysed. The two remaining elements of the speaking situation, the occasion and the audience, constitute the subjects of this chapter.

The Occasion

To appreciate the full impact of a speech it is essential to be acquainted with the social setting in which it was delivered.

> Since every judgment of a public speech contains a historical constituent, the critic is particularly concerned with determining the nature of the setting in which the speaker operates. Although almost a truism, it cannot be overemphasized that speeches are events occurring in highly complex situations; that responsibility of critical appraisal depends heavily on the critic's ability to effect a faithful reconstruction of the social settings long since dissolved.[1]

The sequence of events as they occurred on election days, and the circumstances in which the sermon was delivered are the

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 312.

subjects of investigation here.

Election day was an occasion for festivity on the part of the general public in Boston. Large numbers of people flocked into the town for the spring activities, which included an election of officers of the Artillery Company and the convention of the ministers of the Congregational churches of the province. Even Harvard found it necessary, at least on one occasion, to ease the college program for the weekend in view of the unsettling events in Boston.[1] Various types of amusement and entertainment were engaged in, of which an interesting description appeared in the form of a "poem" written about the year 1760. The stanzas relating the merriment are quoted, but doubtless some allowance should be made for poetic license:

4
The city swarms with every sort
Of black and white, and every sort
Of high, low, rich and poor;
Squaws, negroes, deputies in scores
And ministers and Councillors
Are seen at every door.

5
Long before phoebus looks upon
The outskirts of the horizon,
The blacks their forces summon.
Tables & benches, chairs & stools
Are lug'd into the common.

6
Thither resort a motley crew,
Of Whites & Blacks & Indians too
And Trulls of every sort.
There all day long they sit & drink,
Swear, sing, play paupaw, dance and stink

---

[1]The Holyoke Diaries, 1709-1856 (Salem: The Essex Institute, 1911), May 23, 30, 1747.

There Bacchus holds his court.[1]

While the populace was enjoying the day on Boston Common, the solemn ceremonies connected with the election of the Council were taking place in the heart of the city. The News-Letter of May 27, 1773, has a detailed report of the ceremonies as they occurred on the previous day:

> Yesterday being the Anniversary of the Day appointed by Royal Charter for convening a Great and General Court or Assembly of this Province, Gentlemen who were returned to serve and represent the several Towns, met agreeable to the Precepts at the Town-House in Boston, at Nine o'Clock in the morning: A committee from the Honorable Board, authorized and appointed by His Excellency the Governor, administered the Oath required by Act of Parliament, to the Members of the House, who after having taken the oath of Abduration and subscribed the Declaration, they unanimously chose Mr. Samuel Adams for their Clerk. The House then proceeded to the Choice of a Speaker, when the Honorable Thomas Cushing, Esq., was unanimously chosen.
>
> At Ten o'Clock the Honorable His Majesty's Council, and a number of the principal Gentlemen of the Town, waited upon His Excellency the Governor at the Province House, to congratulate him on this Anniversary, and having partook of a collation, they went with His Excellency in Procession to the Town House, preceded by the Commission-Officers of the Troop of the Guards, of the Boston Regiment of Militia, of the Company of Artillery, and of the Grenadiers, all dressed in their Uniforms, escorted by His Excellency's Company of Cadets, who were under arms, commanded by the Hon. Colonel Hancock, having an excellent Band of Music, playing on their march. The Governor being in Council Chamber a committee from the Hon. House of Representatives waited upon His Excellency to acquaint him with the Choice of their Speaker: The Governor sent a message by the Secretary that he was in the Chair, and ready to receive the Speaker elect. A Committee from the House then went up with the Speaker, and presented him for His Excellency's Approbation, according to the Royal Explanatory Charter, and then returned to the House; His Excellency sent a message in writing to the House, approving of the Choice. . . .

---

[1]Samuel E. Morison, "A Poem on Election Day in Massachusetts about 1760," published in Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts Transactions, Vol. XVIII (Boston: The Society, 1917), pp. 54-62.

At Eleven o'Clock His Excellency the Governor, the Members of the Honorable His Majesty's Council, and the Honorable House of Representatives, went in Procession to the Old Brick Meeting House, according to ancient Custom, where a sermon on this occasion was preached by the Rev'd Mr. Charles Turner of Duxbury, before a very large auditory of Senators, Ministers, and other Respectable Persons, from those Words in Romans XIII.4 "For he is the minister of God to thee for good."

After Divine Service the guns of Castle William, and at the Batteries in this Town were fired: And the Procession was to Concert Hall where an elegant entertainment was provided and a great number of Gentlemen of rank dined with His Excellency. After dinner their Majesty's Healths, and the Royal Family, and other Royal Toasts were drank.

These ceremonies opened the legislative year. Further details regarding the banquet and the election which followed are supplied in the remainder of the waggish Election Day poem:

8
This discipline they soon dispatch
Unless Tom Frink should chance to speak.
Then down they hurry all
With Quicken'd pace & hungry guts
Like flies, unto the Honey pots
To dine at Fanueil Hall.

9
There through the wide-extended doors
Pass deputies & Councillors,
And parsons with their bands on,
There, quick they seize upon their seats,
And every one sits down and eats
What first he lays his hands on.

10
An after they have clear d the Dishes
They keep their seats & drink like fishes
Till four o clock and after.
Then to the Town house trot away
To do the business of the day,
According to the charter.

11
Meanwhile through the joyful town,
King George s health is toasted round,
And every face looks gay.
With jocund mirth each house abounds

The echoing air repeats the sounds
Time sweetly flows away.

12
But night at length invests the skies,
And Sol, to lend us light denies.
Then some go staggering home.
While sleep begins our eyes to lock,
The watchman cries, "past twelve o'clock"
And silence reigns alone.

On the day following the election, the body of the General Court which had appointed the preacher of the day would pass an action authorizing a committee to convey the thanks of the House to the minister and to request the sermon manuscript for the purpose of having it printed.

The Audience

The speaker's skill in adapting his message to the audience is an important factor of the speaking situation with which the critic is concerned.

> Aristotle observed that a speech was composed, or grew out of the interaction of three elements: the speaker, the subject, and the persons addressed. He added that of the three elements, it was the last, the audience, that determined a speech's end or objective. Never seriously questioned, this pronouncement has almost become a rhetorical axiom. It announces the fact that, for the speaker, the audience is the most important element in the situation, and that, if he is to be effective, the speaker must adjust both himself and his ideas to it.[1]

Bearing in mind that election sermons were in a sense religio-political addresses, and that the sermons selected for this study were delivered in critical political situations, the audience characteristics which are especially pertinent to this investigation are (1) their political in-

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., pp. 359-360.

terests, (2) their social status, and (3) their intellectual level. To determine such factors would be an impossible assignment were it not for the fact that there was a marked distinction between social classes in Massachusetts at this time, and that, by and large, the various classes held to certain educational and cultural standards. Furthermore, the various bodies of the General Court belonged quite consistently to the different legislative bodies.

There were five distinct groups in the election sermon preacher's audience: the Governor and other crown-appointed officials, the members of the Governor's Council, the members of the General Assembly, the clergy, and the general public.

The Massachusetts charter of 1691 stipulated that the governor was to be appointed by the king. As the king's representative, one of his important functions was that of insuring that the royal prerogatives were properly respected in the province. By virtue of his position, the governor was commander-in-chief of the militia, and a vice-admiral of the navy. He presided over the Council, and was authorized to veto any acts passed by either the Council or the General Assembly.

Socially the governor and his wife held the leading position at all public functions. His official title was "Excellency," and on state occasions he was accorded a seventeen-gun salute. During the last two decades of British rule in the Province of Massachusetts the royal governors were Shirley, Pownall, Bernard, Hutchinson, and Gage. Since the ser-

mons to be analyzed in this study were given during the terms of office of four of these governors, a brief survey of their careers follows.

William Shirley.-Shirley was born in Preston, Sussex, England, on September 2, 1694. Upon completion of his law studies he was admitted to the Middle Temple and practiced law until he emigrated to America in 1731. Three years later Shirley was appointed "King's Advocate in America," and Governor of Massachusetts in 1745.

Governor Shirley returned to England on leave of absence in 1749, and while there he was delegated to be one of the negotiators with the French regarding the boundaries between the French and British territories in America. Little or nothing came of this conference, and Shirley returned to Boston in 1753 fully convinced that another war with France was inevitable.

In 1756 Shirley was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in America to succeed General Edward Braddock, but was recalled to England the same year after he led an unsuccessful expedition against Fort Niagara. Subsequently he served as Governor of the Bahamas for a brief period, but returned to settle in Massachusetts in 1770. He died a year later. His claim to fame rests upon:

> The expedition against Louisburg, which was mainly planned by Governor Shirley, had contributed greatly to his popularity; but towards the end of his administration the failure of the expedition of 1755, which was perhaps unjustly charged upon him, produced a considerable revulsion in public sentiment, especially after his appointment as "Commander-in-Chief of His Majesty's forces in America". . . . The measures of Governor Shirley

> were criticised and assailed in the public press, particularly in 1756, during his attempts to procure men and money from the Colony for the proposed expedition against the French at Crown Point. . . .[1]

Francis Bernard.-Born in England and educated at Oxford University, Francis Bernard came to Massachusetts on promotion from New Jersey. He served as governor of Massachusetts for nine years.

Bernard came to Boston at a critical time. His administrative talents were mediocre and he fared rather badly when Great Britain began to antagonize the colonies with her tax policies. During the last two years of Bernard's stay in Boston there was continual bickering between the governor and the House of Representatives. Finally, the House petitioned the king for Bernard's removal, and there was open rejoicing in Boston when he sailed for England on July 1, 1769. He was knighted at this time.

Sir Francis Bernard was a man of pleasant and polished manner and an easy-going disposition.

Thomas Hutchinson.-Of colonial birth, and a member of an old and distinguished family, Thomas Hutchinson was an aristocrat, a scholar, and a man with talent and ability for administration.

For ten years after his graduation from Harvard College Thomas worked in his father's merchant business, then

---

[1]William V. Wells, The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1865), I, 30.

turned to politics. Starting as a Boston Selectman he soon became a Representative, and then successively Speaker of the House, Councillor, Lieutenant Governor and Chief Justice, and finally Governor of Massachusetts.

Hutchinson's political sentiments were Tory and as such he was a staunch supporter of the royal prerogatives. While serving as Lieutenant Governor he lost the support of the people because of the position he took on the Stamp Act. It was at this time that the mob severely damaged his house.

As an aristocrat, Hutchinson wished to see something like the British peerage instituted in New England. Though for the last few years of his stay in Boston, and for many years after his departure, his loyalty to Massachusetts was seriously questioned, modern scholarship supports the position that he was a sincere man torn between his love for his native land and his love for royalty. As governor he was in an invidious position, being under obligation to carry out the policies of Parliament while his fellow countrymen were vehemently protesting against those very policies.

Hutchinson suffered his coup de grâce as governor when supposedly seditious letters written by him to a friend in England were discovered by Benjamin Franklin and sent to Boston. Thereupon the House petitioned for his removal from the office of governor. He sailed for England on June 1, 1774.

Thomas Gage.-Before his appointment as governor of Massachusetts, General Gage was Commander of the British forces in America. When Parliament passed the Boston Port Bill

in retaliation for the Boston Tea Party and other acts of insubordination, Gage happened to be in England. He was appointed governor and given the specific responsibility of enforcing the terms of the bill, a task he was determined to execute to the letter. The colonial patriots, on the other hand, were equally determined to resist the punitive bill. Thus the battle lines between the new governor and the House of Representatives were drawn from the beginning of Gage's incumbency.

Upon arrival in Boston, Gage was accorded an impressive reception, but when it became apparent that he intended to enforce the new law with vigor, and that democracy in Massachusetts was a thing of the past, hostility towards him became bitter. The skirmish between Gage's forces and the Minutemen at Lexington on April 19, 1775, marked the final break in relations between Gage and the patriots.

Other Crown-Appointed Officials

Besides the Governor, the king also appointed the Lieutenant Governor, the Secretary of the Council, the Chief Justice, and the Customs Officers. Some of these appointees were colonials, as for example Thomas Hutchinson and the two Olivers. Until about 1768 all these officials were strong royalists. Socially they stood high in Massachusetts, as the following order of precedence indicates:

1. The Governor
2. The Lieutenant Governor
3. The President of the Council
4. The Members of the Council
5. The Speaker of the House
6. The Chief Justice

7. The Treasurer
8. The Assistant Judges[1]

The Governor's Council

The Council of the Province of Massachusetts consisted of twenty-eight men, elected annually by the House of Representatives and the retiring members of the Council voting jointly. The appointment was not final, however, until approved by the Governor. The function of the Council was three-fold: (1) it constituted the Governor's advisory board, (2) it served as the Upper House of the General Court, and (3) it was the highest Court of Appeals in the Province. Though the Governor was authorized to veto any person elected to the Council, this power had to be exercised with care, for should he displease the House with a veto the Governor might lose a favored partisan at the next election.

In normal times the same men were elected year after year, but just before the spring elections of 1766 "a writer in the Boston Gazette urged that the Sons of Liberty elect the right representatives and give them proper instructions."[2] This advice was followed by the electors and consequently such strong prerogative men as Hutchinson and the Olivers lost their seats on the Council Board.

> From this time the Council, which should have been the "aristocratic" part of the government, was just as much dominated by the popular or democratic party as was the

---

[1]Leonard Woods Laboree, Royal Government in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), p. 92.

[2]Robert E. Brown, Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780 (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, Published for the American Historical Association, 1955, p. 28.

House in its dispute with Bernard over the purged Council.[1]

Socially the Councillors were aristocrats and they carried considerable weight in both the social and political life of the Province. Generally they were well educated and cultured people who enjoyed the honor and respect of the citizens.

The House of Assembly

The election of the Lower House of the General Court took place by popular vote in the individual towns of the Province. These elections preceded the annual election of the Council which took place on the fourth Wednesday in May. Boston was allowed four representatives in the Assembly, while the rest of the precincts elected two each. Naturally the towns chose their best men as deputies; for example, the Boston deputies included lawyers and doctors, and other Harvard graduates such as James Otis, Samuel Adams, Thomas Cushing, John Hancock, John Adams, and Doctor Joseph Warren.

The Clergy of the Province

Running concurrently with the annual election of the Council was a convention of the Congregational Church ministers of Massachusetts. Regarding the purpose of the convention Cotton Mather wrote:

> The thing amongst them (the Congregationalists) that is the nearest thereto (a synod) is a general convention of ministers . . . belonging to the Province, at the time of the Anniversary Solemnity, when the General Assembly of the Province meets, on the last Wednesday of the Month of May, to elect their Counsellors for the year ensuing.

---

[1]Robert E. Brown, op. cit., p. 230.

> The Ministers, chusing a Moderator, do propose Matters of Public Importance, referring to the Interest of Religion in the Churches; and tho' they assume no Decisive Power yet the advice which they give to the People of God, has proved of great use unto the Country.
>
> There is now taken up the custom, for a Sermon to be preached unto the Convention of Ministers, on the Day after the Election, by one of their Number, chosen to it by their Votes, at their meeting in the preceding year.
>
> The Governour of the Province, and such Councillors as dwell in the city of Boston, together with the Representatives of the Town, and the Speaker of their House: are invited also to dine with the Ministers at the Table which the Deacons of the United Churches in Boston provide for them, the Day after the Election.[1]

The presence of this large body of well educated and experienced public speakers constituted a challenge to the election sermon preacher.

The General Public

It is probable that a large number of the people not included in the categories previously described were also in attendance at the election service. These members of the general public ordinarily would belong to the social classes known as the "better sort" and the "middling sort." Included in the "better sort" were the "wealthy merchants around whose central position were their lawyers, their ministers, and an occasional master artisan or shopkeepers of impeccable lineage." The "middling sort" were the "hard-working, self-reliant, property conscious shopkeepers and independant artisans of the cities."[2] The three remaining classes -- poor whites, bonded servants, and Negroes -- would certainly not attend the elec-

---

[1]Cotton Mather, Ratio Disciplinae Fratum (Boston: S. Garrish, 1726), pp. 176-177.

[2]Clinton Rossiter, op. cit., pp. 86-93.

tion service. The two upper classes were generally cultured and fairly well educated and would constitute an intelligent audience quite capable of following the discourse of a Harvard trained minister.

Political Parties

The political affiliations of an audience must be taken into consideration by a public speaker, and this would be particularly true for the election sermon preacher in view of the quasi-political nature of his address.

During the latter half of the eighteenth century political partisanship was strong in America:

> An English observer remarked in 1760 that "a spirit of party is universally prevalent in America." He might have remarked more accurately that the colonists seemed to be coming to life politically. And he might have remarked, too, that as men of the west and lower classes came to think and talk politically, they were only too pleased to borrow from eastern aristocrats the language of Whiggery and natural rights.[1]

There were essentially two parties in Massachusetts: those who supported the royal prerogatives, and those who opposed royal hegemony. These two groups adopted the English names Tory and Whig respectively. Broadly speaking the Tory party was composed of the Governor and his party, and the social aristocrats. The Whig party was made up of the members of the House of Assembly and the lower classes of society. The cleavage between these two parties became deeper and wider as the last quarter of the eighteenth century approached.

Summary

1. The annual election day which, in terms of the

---

[1]Rossiter, op. cit., p. 115.

Massachusetts charter, fell on the fourth Wednesday of May, was an eventful day in the pre-Revolutionary political calendar. Not only did the election of the Governor's Council take place on this day, but also the election of the officers of the Artillery Company, and the Convention of the Congregational clergy. Boston teemed with visitors and a festive mood prevailed.

2. The annual election of the Council took place with considerable pomp and ceremony. The solemnities opened with the Governor's procession from his official residence to the Town House for the purpose of confirming the election of the Speaker of the Lower House. The procession then continued to church where the election sermon was given. The actual election took place after a midday banquet, and the names of the Councillors were then presented to the Governor for approval.

3. Five distinct groups of persons constituted the audiences which normally attended election services: the Governor and the other crown-appointed officials, the members of the retiring Governor's Council, the body of the clergy, the members of the House of Representatives, and the general public.

4. There were five social classes in Massachusetts: the better sort, the middling sort, the meaner sort, the bonded apprentices, and the Negroes. The first two classes would be represented in the election service and provided the speaker with a cultured, well educated, and intelligent audience.

5. The preacher had to take cognizance of the fact that his audience was divided into two political parties or factions, the royalists and the patriots, also known as Tories and Whigs respectively.

PART III

ANALYSES OF SELECTED SERMONS 1754-1775

CHAPTER V

JONATHAN MAYHEW'S ELECTION SERMON - 1754

Biographical Sketch

Jonathan Mayhew, the son of a clergyman, was born in Chilmark, Martha's Vineyard, on October 8, 1720. He was educated at Harvard College where he was "highly distinguished for the ease and elegance with which he wrote Latin, and for his skill in dialectics."[1] After graduating at the age of twenty-four, Jonathan continued his studies at Harvard, and was granted the Master's degree in 1747. The same year he was ordained second pastor of Boston's West Church. Two years later Mayhew published Seven Sermons . . . Preached As a Lecture in the West Meeting House[2] which included two sermons dealing with the right of private judgment in religious matters. These sermons are said to have influenced Aberdeen University to grant Mayhew the D. D. degree in February, 1750.[3]

---

[1]Moses Coit Tyler, The Literary History of the American Revolution (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., for Facsimili Library Inc., 1941), I, 125.

[2]Published in Boston, 1749.

[3]Alden Bradford, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Reverend Jonathan Mayhew (Boston: C. C. Little and Company, 1838), p. 32.

Mayhew was an outspoken and serious critic of some of the leading Calvinistic doctrines, and consequently those who sponsored his ordination had some difficulty persuading Boston ministers to assist at the ceremony. Furthermore, the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers, the body which arranged the speakers' roster for the traditional Thursday afternoon doctrinal lectures, refused to include Mayhew's name on the list. Not to be denied, however, Mayhew organized his own lecture series in his West Church, and they were well attended.

In political matters Mayhew was no novice. Regarding his training in this respect, he stated in a sermon in 1766:

> Having been initiated, in youth, in the doctrines of civil liberty, as they were taught by such men as Plato, Demosthenes, Cicero and other renowned persons among the ancients; and such as Sidney and Milton, Locke and Hoadley, among the moderns; I liked them; they seemed rational. Having, earlier still learnt from the holy scriptures, that wise, brave and vertuous (sic) men were always friends to liberty· that God gave the Israelites a King (or absolute Monarch) in his anger, because they had not sense and virtue enough to like a free common-wealth and to have himself for their King; that the Son of God came down from heaven to make us "free indeed"; and that "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty"; this made me conclude, that freedom was a great blessing.[1]

With such a background it is not surprising that Mayhew bitterly opposed acts which appeared to curtail the liberties of the colonies. Two of his first published sermons treated of religious liberty. In 1750, on the annual day set aside to commemorate the "martyrdom" of Charles II, Mayhew, instead of eulogizing Charles according to the traditional practice,

---

[1]Jonathan Mayhew, The Snare Broken (Boston: R. & S. Draper, Edes & Gill, T. J. Fleet, 1766), p. 35.

preached on the right of the people to disobey rulers who issue commands contrary to the law of God and the liberties of the people. The sermon was published in Boston and in England, and though it drew criticism from the Tories it

> was justly deemed an apology for civil liberty, in opposition to the slavish doctrine of passive obedience, and non-resistence, then inculcated by some members of the English Church, as they had been even in the days of the Stuarts.[1]

Two other political sermons by Mayhew were the election sermon of 1754 and a sermon preached upon the repeal of the Stamp Act in 1766.

Mayhew was also a leading figure in the controversy over the activities of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts as well as the much discussed scheme for instituting an American Episcopacy. His political interests and activities are commented upon by John Adams:

> To draw the character of Mayhew, would be to describe a dozen volumes. This transcendent genius threw all the weight of his great fame into the scale of his country in 1761, and maintained it there with zeal and ardor till his death in 1766.[2]

Mayhew was a contemporary and friend of the great leaders of the Revolution James Otis, Samuel Adams, John Adams, and Josiah Quincy. A month before his death Mayhew wrote to Otis proposing that the General Court send a circular letter in order to draw the colonies together for the sake of self-defence.[3] This step was actually taken two years later when

---

[1]Alden Bradford, op. cit., pp. 117-118.

[2]John Adams, Works, X, 288.

[3]Bradford, op. cit., p. 428.

Adams drafted the famous Circular Letter which was voted by the General Court of February 11, 1768. The letter was a "new departure altogether and it . . . succeeded beyond his (Adams') wildest dreams."[1]

Socially Mayhew was a gracious person, though some charged him with vanity and harshness. It would appear that there was some reason for thinking him severe, but because he championed great national causes his friends glossed over his faults. Mayhew was a good preacher, according to a contemporary minister, Charles Chauncy:

> As a minister, how diligent, how laborious, how skillful! making it his care to contrive his discourses so as to inform the mind and touch the heart, so as at once to entertain and profit both the learned and the illiterate, the polite and the less cultivated hearer. Few were able to compose their sermons with so much ease, and yet so much pertinence: and few preached with greater consistency, and took occasion more frequently from the occurrences in the conduct of providence to make what he said seasonable and profitable to his hearers.[2]

Jonathan Mayhew died on July 9, 1766, at the age of forty-six. His career is well epitomized in the following statement:

> For nineteen years his pulpit was the storm center of Boston theology, and for almost as long the religious outpost of colonial resistance to British political and ecclesiastical encroachment. One of the last of the great colonial preachers, he was at the same time the rough-voiced herald of a new day for religious and political liberty. Rationalism and Whiggery had no more outspoken an exponent.[3]

---

[1]Catherine Drinker Bowen, John Adams and the American Revolution (New York: Grossetts and Dunlap, 1949, 1950), p. 320.

[2]Charles Chauncy, Funeral Sermon for Jonathan Mayhew (Boston: R. & S. Draper, Edes and Gill, T. & J. Fleet, 1766), p. 31.

[3]Clinton Rossiter, op. cit., p. 228.

The Political Situation in 1754

In 1754 William Shirley was governor of Massachusetts, having served in that capacity since 1741. Shirley was a popular governor, and much respected for his capture of Fort Louisburg from the French in 1745.

On August 6, 1753, Shirley returned from the Paris Conference which had been convened in order to determine the boundaries between the English and French territories in America. No satisfactory agreement was achieved and both sides began preparations for the renewed struggle which was thought to be inevitable. The French established forts from the Gulf of St. Lawrence along the Great Lakes and on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers: the British established and fortified the town of Halifax as a bulwark against the French entrenchment at Louisburg.[1]

The French settlers on the American continent were heavily outnumbered by the British, but since the former had "more natural genius for winning the affection of the natives, and had no desire to settle the land to the detriment of the game,"[2] London feared that the Indians who were friendly to Britain might be induced to go over to the French. Feelings against the French were intensified in Massachusetts at this time because of evidence brought to Boston purporting that Catholic missionaries were engaging in political activity and even inciting the Indians to molest frontier settlers.

---

[1]This fort had been returned to France by the terms of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748.

[2]Lord Acton, compiler, The Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge: The University Press, 1903), VII, 119.

To meet this situation the Board of Trade, the royal body in control of colonial affairs, proposed that representatives of the American colonies meet in conference with the friendly Indians in order to cement the alliance between Great Britian and the Iroquois. The conference was also to consider what form of union the colonies could be effected for the purpose of mutual support in resisting French aggression. Early in 1754 the Massachusetts House voted to send representatives as requested by London.

Thus, when Jonathan Mayhew rose to preach the election sermon on May 29, 1754, the international political situation was tense, and the Massachusetts colonists felt that their very existence was being threatened by the neighboring French Canadians. The times were indeed serious, and doubtless both people and legislators were waiting for the guidance about to be offered by this talented minister of religion.

Précis of the Sermon

The Text

> His Lord said unto him: Well done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful . . .[1]

The Opening of the Text

After reminding his audience that the text is taken from Jesus' parable of the talents, the speaker asserts that the talents represent the powers and advantages that all enjoy. In this respect rulers are especially favored, having been given the talent of rulership. Mayhew proposes to re-

---

[1]Matthew, Chapter 25, verse 21.

mind the rulers of their duty to God and man with regard to this talent. This specific purpose is to be developed under four heads:

1. The source and origin of civil government.
2. The purpose of government.
3. "Some arguments by which rulers should be induced to exercise their power with fidelity, suitable to the great end and design of it."
4. "Reflections relative to the election anniversary and to the present state of the province."[1]

Body of the Sermon

The source of civil power is God, but the divine activity in government is mediate, not immediate. Thus a particular form of government has not been prescribed, but peoples are to institute the types of government best suited to their circumstances. Government is instituted by common consent for the sake of mutual security and the common good. Civil government also has other minor functions, such as the encouragement of good morals and religion, the protection of the individual, and the preservation of tolerance.

Five reasons are presented as to why rulers should faithfully perform their duties:

1. The prospect of achieving the public good
2. The gratitude and rewards received from the people
3. The effects of their counsel on posterity
4. The dignity and honor accorded to a "minister of God"
5. The happiness that will be theirs in the hereafter

The Applications

This section of the sermon is in two parts. The first consists of three reflections arising out of the theme of the

---

[1]Jonathan Mayhew, Election Sermon (Boston: Samuel Kneeland, 1754), p. 3.

sermon; the second makes seven applications of the sermon to the audience.

The reflections.-The three reflections deal with the following matters:

1. That government is a blessing, for it guards the security, property, peace, religion, and lives of the people.
2. Since government is instituted by God, the people are morally bound to submit to their rulers "for conscience sake." Law, however, and not arbitrary will is to be the measure of the power of the magistrate.
3. Care and integrity are to be exercised in the choice of rulers.

The applications.-The seven applications commence with remarks addressed to the rulers in general. They are exhorted to be faithful in the discharge of their trusts and to rule in the fear of God, for only such rulers will have proper regard for men. Men elected to the Council Board should be acquainted with the processes and circumstances of government and with the public interests. Matters that currently deserve consideration by the legislators are:

1. Whether there are on the statute books some laws inconsistent with the principles of religious liberty.
2. The present state of Harvard College.
3. The encouragement of foreign Protestants to settle in Massachusetts.
4. The need of an act to settle frontier claims.
5. Greater efforts to civilize and Christianize the natives and to win their friendship, especially in view of the efforts of the French to do so as a part of their program of encroachment upon British colonial territory.

In his address to Governor Shirley, Mayhew alludes to the Governor's achievements and comments on his plans to work for the union of the American colonies.

Following the traditional pattern, the next address

should be to the Council, but Mayhew merely states that he has nothing to add to what has already been said about needed legislation. The address to the House of Representatives focusses attention upon the need of providing ample funds for the purpose of making adequate preparation for the impending war with France.

The Conclusion

All have talents for which they are responsible to God and to their fellow men. Faithfulness will be rewarded. Interest is also taken in the hereafter for which this life is but a preparation.

Analysis of the Sermon

The rhetorical analysis of Mayhew's sermon was undertaken under the following sub-divisions: (1) the invention, which includes the choice of the text, the discovery of the theme of the sermon, and the statement of the main divisions of the body of the sermon; (2) the arrangement consisting of two elements -- the support and amplification of the theme and the application of the theme to the audience; and (3) the language of the sermon.

The Invention

Choice of the sermon text.-Mayhew's text is a well-loved and oft-quoted passage of Scripture. It is interesting to note, however, that the speaker used it in a truncated form. The bracketed part is omitted in the manuscript.

> His Lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful (over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things.)

In reading this text aloud the emphasis in the last sentence would normally fall on the contrasting phrases "few things" and "many things." By leaving off the last part of the sentence Mayhew threw the emphasis forward to the word "hast" and thereby altered the meaning of the text to some extent. As to Mayhew's reason for taking this liberty with the text, it can only be conjectured that the young preacher considered the phrase "over a few things" inappropriate to his weighty subject as well as to the abilities of his distinguished audience.

The opening of the text.-The first step taken in opening the text is that of giving its background. Mayhew does this with an economy of words, yet directly and simply. The second step gives the meaning of the text:

> That whatever powers and advantages of any kind, men severally enjoy, are committed to them in trust by the great Lord and Proprietor of all, to whom they are accountable for the use they make of them· and from whom they shall, in the close of the present scene, receive either a glorious recompence of their fidelity, or the punishment due to their sloth and wickedness.[1]

The text is not a striking one, but it was probably well known by the audience, a fact which would facilitate its application to whatever theme the speaker might choose to develop. As interpreted by Mayhew, the text is well adapted to the audience and the purpose of the occasion. Moreover, it is general enough in scope to suit whatever specific exhortations the speaker felt necessary in the light of the impending struggle with France.

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., pp. 1,2.

The theme of the sermon.-In order to arrive at his theme Mayhew makes an application of the general message of the parable of the talents to his audience by asserting that rulership is a special talent vouchsafed to those who are elected to rule. The purpose of the sermon is therefore to remind the rulers of their responsibilities with respect to this talent of rulership, a theme well suited to the occasion.

Digression.-After announcing his theme, Mayhew digresses to make a statement which is probably designed to win the confidence and goodwill of his audience.

> It is customary for those who are called to speak upon such occasions, to apologize for their want of proper qualification for the task. But how much reason soever they may have for this, I think it usually their unhappiness not to be tho't sincere in doing it. Therefore I shall wholly omit this common ceremony; because I would fain be thought in earnest in everything I say before so grave and venerable an auditory, and upon so important an occasion.[1]

This not-too-subtle thrust at former election sermon preachers can perhaps be ascribed to the fact that Mayhew was persona non grata with many of the Congregational clergy in the audience because of his liberal theological views, an attitude which was probably aggravated by Mayhew's evident popularity with the important people of the province.

The rest of the digression is evidently an effort to enhance the speaker's ethos by exalting his office and by praising his hearers.

> Nor will I injure our honored Rulers by the least suspicion, that they can possibly take it amiss to be re-

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., p. 3.

> minded of their duty to God and Man upon this occasion, with all the plainness and simplicity becoming a minister of the gospel, and consistent with decency· the rules of which, it is hoped, will not be violated.
>
> Indeed were One to discourse upon the subject before Rulers in an arbitrary government; or before unfaithful Rulers,even where the constitution is free; there would be almost a necessity of disguising and suppressing the truth, on one hand, and of giving umbrage on the other. A miserable dilemma! But surely there can be no necessity of the former, or any danger of the latter, under such a government as the British, and before such Rulers as I have the honor to speak to.[1]

Main divisions of the sermon.-Mayhew developed his theme by the topical method, dividing the subject into components which, in the opinion of the speaker, need to be emphasized or elucidated. The main divisions are:

1. To consider the source and origin of government.
2. To show what the great end of government is.
3. To recollect some of those arguments by which rulers should be induced to exercise their power with fidelity.
4. Reflections relative to this anniversary, and to the present state of the province.

The fact that the first three main divisions were virtually mandatory by tradition made it necessary for Mayhew to formulate his main heads by Perkins' method of "collection," since the doctrine is not clearly expressed in the text.[2]

The Arrangement: Supporting the Theme of the Sermon

The first main division.-Mayhew's discussion of the source and origin of government may be outlined as follows:

A. The parable of the talents suggests that government is derived ultimately from God. This is supported by other Scriptures:
   1. Daniel 2: 20-21.
   2. Romans 13: 1,6.

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., p. 3.

[2]Cf. supra, p. 40.

B. The power to rule is derived from God mediately, not immediately.
C. Erroneous doctrines regarding rulership are:
   1. That God ordained a particular form of government.
   2. The divine right of kings.
   3. The hereditary inalienable right of succession.
   4. That kings have unlimited, despotic power.
D. Refutation of the doctrine that God established a civil polity for Israel:
   1. The Hebrew civil polity was not established by God directly, for
      a. Moses instituted government on the advice of Jethro.
      b. Israel later changed her form of government by demanding a king.
      c. Even that royal line was broken.
E. The imperfections of all present governments are proof that they are not directly from God.

The proposition that government was instituted by God is established by Biblical authority. Inasmuch as the Puritans considered the Bible to be of divine origin and therefore authoritative, the proof would be considered adequate. By adding three Biblical references Mayhew increased the impact of his proof.

Mayhew felt it necessary to refute an argument used against his first proposition by the advocates of the doctrine of the divine right of kings who cited Moses in support of their position.[1] Mayhew shows that the Old Testament incident referred to actually supports his own position. The form of government instituted by Moses, argues Mayhew, was not given to Moses by God, but it was suggested to Moses, on the

---

[1]The doctrine of the divine right of kings was being advocated by certain elements which favored the restoration of the Stuart line. As recently as 1746 Prince Charles Edward, the Stuart Pretender, had been defeated at the Battle of Culloden, and "for many years the chance of renewing his attempt seemed by no means hopeless." Cyril Ransome, An Advanced History of England (London: Rivingtons, 1911), p. 781.

contrary, by a "mere pagan."[1]

A further reason offered in support of the assertion that God has not prescribed a particular form of government is the obvious fact that there are no such governments in the Christian world. The argument can be reduced to a hypothetical syllogism:

1. If "divine right" was prescribed by an unchangeable God, it should be in operation somewhere.
2. Such a government does not exist.
3. Therefore it cannot have been prescribed by God.

Since the doctrine of God's unchangeableness was not questtioned by the audience, the protagonists for the divine right of kings were faced with a dilemma by this reasoning. Thus Mayhew's first proposition is supported by Bibical proof, and counter arguments are refuted by the method of turning the tables and by the use of the dilemma.

The second main division.-The speaker maintains that the purposes of government are:

1. To glorify God
2. To ensure the happiness and well-being of man
3. To encourage good morals and religion

The first purpose is merely asserted as a theological axiom. The second purpose is developed as follows:

A. Good government ensures benefits, for
   1. It preserves the persons, property, and rights of the citizens.
   2. It secures the well-being and happiness of the people.

Two arguments are offered in support of these statements.

---

[1]The story of Jethro, who was Moses' father-in-law, is recorded in Exodus, Chapter 18. It would appear that though Jethro had been a pagan priest he did accept the worship of Jehovah.

The first is that it would be inconsistent for a good God to institute a system of government that does not seek the happiness of His creatures. The second is that even if God did not institute government, man would do so for the sake of mutual protection and for the common good. The first argument is theological and based upon generally accepted Biblical doctrine. The second is rational and based upon the commonly accepted Lockean theory of government and natural law.

The third purpose of government is that of encouraging good morals. Mayhew reasons that happiness results from good morals. Since it is the function of the church to foster good morals, good government will support the church in this respect by:

1. The rulers themselves setting a good example in supporting the church.
2. Making laws "consistent with the natural and inalienable rights of every man's conscience."[1]

This is an enthymeme based upon the well-grounded belief that happiness and good morals go hand in hand. Very few of the audience would contest the assertion that the church is an effective agent for the encouragement of good morals.

The third main division.-Mayhew here proposes to give some of the arguments "whereby rulers should be induced to exercise their power with fidelity suitable to the end and design of it." The reasoning may be outlined as follows:

III. Arguments for fidelity in rulers are:
  A. By it the public good will be achieved.
    1. It is a patriotic and Christian duty.
    2. It is just.

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., p. 14.

B. It brings gratitude and reward from the people, for the people know when they are well governed.
C. Good counsel and conduct will have a good effect on posterity.
D. They will enjoy the dignity and honor accorded a "minister of God," for
   1. As such they will imitate the justice and goodness of God.
   2. They will fulfill the will of God.
   3. They will follow the example of Jesus in making good laws.
E. They will remember that they must give an account of their talents to God.
   1. The parable teaches this.
   2. The example of Belshazzar is further proof.
   3. Prophesy predicts retribution for unfaithfulness. Revelation 6: 14-17.

These are "arguments" which touch various basic motives calculated to stimulate the rulers. By using them Mayhew is linking his theme to such natural desires as prestige, honor, inner satisfaction for a task well done, and the desire to please God.

Arrangement: Application

Inasmuch as Puritan homiletic practice employed emotional appeals primarily in the application, and since the particular concern of this study is to discover what persuasive techniques were used by the election sermon preachers in connection with proposals they made concerning the current political problems, the applications were examined for proposals made, emotions appealed to in order to stimulate action, and language used to reinforce the emotional appeals. It should be pointed out that Puritan preachers considered the applications to be the most important part of the sermon. In Mayhew's sermon, for instance, the applications constitute more than half of the total number of pages.

Before making his applications of the sermon to the

audience, Mayhew makes three observations or reflections regarding government and the election which was about to take place.

First reflection.-Good government is a blessing because it safeguards security, prosperity, peace, and religion. England's government is the best type inasmuch as the British people enjoy these benefits more than any other nation. Moreover, the king is just, good, and wise.

Second reflection.-Since government is a divine institution, Christians are duty bound to submit to the rulers for conscience' sake. Government and law are the measure of the magistrate's power and of the obedience of the subjects. The speaker again refers to efforts being made to restore the Stuart line to the English throne.

Third reflection.-The election about to take place requires care and integrity so that government will not fall into the hands of the weak, the designing, or the covetous. Lawmakers are to eschew bribery and corruption. In stressing the last point Mayhew appeals strongly to feelings of pride and shame. Note the rich Biblical language and emotionally charged references to the pioneers with which the appeals are reinforced:

> God forbid that ever such things should become fashionable and reputable amongst us; or that any son of New England, should prove such a profane Esau, as to sell his birthright! Our ancestors, tho' not perfect in all respects, were a religious, brave and vertuous (sic) set of men, whose love of liberty, civil and religious, brought them from their native land, into the American deserts. By their generous care, it is, under the smile of gracious providence, that we have now here a goodly heritage; and see these once desart (sic) and solitary places rejoic-

> ing and blossoming as the rose, the glory of Lebanon being given unto them, and the excellency of Carmel and of Sharon. By the wisdom & (sic) piety of our forefathers it is under that God who hath determined the bounds of all mens habitation, that we here enjoy many invaluable privileges; of which this day, amongst other things, is a proof & monument. Tho' we are not an independent state, yet heaven be thanked! we are a free people. However all know, that it is not from our privileges and liberties, simply considered, but from the use we make of them, that our felicity is to be expected. And they are so great and ample, that the right improvement of them, cannot but make us happy, provided we have the vertue and honour to make such a one of them. Nor can I think that we are so far degenerated from the laudable spirits of our Ancestors as to despise and abuse what they procured for us at so dear a rate. I am not willing to believe we are running so fast into the evil practices and customs of other places; or so fond of imitating the fashionable follies and vices of any, even of those whom decency may perhaps require us to call our betters, as some would insinuate that we are; and from hence prognosticate our destruction. No: I will not believe but that we fear God, reverence the memory of our forefathers, love our country, and ourselves, more than to do thus: and that God will still give us to see the good of his chosen.[1]

With this appeal the reflections are completed and the speaker begins his applications.

First application.-The first application is an exhortation to the rulers to be faithful in the discharge of their duties. In doing this Mayhew repeats, in one long paragraph, the points presented under the third division of the body of the sermon. A strong emotional effect is achieved by the appeals made and by the structure of the passage. The short sentence and parallel structure make for passion and vehemence.

> But surely I should forget the proper duty of my station, if I did not embrace the opportunity which this day affords me, to beseech you, as you fear God, whose ministers you

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., p. 23-24.

> are; as you love the country, whose welfare depends upon you; as you regard that good name, which is "as precious as ointment," and "rather to be chosen than great riches;" as you have any concern for posterity, even your own; as you would enjoy the blessed peace of a good conscience, in life and death, and, in fine, as you would be found of our common judge in peace, in the day of his appearing; if I did not beseech and exhort you, by all these motives, to be faithful in the discharge of that trust which is devolved upon you by God and man; but in all things to consult and prosecute the public good.[1]

Second application.-The legislators are exhorted to rule in the fear of God, for those who do not fear God will have little regard for man. The exhortation is reinforced with an appeal to the emotion of religious fear. Note again the rich Biblical language quoted:

> Be pleased, therefore, always to bear in mind that glorious Being, who is ever with you, who spake all worlds into existence; whose power sustains and governs all things; in whose presence no seraph is veiled; at whose frown, apostate spirits tremble; before whom all "the inhabitants of the earth" are reputed as nothing; whose "eyes ever view, whose eyelids try the children of men: the righteous Lord who loveth righteousness;" and under whose administration, all men shall at last, find their account in an upright conduct, and in that alone.[2]

Third application.-Advice is offered to the electors regarding the kind of men who should be chosen to the Council. The speaker stresses the importance of the Council and the need of men for that office who are actuated by Christian and patriotic principles.

Fourth application.-Attention is drawn to matters within the province which deserve consideration by the legislators: whether there are laws on the statute books which

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., p. 24-25.

[2]Ibid., p. 28.

"are hardly reconcilable with the religious liberty which we possess,"[1] the state of Harvard College, an act to settle frontier claims, the encouragement of foreign Protestants to settle in the colony, and greater efforts to humanize and Christianize the poor savages."[2] In connection with the last point Mayhew makes a plea for an effort to cement the alliance with the Iroquois and to form a union of the colonies for the purpose of resisting French encroachments. This plea constitutes Mayhew's first specific proposal concerning the current political problems:

> It is hoped that You, our honored Rulers will not neglect any means that are proper to be used by the government, to humanize and christianize these poor Salvages (sic). Charity requires this, and requires it the more, because they will, otherwise, be in great danger of apostatizing from their natural paganism and barbarity, into that which is worse, the religion of Rome; a religion, calculated rather to make men wicked, than to keep them from being so, or to reform them after they have become so. We know the great pains, and various artifices, that are used by the Romish missionaries, to convert them to their wicked religion. Nor can one help calling to mind here the words of our blessed Savior: "Woe unto you;-for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell & C."
>
> But as was intimated before, were compassion to the souls of these miserable pagans wholly out of the case, even policy requires us to bring them, if possible, to embrace the Protestant faith. This would be one great means, amongst others not so proper to mention in this place, of attaching them to the British interest: "Where as they will, otherwise, probably be our enemies. And what sort of enemies we are to expect of them, is no hard matter to conjecture, since the great duties which the missionaries of Rome inculcate upon their savage converts, are those of butchering and scalping Protestans (sic): Generous enemies, doubtless, when their native ferocity is whetted and improved by a religion that naturally de-

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., p. 26.

[2]Ibid., p. 31.

30 lights in blood and murder.[1]

Anti-Catholic feeling was very strong in New England, and Mayhew appeals to this prejudice in lines 7 to 16 and 24 to 30. The fear of Indian atrocities was also great, and this appeal to that fear is particularly strong. The irony employed in lines 28 to 30 serves to intensify the emotion of fear. The whole passage is well calculated to arouse the righteous indignation of the colonists against the French Roman Catholics.

Mayhew continues by referring to the greater efforts which were being made by the French than by the British to win the friendship of the Indians. He warns that "whoever has the friendship of most, or all of the natives, may probably, in time, become master of this part of the continent. Whether we, or they who are now making such a resolute push for it, Heaven knows!"[2] The plea for greater efforts to win the Indians is accompanied by an appeal to the emotions of pride in past achievements and anger towards the enemy:

> The warlike preparations that are made and making, in our southern colonies, prove that they are not unapprehensive of what may be the consequences of those quick advances & gigantic strides, which the French are making towards us; the consequences of the strict alliance they are forming with those Indians who are already our enemies; of their endeavors to secure such as are yet neuters; and of their practices, and many artifices, to corrupt those who are in amity with us. We, surely, who have always distinguished ourselves by a jealousy of our rights; by our loyalty; and our zeal for the common interests of his Majesty's dominions on the continent; We, surely, shall not be inattentive to these com-

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., p. 31-32.

[2]Ibid., p. 33.

motions, nor inactive when the general good, yea the very being of all these colonies is threatened. Shall not be inattentive and inactive, did I say? We are not, we cannot be. We see from the late conduct of our neighbours, from their recent encroachments, and unprovoked hostilities, (unless to breath [sic] on our own territories to be a provocation to such men) we see from these things, in what manner all controversies about bounds & limits, are to be settled; how very amicably! Punic faith! unless perhaps, Gallic is become sufficiently proverbial. No one that is not an absolute stranger to their ambitions, to their injustice, to their perfidiousness, can be in doubt what they aspire to.[1]

This is passionate language. Note again the short, dynamic sentences, the rhetorical question (lines 16-17), the exclamations (lines 22,23), the vituperation (lines 23-26. Punic is synonymous with treacherous), and the irony expressed in lines 19-20, 22.

Mayhew's second proposal concerning the crisis is related to the need for union of the colonies. He asserts that enemy movements indicate an early opening of hostilities. The French, Mayhew claims, are determined to control the whole American continent, and immediate action by the colonies is imperative. In connection with this presentation the speaker makes his greatest emotional appeal. Fear, religious prejudice, and indignation constitute the main emotions he seeks to stir.

And what horrid scene is this, which restless, roving fancy, or something of an higher nature, presents to me; and so chills my blood! Do I behold these territories of freedom, become the prey of arbitrary power? Do I see the motly armies of French and painted Savages, taking our fortresses, and erecting their own, even in our capital towns and cities! Do I behold them spreading desolation through the land! Do I see the slaves of Lewis with their Indian allies, dispossessing the freeborn subjects of King George, of the inheritance re-

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

ceived from their forefathers, and purchased by them at the expense of their ease, their treasure, their blood! To aggrevate the indignation beyond human toleration, do I see this goodly patronage ravished from them, by those who never knew what property was, except by seizing that of others for an insatiable Lord! Do I see Christianity banished for popery! the Bible, for the mass-book! the oracles of truth, for fabulous legends! Do I see the sacred Edifices erected here to the honor of the true God, and His Son, on the ruins of pagan superstition and idolatry; erected here, "where Satan's seat was;" Do I see these sacred Edifices laid in ruin themselves! and others rising in their places, consecrated to the honor of saints and angels! Instead of a train of Christ's faithful, laborious ministers, do I behold a herd of lazy Monks, and Jesuits, and Exorcists, and Inquisitors, and cowled and uncowled Imposters! Do I see a Protestant there, stealing a look at his Bible, and being taken in the fact, punished like a felon! What indignity is yonder offered to the matrons! and here, to the virgins! Is it now a crime to reverence the hoary head! And is he alone happy, that taketh the little ones, and dasheth them against the stones! Do I see all liberty, property, religion, happiness, changed, or rather transubstantiated, into slavery, poverty, superstitution, wretchedness! And in fine, do I hear the miserable sufferers (those of them that survive) bitterly accusing the negligence of the public Guardians! and charging all their calamities, less upon the enemies, than upon the fathers of their country! O dishonest! profane! execrable sight! O piercing sound! "that entereth into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth!" Where! in what region! in what world am I! Is this imagination? (its own busy tormentor), Or is it something more divine? I will not, I cannot believe 'tis prophetic, or that God has so far abandoned us!

And how different a scene is now opened upon me, with clearer indication of truth and reality! There, insolence and injustice punished! Here, "the meek, inherit the earth!" Liberty, victorious! Slavery biting her own chains! Pride brought down! Virtue exalted! Christianity triumphing over imposture! And another Great Britain rising in America! But I must not declare the whole--"The Lord God omnipotent reigneth . . ." "What has pride profited! Or what good hath vaunting brought you," ye restless disturbers of peace! What good, are your masses? your relicks? your crossings? your Ave Maria's? And to which of your saints will you now turn![1]

The emotional power of this passage lies not only in the emotions appealed to, but also in the language with which

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., pp. 37-39.

the appeals are made. Note the bold and vital nouns and adjectives in the following lines:

1 horrid scenes, restless, roving fancy.
5 motly armies of French and painted savages.
11-12 at the expense of their ease, their treasure, their blood.
16 insatiable Lord.
18 fabulous legends.
26-27 Exorcists, and inquisitors, and cowled and uncowled imposters.
40 O dishonest, profane, execrable sight! O piercing sound!

Strong descriptive verbs give force to the passage:

3 Chills my blood.
14 goodly patronage ravished from them.
16-17 Christianity banished for popery.
28 Protestants . . . stealing a look.
32-33 dasheth them against the stones.
34 changed, or rather transubstantiated.
37 bitterly accusing the negligence . . .

The emotional impact is further intensified by the effective use of figurative language:

The whole passage is a hypotyposis because it presents a vigorous picture as though seen before the eyes.

Rhetorical question and parallel structure are combined in lines 1 to 40.

Eckphonesis (exclamation and outcry): 40-42.

Metonomy (substitution of an attribute for the thing referred to): 14 (goodly patronage) 20-21 (ruins of pagan superstitution and idolatry), 38 (the public guardians).

Synecdoche (substitution of the part for the whole or vice versa): 3 (chills my blood), 31 (the hoary head).

Asyndeton (omitting conjunctions): lines 46-51.

Personification: 48-50.

All these figures are usually employed for their emotional and dramatic effect upon the audience. Mayhew has used them well.

Fifth application.-Here Mayhew begins his addresses to the various bodies of the legislature, a formality which was traditional. The first address is to Governor William Shirley. The province is fortunate, he said, in having a governor who is well acquainted with and capable of serving the interests of the people. Mayhew refers to Shirley's victory over the French and commends his efforts to effect a union of the colonies. The governor is compared to a capable ship's pilot guiding his ship through a storm.

Sixth application.-Customarily the second address is directed to the Council. Mayhew merely states, however, that no more need be said to the Council beyond what had already been said regarding needed legislation under the fourth application.

Seventh application.-The address to the House of Representatives reminds the members that they are the guardians of the rights of those by whom they were elected and that since they hold the power of the purse of government they are to use it with wisdom, but not parsimoniously in view of the French threat. This is Mayhew's third specific proposal relative to the current crisis:

> I speak now with particular reference to the necessary defence of this and all these colonies, against those who are making inroads upon us; and who have, even within the space of a few weeks, had the hardiness to commit such hostilities as are not to be endured, unless we are determined to sit down in inglorious ease, and patiently to look on, while our trade with the natives is ravished from us;our fortresses taken; our friends and brethren, captivated, butchered, scalped; our fields, laid waste; our territories possessed by those that hate us; and the British interest on the continent brought to nothing. Peace is a great blessing; peace is what we

should chuse; peace is the desire of all who deserve the name of Christian. But shall the trumpet sleep? Shall the sword rust? Shall our gold and silver canker in our coffers? Shall our military garments be motheaten for want of use, when such things are doing? It is impossible, Gentlemen, you should be any way backward, or parsimonious, in such a cause as this; a cause wherein the glory of God, the honor of your King, and the good of your country, are to deeply concerned; I might perhaps add, a cause whereon the liberties of Europe depend. For of so great consequence is the empire of North America, (and that, you are sensible, is the thing now aimed at by our neighbors) that it must turn the scale of power greatly in favour of the only Monarch, from whom those liberties are in danger; and against that Prince, who is the grand support and bulwark of them. Consider then, Gentlemen, in the name of God, consider what you owe Him, and to your holy religion; what, to the Protestant interest in general; what, to your King and to Great Britain, in particular; what, to your native country; what, to the honour of your ancestors; what, to the present generation; what, to future ones; what, to yourselves; and what, to those whom the God of nature has made dearer to you than yourselves, your children. It is even uncertain, Gentlemen, how long you will have a House to sit in, unless a speedy and vigorous opposition is made to the present encroachments, and to the farther designs of our enemies! This, surely, is not a time to be saving, unless in our private expenses.[1]

Here again the emotional material presented is greatly reinforced by the use of emotionally charged language.

Note the vigorous verbs:

Lines 4-8: hardiness to commit
not to be endured
we are determined to sit down
ravished from us
Line 9: captivated, butchered, scalped
Lines 14-16: sleep, rust, canker

Excellent use is made of dramatic sentence structures:

Asyndeton: Lines 30-36.
Epanaphora (repetition of words for effect):
peace- 12-14.
shall- 14-17.
a cause- 19.
what . . . to 29-36.

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

Optation (appeal to deity): line 29.
Omination (expressing foreboding): lines 37-40.

Take note also of the predominance of short sentences which give the effect of urgency, strong passion, and vehemence. Even the Scriptures quoted (lines 14-17) are of a highly dramatic nature.

The applications are concluded with an apology for the political and emotional nature of the sermon:

> If anything has been said in this discourse, not sufficiently conformable to the usual style of the pulpit; if anything that approaches too near to politicks; if the discourse has not been enough confined to matters altogether spiritual; if our temporal and worldly concernments have been too long dwelt upon; in fine, if there has been any greater liberty of speech used; if, any greater pathos of expression, than becomes an English subject, a lover of his country, and a Protestant minister, upon such an occasion, and at such a juncture, as the present; if this is the case, as perhaps it is, the greater candor of the audience is humbly relied on, to make the most favourable apology, that the nature of the thing will admit, for him that has thus transgressed. And that will be, at least, as good a one, as any he could make for himself, should he attempt one.[1]

Summarizing Mayhew's applications it was found that two of them dealt specifically with the political problems of the day, making suggestions as to how they should be solved:

1. That an effort should be made to strengthen the British alliance with friendly Indian nations.

2. That a way should be found to form a union of the American colonies for the purpose of resisting the encroachments of the French.

3. That the House of Representatives, who have the control of government finances, should be liberal in financing preparations for the expected war.

Mayhew sought to stir his audience to action in these matters

---

[1]Mayhew, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

by arousing the emotions of fear, religious prejudice, indignation against the French, loyalty, and patriotism. The appeals were reinforced with colorful emotional language including well-chosen concrete nouns and adjectives, forceful and descriptive verbs, and sentence structures which lend urgency and vitality to the ideas. The whole is enriched by the use of various types of tropes and figures and dramatic quotations from the Bible.

The Language of the Sermon

Clarity.-Inasmuch as the language in which Mayhew couched his emotional appeals has been analyzed, it will not be necessary to do more regarding the qualities of impressiveness and forcefulness. The clarity of the sermon language will therefore be the subject of this part of the study.

Style achieves clarity, to a large extent, by the use of familiar words; familiar, that is, to the specific audience.

Approximately twelve percent of Mayhew's vocabulary consists of words of three or more syllables. In the case of the Sermon on the Mount, the percentage is four. Some of Mayhew's longer words, chosen at random, are:

territories	arbitrary
desolation	dispossess
toleration	indignation
insatiable	laborious
calamity	impotent

Though long for oral style these terms are not technical or unfamiliar. All of them except "arbitrary" are used in the Bible, and were probably readily understood by the audience. Nevertheless this is not simple language.

No fault can be found with Mayhew's grammar and syntax. There is great variety in sentence structure; when the material is expository in nature the sentences tend to be relatively long, ranging from twenty words to well over one hundred and averaging approximately thirty-five words per sentence. When the material is of an emotional nature, on the other hand, the average length of the sentences is fifteen words, ranging from two to twenty-five words each.

Most of the sentences are of a simple, straightforward construction, but occasionally they are long and complicated. An example of one was quoted on page 95 where ninety words are inserted between the subject and the predicate of the 150 word sentence. A redeeming feature in this case is that this sentence summarizes material which had been developed at length earlier in the sermon.

Interesting structural devices are frequently employed. These include the periodic sentence,[1] parallel[2] and antithetical[3] structure, and occasionally alliteration.[4]

Mayhew's audience probably had no difficulty following his development of the theme of his sermon. The form of the sermon differs only slightly from its many predecessors since the turn of the century.[5] Moreover, the people were accustomed to the pattern of structure used -- opening of the

---

[1]Mayhew, supra, p. 96. [2]Ibid., p. 99, lines 1-36.

[3]Supra, p. 100, lines 16-29, 46-51.

[4]Ibid., p. 99, lines 3-7.

[5]His three "reflections" were not usually announced as such by other preachers.

text, announcement of the theme and main divisions, the proof, and the applications -- inasmuch as this pattern had been in vogue since the first Puritan ministers preached in New England more than a century earlier.[1] Furthermore, Mayhew's sermon is particularly well organized for easy comprehension: the main divisions are clearly indicated by the use of transitional phrases:

> "In the second place . . . "
> "Thirdly: It is now time to mention . . ."
> "It now remains to make some reflections . . ."[2]

The transitions between the general applications and those addressed to the legislators is made as follows:

> But long custom requires that, upon this occasion, I apply myself more particularly to our honourable rulers, or, at least, custom will screne (sic) me from the imputation of presumption in doing it to you, therefore, to the legislators and political fathers of the country, I would now, with all proper humility and diffidence, direct my discourse.[3]

Thus from the point of view of the language employed as well as from that of the organization of the sermon, Mayhew's address can be said to be clear.

The Sermon and Later Developments

Mayhew's election sermon is chiefly concerned with the political crisis which resulted from French encroachments and threats. With cogent reasoning and superb persuasion he urges three courses of action: (1) cement a closer

---

[1] Cf. Supra, pp. 42-44.

[2] Mayhew, op. cit., et passim.

[3] Ibid., p. 24.

alliance with friendly Indians, (2) effect a union of the American colonies, and (3) make sufficient funds available for the war effort.

While the rhetorical analysis reveals that Mayhew was an outstanding orator, a puzzling situation remains to be resolved. Why did Mayhew think it necessary to offer solutions when these very solutions had already been acted upon by the General Court?

The evidence is that more than a month before Mayhew preached his sermon the General Court had responded as follows to Governor Shirley's request that the Court consider the matter of sending delegates to a conference:

General Court of Massachusetts to
William Shirley, April 9, 1754

> . . . Your Excellency must be sensible that an union of the several governments for the mutual defence and for the annoyance of the enemy, has long been desired by this province and proposals made for the purpose. We are still in the same sentiments, and shall use our endeavors to effect it. An heavy charge must necessarily attend the several measures proposed and we shall forthwith apply ourselves to the making provision for defraying the same.[1]

Any reasons offered for his course of action must of necessity be conjectural. The following may, however, have some bearing on the question:

1. The election sermon, being in the nature of a key-note address, would be expected to discuss matters of public urgency.

2. Though the General Court had indicated its willingness to cooperate with the Board of Trade in the matter of sending delegates to the proposed conference

---

[1]C. H. Lincoln, ed., Correspondence of William Shirley (New York: Macmillan Company, 1912), p. 49.

in Albany, final arrangements still had to be made by the House.

3. The sermon would serve to impress the General Court and the public with the seriousness of the situation so there would be no thought of delaying action in the matter. Inasmuch as only six years had elapsed since the conclusion of the previous war with France the country was liable to be reluctant to engage in another war, especially since Massachusetts was still suffering a post-war depression.

During the session of the General Court immediately following Mayhew's sermon, the representatives to the Albany Conference were commissioned and instructed to vote for union. On July 10, the Conference recommended a plan of union to the colonial legislatures. The colonies, however, rejected the plan because they feared that it would give England too strong a hand in colonial affairs.

Mayhew was right in predicting an early outbreak of war with France. He could not have known that on the previous day (May 28, 1754) Colonel George Washington had had his first military engagement with the French forces near Fort Duquesne. On July 9, General Braddock was defeated and killed at the Battle of the Wilderness. England finally declared war on France on May 15, 1756.

Massachusetts made a splendid contribution to the war effort in both men and money. Mayhew's sermon may have had little or nothing to do with this, but these developments do reveal him to have had statesmanlike foresight. This quality is further revealed in his vision of "another Great Britain rising in America."[1] To Mayhew's generation Britain

---

[1]Cf. supra, p. 100.

represented the apogee of enlightened power and though to us his prediction reveals remarkable foresight, it must have sounded fantastic to his contemporaries. It has been said that among the criteria of effective deliberative oratory is that of the speaker's "wisdom in judging the trends of the future."[1] By this standard Mayhew can be said to have been successful

By his contemporaries Mayhew was esteemed a man of wisdom and resourcefulness. A fellow clergyman wrote:

> Few surpass him, either in the quickness of his apprehension, the clearness of his perception, the readiness of his invention, the brightness of his imagination, the comprehension of his understanding, or the soundness of his judgment. And together with these gifts of God, he was endowed with a singular greatness of mind, fortitude of spirit and yet softness and benevolence of temper; all of which, being enlarged and strengthened by a good education, and the opportunity of free converse with men and books, soon qualified him to make a considerable figure in the world; as he was hereby able to speak and to write with that freedom of thought, that justness of method, that strength of argument, that facility of expression, that liveliness of fancy, that purity of diction, and that apparent concern for the good of mankind, which procured him a name, both here and abroad, which will be remembered and honored long after his body is crumbled into dust. It was this that made way for his correspondence beyond the great waters, which was daily increasing.[2]

Summary

1. Jonathan Mayhew (1720-1766) was pastor of Boston's West Church. He was noted for his liberal theological views, and for his political interests. Mayhew preached the election sermon before the Massachusetts General Court on May 29, 1754.

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 457.

[2]Charles Chauncy, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

2. War between England and France seemed imminent in May, 1754. The Paris Conference to determine the boundaries between French and British territory in America had failed and France was building forts on the Great Lakes and on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Counter-moves were being made by the colonies.

3. To remind the rulers of their duty to God and man was the purpose of Mayhew's election sermon. His text was taken from Christ's parable of the talents: "Well, done, thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful . . ." The text is "opened" by a brief explanation of its setting and meaning and by the announcement of the sermon theme and main divisions.

4. In developing his theme Mayhew shows:

a. That government is from God, but that God does not govern immediately, but mediately.
b. That the purpose of government is to ensure the happiness of the people.
c. That there are several reasons which should induce rulers to be faithful.

5. In his applications Mayhew offers three suggestions as to what should be done to meet the current political crisis:

a. Cement the alliance with friendly Indians.
b. Work towards a union of the British American colonies.
c. Release government funds liberally in preparation for the impending struggle with France.

Mayhew's discussion of the problems of the province reveals a keen insight into current political affairs and his plea for action along the lines suggested is urged with strong emotional appeals.

6. Mayhew's style which is clear, vivid, and impressive, has been well summarized in the following excerpt:

> As to method and form, his sermons have never the quality of mere essays -- placid and disinterested statements of thought: They are essentially orations, not to say fulminations, -- their sentences being framed, or rather born, for strong and passionate utterance, and swelling climaxas of argument and emotion. He has a towering and soaring sort of eloquence. He nobly wields majestic Biblical language. He compacts his pages with edged and pointed diction, concentrated sayings, epigrams.[1]

7. The sermon reveals nothing new concerning the issues of the day. Mayhew's suggestions regarding ways of meeting the impending crisis had already been determined by the General Court. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that the sermon, being in the nature of a key-note address, was intended to crystallize the thinking of the audience and of the government, and to strengthen the morale of the nation in the face of the impending war with France. There are features in the sermon, nevertheless, that show Mayhew to be an astute political observer and statesman. Moreover, his sermon, its organization, language, and persuasive techniques, bespeak the work of a skilled orator.

---

[1]Tyler, op. cit., p. 128.

CHAPTER VI

ANDREW ELIOT'S ELECTION SERMON - 1765

Biographical Sketch

Andrew Eliot was born in Boston on December 25, 1719. He received his first schooling in Boston's South Grammar School, and was then sent to Harvard College where he graduated in 1737. With the assistance of a Hopkins Scholarship, he continued his studies at Harvard and received a master s degree three years later. In 1742 he became the co-pastor of the New North Church, succeeding to the pastorate upon the death of the incumbent. This church, which Eliot served as pastor until his death on September 13, 1778, had the largest congregation of all the Boston churches.

Eliot was a patriotic American, yet enjoyed the best relations with the royal prerogative party (Tory). Two incidents illustrate his unprejudiced political attitude: during the Stamp Act crisis, when on August 26, 1765, the mob sacked the house of Thomas Hutchinson because of his pro-British sentiments, Eliot risked his own life to rescue Hutchinson's manuscript, History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, which had been tossed into the muddy street; at the opening of hostilities between Gage and the Patriots, Eliot declined to flee from Boston, choosing rather to

minister spiritually to those who were unable or unwilling to leave. Though he was "a warm friend of America, and was early and constant in his advocacy of the claims of the colonies,"[1] Eliot seldom preached political sermons, a reticence for which he was sometimes criticized by members of his congregation.

All his life Andrew Eliot was deeply interested in the affairs of Harvard College: for some time he served as secretary of the Board of Overseers, he became a member of the College Corporation, and served as a member of the committee responsible for gathering funds for the restoration of the college library which had been destroyed by fire.

Eliot's contemporaries considered him a scholar. One biographer states, "The Reverend Andrew Eliot holds a very elevated rank among American scholars and divines. Both in this country and abroad he was regarded as one of our brightest lights."[2] In 1776 the degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred on him by the University of Edinburgh. His published works include, besides the election sermon, a volume of twenty-four sermons and about a dozen other individual sermons.[3] When Eliot preached his election sermon in

---

[1] Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston: John Eliot, 1814), Vol. 1, Second Series, note, p. 237.

[2] Delano A. Goddard, "The Pulpit, Press, and Literature of the Revolution," published in Justin Winsor's Memorial History of Boston (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1881), III, 124.

[3] "Letters from Andrew Eliot to Thomas Eliot," published in Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, IV, Fourth Series, (1858), pp. 398-399.

1765 he was forty-two years of age and at the height of his powers.

A tribute was paid to the stirling quality of Eliot's character by Thomas Hollis, a prominent British friend of America: "His letters bespeak a man of great judgment, good sense, a benevolent heart, and undissembled piety."[1]

The Political Situation in 1765

At the close of the Seven Years' War (1763) Great Britain was faced with an enormous debt. Parliament decided that the American colonies should contribute towards the liquidation of the debt as well as to the expense of administering the newly acquired North American territories. In pursuance of this plan Parliament ordered that the Molasses Act of 1733, which had been consistently violated by smugglers for twenty years or more, should be strictly enforced. Since, however, the Molasses Act was about to expire, George Grenville, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed a measure known as the Suger Act. This act, by reducing the prohibitive duty on molasses by half, removed the hardship which was believed to be at the root of the smuggling evil. The colonists were dismayed, nevertheless, since the bill constituted a violation of the principle of "no taxation without representation." Moreover, the provisions for the enforcement of the act made further

---

[1]For the complete list of works by Andrew Eliot see Sprague, op. cit., I, 419.

smuggling well-nigh impossible.

A Boston town meeting, called immediately upon receipt of the official notification of the passage of the Sugar Act, passed a resolution registering the town's protest. The General Court responded by petitioning Parliament to rescind the Act, by authorizing the preparation of a pamphlet setting forth the arguments against the act[1], and by establishing a committee of correspondence responsible for notifying the other American colonies regarding the steps taken by Boston in this matter.

Relations with Great Britain became further strained when, in April, 1765, word of the passage of the Stamp Act, the first direct tax ever to be levied on an American colony, was received in Boston. At the same time Parliament also passed the Quartering Act which required that civil authorities in America provide barracks and supplies for the British forces whenever called upon to do so. Massachusetts had always objected on principle to the establishment of a standing army, and therefore deeply resented this further interference on the part of Parliament in the province's domestic affairs.

When Andrew Eliot addressed the General Court on May 29, 1765 in Boston, the people of Massachusetts were experiencing feelings of anger and frustration because of these unprecedented and provoking actions on the part of the

---

[1]The pamphlet, titled The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved, was prepared by James Otis.

British crown and parliament.

Précis of the Sermon

The Text

> And the children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do, the heads of them were two hundred; and all their brethern were at their command.[1]

The Opening of the Text

Eliot "opens" his Scriptural text by (1) describing briefly the political organization of the Hebrews during the tribal era, (2) outlining the events which led up to the episode referred to in the text, (3) explaining the meaning and implications of the text, (4) giving the theme of the sermon: "What a prospect of prosperity, where rulers are wise and good, and the people are quiet and submissive," and (5) announcing the main divisions of the sermon:

1. What the character of a good ruler is.
2. What the duties of the subjects of a state are towards their chosen leaders.

Body of the Sermon

The consideration of the first main division of the sermon commences with a definition of the phrase "good ruler." Since the purpose of good government is to promote the good of the people, good rulers are those who know what the public interest is and are capable of advancing it.

To amplify his concept of a good ruler Eliot states and develops four points: a good ruler should (1) be wise

---

[1] I Chronicles 12: 32.

in the art of governing, (2) be well acquainted with the country's constitution, (3) be a man of religion and virtue, and (4) be able to conduct affairs of state "in seasons which are critical and alarming."[1]

Having delineated the qualifications of a good ruler, Eliot next seeks to show that good rulers will not necessarily be free from mistakes and faults. Some men are born to rule and it would be a mistake not to re-elect them to office. On the other hand, there are unworthy men who endeavor to obtain office by "art and intrigue." A true patriot will not allow such men to participate in government.

Turning to the second main division of his sermon, Eliot quotes from Scripture to prove that the duty of the people towards their rulers is that of submission. He is at pains, however, to caution that submission must not be confused with "unlimited obedience," for such obedience is due only to rulers who are "ministers of God." To submit to tyranny is a sin.

The Applications

In conformity with established custom, Eliot's first application refers to the king. The people of Massachusetts are loyal and happy because the king has respect for law and virtue as well as for the privileges and

---

[1]Andrew Eliot, Election Sermon (Boston: Green and Russell, 1765), p. 30.

liberties of the colony.

The governor of the colony is commended for his knowledge of the constitution and for his evident desire to promote the happiness of his subjects.

In his address to the newly elected members of the House of Representatives Eliot urges the members to choose men as Councillors who have the qualifications of good rulers as depicted earlier in the sermon. The election of the Council Board is a valuable charter privilege which must be secured by exercising it wisely. Discussing the critical political situation, Eliot asserts that the current impasse is due to mistakes and misunderstandings in Great Britain regarding the situation in America, and that it is the duty of the Massachusetts rulers to work for the restoration of good relations. Arguments are offered in support of the claim of the colonists that they are Englishmen and therefore entitled to the privileges of Englishmen.

The final application is addressed to the general public. Eliot reminds the people of their duty to obey the rulers. The task of the legislators is difficult enough, and they should not be plagued with "factions and turbulent behavior" on the part of the citizens.

The Conclusion

Since life is brief and uncertain, and since all must give an account to God for their actions, rulers should improve their talents, and the people should maintain peace and union. All should seek to be approved of God

and to have the spiritual understanding which "only can make us meet for the inheritance of the saints in light."

Analysis of the Sermon

Andrew Eliot's election sermon is constructed upon the Perkins plan, and the analysis will therefore follow the pattern used for the Jonathan Mayhew election sermon.

The Invention

Choice of the sermon text.-The opening Biblical text uses two striking phrases which are significant in the context of the ominous political situation brought about by the passage of the Stamp Act. The expressions "understanding the times" and "to know what . . . to do" focussed attention on the urgent need for the type of leadership which the tribe of Issachar had in a time of crisis:

> And the children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Isreal ought to do, the heads of them were two hundred; and all their brethern were at their command.

The situation in Massachusetts was indeed critical. The news of the passage of the Stamp Act was "received with mingled alarm and indignation."[1] Samuel Adams wrote concerning the reaction of the people:

> Nothing could have given greater disgust than the Stamp Act. The people are in consternation from one end of the continent to the other. Whatever the favorers of the act on your side of the water may apprehend, it certainly is esteemed a grievance in the

---

[1]William V. Wells, The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1865), I, 60.

> opinions of many thousands of as loyal and quiet subjects as any under the King's government.[1]

With this mood predominating in the province, Eliot's opening text gave promise of a discussion at once vital, timely, and challenging.

The opening of the text.-Eliot's first step in opening his text is to relate its historical setting. After the death of King Saul his kingdom was divided between his son Ishbosheth and David, but upon the death of Ishbosheth the tribes of Israel decided to reunite and to make David the sole ruler. The tribe of Issachar was represented at the convocation which had been called to proclaim David king.

Next the speaker explains and amplifies the text as follows:

> It is an excellent character that is given of the heads of Issachar, and it was a singular favor to this tribe, that they had such a number who were able to guide them at this critical season.--You are told the good effects of their wisdom and prudence, there was an entire union between them and the rest of the community. They who were in government were possessed of talents which qualified them for their trust, and their brethren were so satisfied of their prudence and integrity, that they reposed an entire confidence in them, and submitted to their authority without murmuring or opposition.[2]

The theme of the sermon.-The amplified restatement of the sermon text is condensed into one sentence to constitute the theme of the sermon:

> You have here the model of a happy state: What a prospect of peace and lasting prosperity, where

---

[1]Quoted from a letter written by Samuel Adams on November 13, 1765, Cf., Wells, op. cit., I, 99-100.

[2]Eliot, op. cit., p. 7.

rulers are wise and good, and the people are quiet and submissive![1]

The main divisions of the sermon.-Though deduced from the text, the main heads of the sermon are not divisions of the text but are topics based on the theme. Two main divisions are announced:

1. To consider the character of a good ruler as it is drawn in the text.
2. To point out the duty of subjects to their rulers.

The Arrangement: Supporting the Theme

The first main division.-An outline of Eliot's development of his first main division follows:

I. The character of a good ruler (Since the purpose of good government is to ensure the public good, a good ruler will know what the public interest is and be capable of advancing it).
   A. The following qualities are necessary in rulers:
      1. Rulers should have a good degree of wisdom and knowledge.
         a. To make wholesome laws which restrain vice without infringing upon liberties.
         b. To know how to apply and execute laws.
         c. To know how to impose taxes with prudence and caution.
         d. To superintend the business interests of the community.
         e. To counteract the machinations of crafty and ambitious faultfinders of government.
         f. To keep a watchful eye on bordering states.
         g. To consult the good of future generations in present actions.
      2. Rulers "should have a particular acquaintance with the constitution of the country they are called to govern." (Reason dictates there should be government, government is founded on compact, and the power of rulers is defined by a constitution.)
         a. To understand their powers.
         b. To understand the privileges of the governed.
      3. Good rulers will be men of religion and virtue. These qualities:

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., p. 8.

a. Purify from corrupt principles.
b. Enlarge the mind.
c. Help distinguish between right and wrong.

4. Good rulers have "prudence to conduct affairs in seasons that are critical and alarming."
   a. Causes of crises include: foreign enemies, internal tumults, mistakes of well-wishers, intrigues of designing men, vice and folly, wickedness of others.
   b. The situation of a state is never hopeless. (Illustration from Roman history.)
   c. Rulers must understand the times, and know how to deal with the situation.

B. Remarks concerning the choice of rulers.
   1. Some persons are born to be rulers, and it would be a mistake not to elect such though they may not be perfect in other respects.
   2. Some good men are diffident about offering themselves as rulers.
   3. In a hereditary form of government the people have little choice, though they can overthrow tyrants, as in England in 1688.
   4. It would be foolish to choose the weak or the wicked to office.

The discussion of the first main division opens with a definition of the concept of a "good ruler." A good ruler is one who rules in terms of the principles of good government. Good government is not a display of pomp and ceremony nor an opportunity for rulers to satisfy their pride and avarice. On the contrary, "the public good is the great, the only end of magistracy." It follows, therefore, that good rulers are those "who know what the public interest is, and are capable of advancing it."[1]

Having defined a good ruler, the speaker proceeds to show that such a ruler will have four major qualities:

1. He will have knowledge and wisdom regarding the process of government.
2. He will be acquainted with the constitution of his country.

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., p. 8.

3. He will be a man of religion and virtue.
4. He will have the ability to conduct affairs of state in critical times.

Clearly these sub-divisions derive from the speaker's thinking on the government-by-contract concept, from his own function as a minister of the gospel, and from the exigencies of the political situation. No arguments are employed to establish these four assertions. They are basic principles. First a fundamental principle is enunciated and upon it a complete argument is built by adding axiom to axiom.

Though always careful to observe the homiletical rule that the first part of the body of a sermon should discuss the sermon theme without emotion, Eliot did not hesitate to offer suggestions or warnings regarding critical political situations when the ideas developed in the sermon impinged on such situations. For example when speaking of the need of knowledge regarding tax policies Eliot obviously alludes to the Stamp Act when he adds:

> Where government subsists, there must necessarily be burthens laid upon the people to defray the charge of it. There is nothing that effects men more than when you touch their interests; people in general find it hard to procure the conveniences of life· nothing will sooner alienate their minds from government, than when rulers needlessly deprive them of that which they have dearly earned, and want only to dissipate the public treasures.[1]

Another example occurs in connection with the discussion of the fundamental nature of the constitution and the responsibility of rulers to guard the constitutional rights of the citizens:

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

> In free governments people are apt to feel much quicker. To touch their liberties is to touch the apple of their eye; every attempt alarms them, makes them jealous of further designs, and throws them into the arms of factious demagogues, who hate government, and are ever watching for opportunities to embarrass public measures, and to introduce anarchy and confusion.
>
> Where so much depends, and the danger of acting wrong is likely to have such consequences to the community, and perhaps to themselves; rulers ought to know very well what it is to act right, where power ends and liberty begins.[1]

Here Eliot is reflecting the declaration of the Boston Town Meeting, used in a directive to the Representatives to the General Court a year previously, that taxation "annihilates our rights to govern and tax ourselves;"[2] and an assertion by James Otis in his pamphlet published at about the same time, that there was no liberty where property was taken away without the consent of the owners.[3]

The following statement may be a response to an assertion in a newspaper article which had been widely circulated at that time, that "when an act of parliament is once passed, it becomes a part of the constitution."[4]

> I will not say that they who are in government may not propose an alteration in the constitution, when they see manifest inconveniences; every member of the state may do this· and there may be extraordinary cases wherein it may be necessary to deviate from common rules; in such cases the safety of the people is to be preferred to any other consideration. But no wise ruler would desire a general power of dispensing with the laws; nor is it possible to proceed with too much caution in making any great alteration in the constitution of a state; especially when it has been long established, and the wisdom of ages has been employed to confirm it. Where there seems to be a defect the remedy may often prove

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., pp. 21-22. [2]Wells, op. cit., p. 46.

[3]Otis, op. cit., p. 37. [4]Wells, ibid., p. 59.

> worse than the disease; and by attempting to guard against the inconvenience, we may open the way to a great many which we do not now forsee. When a constitution is essentially bad, rulers & (sic) everyone else ought to run every risk to make it better. But where the constitution is tolerably good, it is generally the wisdom of those in power, to maintain a sacred regard to it themselves, and to endeavour that it may not be violated by others. This is their safety and very often the safety of those they govern. When a humour of changing once begins no mortal can tell where it will end.[1]

The discussion of the fourth characteristic of good rulers lists "mistakes of well-wishers" as some of the causes of political crises. This may be a restatement of Otis's assertion concerning the Sugar Act:

> With regard to parliament, as infallibility belongs not to mortals, 'tis possible that they may have been misinformed and deceived. . . . And 'tis to be presumed, the wisdom and justice of that august assembly, always will afford us relief by repealing such acts, as through mistakes, or other human infirmaties, have been suffered to pass if they can be conceived that their proceedings are not constitutional, or not for the common good.[2]

The "well-wishers" are not identified. They were probably colonists visiting England.

The second main division.-The duty of subjects to their rulers is discussed in this part of the sermon.

A. The duties of rulers and subjects are mutual.
   1. Rulers ought to love their subjects and seek their welfare.
   2. Subjects ought to be submissive and obedient to their rulers.
      a. The Bible teaches this - Matthew 22: 21; Romans 13: 1, 2, 4; I Peter 2: 13, 14.
      b. These texts do not teach passive obedience and non-resistance. Obedience is due only to rulers who are "ministers of God."

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., p. 21-22.

[2]Otis, op. cit., pp. 39-40.

3. Where submission ends and resistance should begin.
   a. Resistance is unlawful:
      (1) When the faults of rulers are due merely to human weakness.
      (2) When motivated by jealousies, resentments, or private interests.
      (3) When rulers are good and wise.
   b. Resistance is lawful when rulers are tyrants. To fail to resist is then an offense.

The authority for an attitude of submissiveness and obedience towards rulers on the part of the people is found in the Bible. Since, however, some of these Biblical references were being used by the advocates of passive obedience and non-resistance, Eliot finds it necessary to refute the argument. His reasoning may be reduced to a syllogism:

1. Obedience is due to rulers who are "ministers of God."
2. God instituted government to promote public happiness.
3. Rulers who subvert public happiness by flouting the constitution and enslaving the people, are not ministers of God and need not be obeyed.

This syllogistic form of reasoning is based upon the accepted doctrine of government by compact.

The statement concerning circumstances under which it would be unjust (3a) to resist rulers is another reference to types of men who should be elected to office. Eliot's return to the matter indicates the seriousness with which he viewed a campaign being waged to have certain leaders dropped from the Council.[1]

The advice offered concerning the attitude to be taken towards tyrants is a corollary of the doctrine of

---

[1]Cf. infra., pp. 132-133.

government by compact, and may have been given as a warning of the potential hazards should Parliament enforce the Stamp Act. Eliot said:

> But where men are grossly of a contrary character and pervert their power to tyrannical purposes; submission, if it can be avoided, is so far from being a duty, that it is a crime. It is an offence against the state, of which we are members, and whose happiness we ought to prefer to our own chief joy.[1]

Similar statements had been made by John Wise in 1715,[2] Jonathan Mayhew in 1750,[3] and James Otis in 1764,[4] but never had this pronouncement been as pertinent and necessary as when uttered by Eliot.

With the last-quoted statement Eliot closes the body of his sermon, and without a transitional statement of any kind he moves into the applications.

Arrangement: The Applications

First application.-Referring to the king, Eliot asserts that the province is happy in a sovereign who:

1. Reigns over a free people.
2. Will always make the law of the land the rule of his administration.
3. Has a constitution which "scarsely admits of tyranny."
4. Is a hereditary ruler "as that right is now understood."
5. Is virtuous and therefore assured of the love and obedience of his subjects.

---

[1]Eliot, op.cit., p. 48.

[2]John Wise, The Churches' Quarrel Espoused (Boston, 1715), p. 209.

[3]Jonathan Mayhew, A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers (Boston: D. Fowle and D. Gookin, 1750), p. 17.

[4]James Otis, op. cit., p. 9.

No direct emotional appeal is made here, but by lauding the king and his constitution Eliot appears to be making an effort to revive the colony's waning confidence in royalty and parliament.

Second application.-Governor Francis Bernard is commended because:

1. He understands the civil constitution of Massachusetts.
2. He evidently sincerely aims "at the happiness of the people he is appointed to govern."

The fact that Governor Bernard was wavering in his sympathy between Great Britain's tax policy and the rights of the colonies[1] seems to be hinted at in Eliot's use of the qualifying phrase "we persuade ourselves":

> Especially we esteem it a privilege, while we have a Gentleman at our head, who so well understands our civil constitution, and who, we persuade ourselves, sincerely aims at the happiness of the people he is appointed to govern.[2]

Third application.-Addressing the General Assembly Eliot expresses:

1. Thankfulness for liberties enjoyed by the province.
2. His pleasure at seeing so many members returned to the House by their constituencies.
3. Thoughts on the importance of the election which is about to take place. Those elected should be:
   a. Men of wisdom and integrity.
   b. Men of prudence in times of crisis.
4. Conclusions regarding the current crisis:
   a. England's action must be ascribed to misrepresentations.
   b. It is the responsibility of the rulers to rectify this matter.
   c. The province is entitled to the rights of Englishmen.
      (1) The pioneers believed this was their right

---

[1]Albert Bushnell Hart, ed., Commonwealth History of Massachusetts (New York: The States History Company, 1928), II, 146-150.

[2]Eliot, op. cit., p. 49.

(2) This was tacitly recognized in the first charter.

d. The province does not desire independence from Great Britain.

e. It is to be hoped that king and parliament will heed the petitions and confirm the liberties of the province.

5. His conviction regarding other matters that require the attention of the legislators:

a. The excessive indulgence in luxuries in the province.

b. The sale of liquor and the prevalence of intemperance.

In this application Eliot comes to grips with the outstanding problem of the day -- the Stamp Act crisis.

> Such a critical season, if I mistake not, is the present and I cannot be easily mistaken, when all orders of men are so generally alarmed, in this and the other colonies, and apprehend their most valuable privileges in danger.[1]

Britain's action must not be ascribed to malice aforethought.

> I am far from impeaching the justice of the British Parliament. If any acts have been pass'd that seem hard on the colonies, we ought to suppose, that they are not owing to any design formed against them. . . .[2]

A mistake has been made and it is the duty of the rulers to point out that mistake. Two reasons are offered for the claim that the American colonists are in fact Englishmen, and therefore entitled to their rights:

1. The early settlers left England fully believing that though living in a distant continent, they continued to be subjects of the Englsih crown.
2. The first charter granted to Massachusetts Bay by Charles I confirmed the opinion of the first settlers.

Eliot offers no evidence in support of the first assertion. The second is supported by a statement made by Bishop Burnet in England at the time when the first charter of Massa-

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., p. 54.

[2]Ibid., p. 20.

chusetts was revoked.

After stating that the province highly values its connection with Britain and that "there is perhaps not a man to be found among us, who would wish to be independent on our mother country,"[1] the speaker makes an emotional appeal for action:

> Our rulers are part of ourselves, they look on the whole community as their brethren, they have one common interest with us. We doubt not they feel for their people in this difficult day, and will exert all their abilities in the present exigency. Time has been when even darker clouds hung over the British colonies than those which now threaten us; and the God of heaven has appeared and dissipated them. His arm is not shortened that he cannot save, his ear is not heavy that he cannot hear. The friends of Zion will not cease to pray, that our rulers may be lead in a safe and plain path; and we trust they will themselves implore the direction and assistance of him who "giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding." Happy will it be for you, our honored fathers, if you are the instrument of prolonging our tranquility. It will be an honor put upon you by the God of heaven: It will render you accepted of the multitude of your brethren: You will be esteemed and bless'd while you live; and your names will be had in grateful remembrance long after you have enter'd the world of spirits.[2]

The emotions appealed to are loyalty (lines 1-5) and confidence in deity (lines 5-15). Motives appealed to are the desire for happiness (lines 15-17) and the desire for honor and good reputation (lines 18-22). While these appeals are directed to powerful emotions and motives, their force is somewhat blunted by the plainness of the language.

Fourth application.-In addressing the general public, Eliot reasons that since obedience to rulers is a religious

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., p. 54. [2]Ibid., pp. 54-55.

injunction, unreasonable opposition to the rulers is displeasing to God. Moreover mob activity adds to the difficulties of the rulers.

> The business of rulers is difficult enough in itself, we ought not to increase their difficulties by factious turbulent behavior. No good ruler will be averse to have his public conduct examined, or find fault with decent remonstrances when they act contrary to the sense of the community.[1]

Stressing the importance of supporting rulers despite their human frailties, the speaker calls upon the people to love their rulers for the sake of their works:

> But it is hard, when they (the rulers) have done their best to be censured and reviled and to have government made uneasy by the jealousies and intrigues of discontented men, who think nothing right but what they do themselves; and delight to raise suspicions of designs which are the product of their own vain imaginations. We should remember that rulers are men of like passions, and are in a state of peculiar temptation. We ought not to magnify their faults, but to bear with their infirmities and overlook their mistakes, when we have reason to think they do not proceed from a bad heart. When God has honored them by making them instruments of good, we ought not only to reverence, but to esteem them and love them for their works sake.[2]

It is possible that Eliot was here thinking of Samuel Adam's activities against Thomas Hutchinson. Adams had been selected by the Town Meeting of early 1764 to draft the customary instructions to the Representatives in the General Court, and he used the opportunity to strike at Hutchinson.

> The four men (Boston Representatives) were instructed to oppose the Stamp Act in every way they could. And--here lay the sting for Hutchinson -- they were urged to pass a law unseating any member of House or Council who accepted a post from the crown, also to refuse a

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., p. 58. [2]Ibid., p. 59.

> salary to any judge who held another post beside his judgeship. Considering that Hutchinson, a member of the Council, was himself both Lieutenant Governor and Chief Justice by crown appointment, considering also that his brothers and cousins occupied like positions, Samuel Adams's Instructions were the insult direct. They might as well have named Hutchinson outright and have been done with it.[1]

It appears that Eliot was trying to counteract Adams's campaign against Hutchinson by urging that it was in the interest of good government to elect good men despite any human frailties they may have:

> But though you may not expect a perfect character, yet the great author of nature . . . "has thought fit to mingle from time to time among the societies of men, a few of those on whom he is graciously pleased to bestow a larger portion of understanding and integrity, than is given in ordinary course of his providence to the sons of men. There are superior spirits, men who are born to guide, to instruct, and to preserve;" their abilities and their virtues denote that they were formed for the public good, and it would be a fault not to improve those talents, with which the great Lord of all has entrusted them. They ought not to let slip any opportunity that presents to serve their country, or to do good to mankind.[2]

Here again Eliot calls upon the people of Massachusetts to support their rulers loyally, reflecting his concern regarding the re-election of certain leaders. He appeals to the motives of fair play and religious duty. The language used in these appeals is, however, relatively objective and does little to reinforce the emotional force of the argument.

Conclusion of the Sermon

To close the sermon Eliot makes a brief religious

---

[1]Catherine Drinker Bowen, John Adams and the American Revolution (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1950), p. 260.

[2]Eliot, op. cit., p. 36.

appeal. His hearers are exhorted to remember that finally all have to render an account to God, and that this prospect should lead rulers to improve their talents, and subjects to promote peace and unity.

Language of the Sermon

Clarity.-During the early days of the Revolution, while voluntarily confined to Boston, Andrew Eliot wrote to his clergyman son John:

> Affect not a pompous and florid style, but seek a plain, easy manner of writing (sermons) which will be level to the capacity of all your hearers. This may be without sinking into incorrectness, or cloathing your sentiments in a low, slovenly dress.[1]

That Eliot followed these precepts himself is attested to by the Reverend Peter Thacher in the course of his sermon at Eliot's funeral:

> His sermons were universally admired; he possessed a most happy talent of arranging his thoughts and expressing them in a plain, elegant, nervous manner: when a man heard him preach, he could always think that this was the very way in which he would have wished to express himself, had he been called to speak on the same subject: he discovered no design to work upon the passions; his discourses were plain, pathetic and animated, without those strained descriptions and intemperate expressions which nauseate the serious mind; and yet such was his manner as that many have observed, no man could sooner move their affections; You never knew him have a careless, inattentive auditory; every eye would be fixed upon him and every ear would be open to imbibe the ingenuous and instructive truths which distilled from his lips "like rain from the mown grass, as showers that water the earth." This might be owing in a degree, perhaps, to the dignity, the gracefulness, and unaffected fervor of his delivery;

---

[1]Andrew Eliot, "A letter to John Eliot, August 1, 1775," published in Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, (1878), p. 281.

> that it was wholly so is evident from the effect of perusing the many excellent discourses, which, thanks be to God, he hath left published behind him; by which, being dead, we may yet, hear him speak.[1]

Characteristics of Eliot's style and delivery are delineated by another biographer:

> In the pulpit he was a favorite. His discourses were plain and practical, seldom on controversial points. They were delivered without action, but with a pathos and solemnity that commanded attention. He always used notes. His tone was bold and positive, as though he was not to be contradicted; nor indeed did he hear contradiction tamely out of the pulpit.[2]

Approximately eight percent of Eliot's vocabulary is composed of words of three or more syllables. This compares favorably with Mayhew's twelve percent, though it is still double that of the Sermon on the Mount. The following is a list of some of the less familiar words used by Eliot.

intimation	parasite	foible
insinuation	interposition	extricate
sedately	infatuate	penetrate
infringe	exigency	machination
precedent	prevaricate	transitory
plaudit	temerity	intricate
aggrandize	impeach	indefeasible
obligatory	deviate	prodigies
solicitious	precipitate	obloquy

The sermon bears out Thacher's statement that Eliot "possessed a most happy talent of arranging his thoughts and expressing them in a plain, elegant and nervous way." Sentences range in length from five to forty words each, with an average of twenty-two. Most of the longer sentences are of the loose type, however, and are therefore easily comprehended.

---

[1]Peter Thacher, Funeral Sermon for Andrew Eliot (Boston, 1778), p. 30.

[2]Sprague, op. cit., I, 417-421.

An example follows:

> We highly value our connection with Great-Britain, there is perhaps not a man to be found among us, who would wish to be independent of our mother country, we would regret the most distant thought of such an event; . . .

The general organization of the sermon follows the William Perkins pattern. The use of transitional phrases facilitate easy recognition of the various parts as, for instance, when Eliot discusses the kinds of knowledge necessary in a ruler:

> "The first thing that presents itself . . ."
> "Besides this, secondly, it is necessary . . ."
> "Thirdly, Rulers cannot come up . . ."
> "Fourthly, another accomplishment . . ."

The transitions are poor in the applications, however. The fourth application, for example, opens with a sentence in which the only clue as to which body of the legislature is being addressed is the word "us":

> While our fathers (rulers) are consulting the public good, and enquiring what this people ought to do, it becomes <u>us</u> to submit to their authority. . . .[1]

Eliot stated the theme of his sermon clearly, and throughout the address the theme remains the unifying element. The main divisions of the body of the sermon are announced as such. In the case of the first division, however, the sub-divisions are also given in advance, doubtless because it is an extended discussion of a complicated subject. Three or four internal summaries further facilitate an easy comprehension of the ideas presented.

To summarize the findings with respect to clarity,

---

[1]Eliot, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 58.

it seems fair to say that Eliot's election sermon is well organized, the theme is kept clearly in mind throughout, sentence structure is generally simple, aptly expressing the ideas. The vocabulary is large and accurate, though the frequent use of unusual and difficult words probably tended to hamper easy comprehension in some parts.

Forcefulness.-Abstract expressions tend to militate against forcefulness in language and Eliot tends to prefer abstract to concrete expressions. Though the nouns and adjectives are well chosen for accuracy, they are not bold, vital, or moving. Note the following examples:

"wantonly dissipate the public treasures."
". . . to counterwork the machinations of . . . "
". . . those who claim divine indefeasible right . . ."
". . . nice metaphysical distinctions . . ."
". . . hearken to the insinuations of flattery . . ."
". . . who cannot be denominated insincere."
"for the sake of pomp and appearance."
". . . the present imperfect state of human nature."
". . . to gratify their base and sordid passions."
"disinterested benevolence."
"stations of dignity."
"perverse and turbulent behavior."

Verbs are generally active and explicit, though not vivid:

"if men could subsist as well . . ."
"he may not reasonably infringe the liberties . . ."
"destroy the peace . . ."
". . . wrested from us."
"wantonly dissipate."
"to be censured and reviled."
"affront the virtues."

Considerable variety in the length of sentences is apparent but not much in the structure of the sentences. Occasionally parallel structure occurs, of which the following sentence is the most striking example:

> The religion of Jesus Christ enlarges the mind; it divests us, so far as it prevails, of every criminal prejudice; it makes us willing to deny ourselves, to sacrifice our worldly ease, our temporary interests, to the honor of God and the good of men; it fortifies against temptation, it curbs our passions, it regulates our desires, it produces noble and generous sentiments, it teaches us to look not every one on his own things, but on the things of others . . .[1]

Another structural device used is the periodic sentence, but its employment is rare.

Impressiveness.-In harmony with the advice which he gave his son, Eliot makes little or no effort to use impressive language. Besides a few Biblical metaphors, figures of speech rarely occur. The most striking metaphors are:

> "to touch their liberty is to touch the apple of their eye."
> "the remedy may often prove worse than the disease."
> "a doctrine so big with absurdity that one could . . ."
> "when even darker clouds hung over the British colonies."

Twice points are amplified by the use of anecdotes from Roman history. A few illustrations are employed: when showing that government is a natural phenomenon Eliot cites as proof of the fact that even the most primitive barbarians have some form of government; the assertion that critical times require rulers with special qualifications is supported with an example: "A man may be a good pilot in a moderate gale, who can do nothing in a storm."

Eliot's use of devices which lend impressiveness to style is too rare to warrant characterizing the style as impressive. In matters of style Andrew Eliot is a true Puritan in that clarity was his primary objective. His pure

---

[1]Eliot, op. cit., p. 37.

language and ease of expression would justify the use of the descriptive adjectives "elegant" and "clear" to characterize the style a little more accurately.[1]

The Sermon and Later Developments

Andrew Eliot made three suggestions regarding the tense political situation arising out of the Stamp Act. (1) Men who are talented to rule, and who have shown ability to guide state affairs in times of crisis, should be elected to the Council. The speaker was probably seeking to influence the General Assembly to re-elect Thomas Hutchinson to the Council, since at that time Samuel Adams was conducting a campaign against Hutchinson's re-election. If this supposition is correct Eliot's appeal was not in vain, for Hutchinson was re-elected at that time despite the efforts of Samuel Adams to prevent it. Adams had his way, however, the following year.

(2) Eliot appears to be following James Otis in maintaining that Parliament had passed the Stamp Act because it had been misinformed and mistaken about the situation in the colonies. Being convinced of the goodwill of Parliament towards the colonies, Eliot advocated further reasoning with the mother country as a sure means of having the mistaken opinion rectified. Adams, on the contrary, took the position that nothing was to be gained by reasoning with London.

---

[1]Elegance in style is defined by Witherspoon (Lectures in Moral Philosophy and Eloquence) as language with good taste and ease of expression.

Later evidence indicates that Parliament was paying little or no attention to the colonial petitions and representations and the repeal of the Stamp Act finally came, not because of sweet reason, but because of economic pressure on the part of the colonial merchants. Here, then, Eliot did not read political trends correctly.

(3) When Eliot warned the public against "factious turbulent behavior" did he foresee the dangerous mob activity which was to develop three months later? The fact that he seems to have been convinced that England would listen to reason and rescind the "unjust" act, precludes the conclusion that Eliot anticipated violent mob action. It seems, therefore, that he uttered his warning because minor occurrences of mob activity had been taking place over a considerable period. It is fair to conclude that in this respect, too, Eliot was mistaken about the feelings of the people. Perhaps he had linked himself too closely to James Otis, whose influence and political acumen were being called in question at this time. Otis had approved of Taxation by Parliament on condition that the colonies were represented in the House of Commons.[1]

Summary

1. Andrew Eliot (1719-1778) received the M. A. degree from Harvard College and was honored by the University of Edinburgh with the degree of Doctor of Divinity. He served

---

[1]Cf. John C. Miller, Origins of the American Revolution (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1943), pp. 114-115.

as Pastor of the New North Church of Boston for thirty-six years. Eliot was chosen by the House of Representatives to preach the election sermon on May 29, 1765.

2. When the Seven Years' War ended in 1763, Parliament devised plans for taxing the colonies in order to liquidate the huge war debt. The Stamp Act was passed early in 1765 despite petitions and remonstrances by the colonies. News of the passage of the act reached Boston five days before Eliot preached his election sermon; consequently his audience was in a mood of frustration and despair, if not anger.

3. Choosing a text well suited to the occasion and the audience, Eliot spoke on the subject of prosperity in a state as the result of wise and good rulership and of quietness and submission on the part of the people.

The first of the two main divisions of the sermon shows that the qualifications of good rulers are (a) Wisdom and knowledge regarding government, (b) acquaintance with the constitution, (c) religion and virtue in their lives, and (d) ability to conduct affairs of state in critical times.

The second part of the sermon emphasises the importance of obedience and submission on the part of the subjects when the rulers are "ministers of God."

The four applications of the sermon consist of remarks addressed to the various legislative bodies of the General Court. Several suggestions are made regarding the current political crisis. (a) Assuming that England's new

tax policy was undertaken as a result of misinformation regarding the situation in the colonies, the rulers have the responsibility of rectifying matters. (b) The general public is warned against turbulent behavior, as this only aggravates the difficult task of rulers. (c) Men of proven ability to rule in critical times should be appointed to the Council. In urging the third idea the speaker probably has in mind the efforts which were being made to discredit Thomas Hutchinson in order to prevent his re-election to the Council.

The exhortation to rulers to restore amicable relations with Great Britain is fortified by appeals to the motives of loyalty, confidence in God, desire for happiness, and for honor. The language of these appeals is quite unemotional, however.

4. An analysis of the style of the sermon shows it to be clear and elegant, but relatively unadorned. The vocabulary tends to be difficult for the average reader, though accurate, and appropriate.

5. No new ideas are presented in the sermon. Internal evidence seems to indicate that Eliot based some of his ideas upon James Otis's The Rights of the British Colonies. It would appear that Eliot may have persuaded the audience to re-elect Thomas Hutchinson to the Council, but that he was somewhat mistaken about popular political feelings in the province as well as of the attitude of Parliament toward the American colonies in the matter of taxation.

CHAPTER VII

SAMUEL COOKE'S ELECTION SERMON - 1770

Biographical Sketch

Samuel Cooke was born in Hadley, Massachusetts, on January 10, 1709. His early education was interrupted because of domestic difficulties, but at the age of twenty Samuel returned to grammar school, and was ready to enter Harvard College two years later. He earned a Hopkins prize for excellence in his studies at Harvard, and upon graduation in 1735 was granted a Hopkins fellowship for graduate study. While pursuing his theological studies Cooke was called upon to preach in nearby churches, several of which offered him pastorates. He chose, however, to become the pastor of a new church which was about to be organized in Metonomy (now Arlington), and was ordained on September 17, 1739.

Cooke married three times. His first wife passed away less than a year after marriage. The second bore him eleven children during twenty years. The third was the widowed daughter of John Hancock of Revolutionary fame. "One suspects that the outbreak of emotionalism in Parson Cooke's preaching reflects these personal tragedies."[1]

---

[1]Clifford K. Shipton, Sibley's Harvard Graduates (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1956), IX, 503.

As a preacher Samuel Cooke was popular. Among important sermons he was asked to preach are the Artillery Election sermon in 1753, the Dudleian Lecture at Harvard in 1767, the General Court election sermon in 1770, and the sermon to the Ministers' Convention in 1776.

Politically Cooke was an ardent Whig. During the siege of Boston at the opening of the Revolution his parsonage was used as a hospital, and he himself labored among the sick and wounded. In the spring of that year he was made Chaplain of the General Court which was then meeting in Watertown. On the second anniversary of the Battle of Lexington Cooke preached a commemoration sermon which is said to have "glowed with hatred for the foe."[1]

Samuel Cooke's passing on January 4, 1783, was widely lamented. The following eulogy was published in a Salem newspaper:

> Of this worthy man it truly may be said -- he was a burning and a shining light, of superior powers of mind, and distinguished literary accomplishments; diligent in study, catholic in principle, apt to teach; fervent and devout in prayer; judicious and instructive in preaching; wise in counsel; prudent and faithful in discipline; tender and skilful in comforting; grave in deportment; agreeable and edifying in conversation, meek toward all men; constant and candid in friendship; endearing in every relation; a pattern of patience and submission under multiplied trials and bereavements in his family; as well as his own long sickness.[2]

---

[1]Sibley's, op. cit., p. 506.

[2]Salem Gazette, June 26, 1783.

The Political Situation in 1770

The Boston Massacre of March 5, 1770, was the climax of a series of events that had their origin in the passing of the Townshend Acts by the British parliament on June 29, 1767. Charles Townshend, Chancellor of the Exchequer, drafted the acts to meet the objection of the colonies that the imposition of an "internal" tax was a violation of colonial rights. The Townshend Acts proposed to levy import duties on glass, lead, paint, and tea; ensured the better collection of these duties by reaffirming the power of the courts to issue writs of assistance; made provision for the establishment of new vice-admiralty courts; and authorized the appointment of commissioners of customs who were directly responsible to the British Treasury. The preamble stated that the funds collected in terms of the bill should be used for "defraying the charge of the administration of justice, and the support of the civil government" in the colonies.[1] The acts became effective on March 20, 1767.

A Boston town meeting held on October 28, 1767, strongly disapproving of the act, voted to revive the non-importation agreements which had worked so effectively against the Stamp Act. The General Court took action against the Townshend Acts on February 11, 1768, by authorizing the dispatch of a circular letter to the American colonies for

---

[1]Henry Steele Commager, ed., Documents of American History (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949), p. 63.

the purpose of securing united action. The letter denounced the acts as a violation of the principle of "no taxation without representation." It discussed the province's objections to all taxation, whether external or internal, on the grounds that the colonies neither were, nor could be represented in the British parliament. The right of the crown to pay the salaries of governors and judges of the colonies was also called in question.

Upon receipt of a copy of the Circular Letter Lord Hillsborough, the British Secretary of State for the colonies, instructed Governor Bernard of Massachusetts to demand the annulment of the act which authorized the letter. The General Court refused to comply by ninty-two to seventeen votes, whereupon Bernard dissolved the House.

The customs commissioners in Boston were objects of intense hatred. When on June 10, 1768, they ordered the seizure of John Hancock's ship "Liberty" for landing a cargo of Madeira wine without paying duty, the people demonstrated so determinedly against the customs officers that they and the commissioners fled for safety to Fort William. The commissioners then appealed to London for troop protection in the performance of their duties and in due course it became known that several British regiments had been dispatched to Boston. The patriot leaders of the town immediately requested the governor to convene the General Court in emergency session. The request not being granted, the patriots called a convention of specially appointed representatives

from all the towns of Massachusetts. The convention met September 22-28 and formally protested against the stationing of troops in Boston. The regiments landed, nevertheless, and the townspeople offered no opposition.

The first action taken by the Assembly at the opening of the 1769 session was a request for the removal of the troops. The action was vetoed by the governor. The House then requested that the cannons which were trained on the House be removed. Rather than grant this request the governor transferred the General Court to Cambridge. This arbitrary act led the exasperated General Assembly to petition the king for the removal of Bernard as governor of Massachusetts. The petition was granted and there was general rejoicing when Francis Bernard sailed from Boston on August 1, 1769. Thomas Hutchinson was then named Acting Governor.

Meanwhile tension was growing between the people of Boston on the one hand and the Customs Commissioners and British soldiers on the other. The strained relations reached a climax with the Boston Massacre on the night of March 5, 1770. The following morning Samuel Adams, supported by a large number of prominent citizens, presented Hutchinson with a demand for the immediate removal of the troops from the town. After some hesitation the Acting Governor reluctantly gave an order to that effect.

By the time Lord North became head of the British government in 1770 a movement to repeal the Townshend Acts had gained considerable impetus because of the paralyzing

effect the colonial non-importation movement was having on British trade. North therefore presented a bill to repeal the Acts. The Repeal Bill, voted on April 12, 1770, retained, however, the tax on tea for the purpose of demonstrating Parliament's authority to levy taxes on the colonies. Despite the tax on tea the American colonies, with the exception of Massachusetts, quickly abondoned the non-importation plan. Massachusetts followed suit six months later.

On May 31, 1770, the Massachusetts General Court was convened in Cambridge by order of Thomas Hutchinson. The members deeply resented his disregard of their request that the General Court be returned to the Town House in Boston. Moreover, the bitterness generated by the Boston Massacre was still unassuaged. Such was the prevailing mood when Samuel Cooke rose to address the House in one of the Cambridge churches.

Précis of the Sermon

The Text

> He that ruleth over Men, must be just, ruling in the fear of God.
> And he shall be as the light of the morning when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds: as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.[1]

The opening of the text

The words of the text constitute the dying message of a great ruler who had ruled in the fear of God, and who had served his generation according to the divine plan. It

---

[1] II Samuel 23: 3-4.

may be inferred from this text that God approves of the establishment of government. The Bible also speaks concerning the purposes of government, the character of rulers, and the duty of subjects.

The Body of the Sermon

After succinctly tracing the origin, purpose, and form of government in terms of the natural law-compact doctrine of government, Cooke asserts that of all the existing forms of government Great Britain's is the most effective. Cooke indicates that in the last analysis, however, the advantages of civil government are dependent upon the conduct and character of the rulers.

The discussion concerning rulers is opened by defining the terms "ruler" and "justice," and the phrase "in the fear of God." Just rulers will:

1. Remember that they rule over men.
2. Make laws which are plain and easily understood.
3. Fill civil offices with men of merit and integrity.
4. Carefully guard the constitution.
5. Repeal such acts on the statute books as are found to be contrary to natural rights.
6. Be willing to have their conduct critically examined.

Rulers, like the people, are under obligation to obey divine law, for in the law of God is the basis of morality and wisdom.

The effects of a "just administration of government" are outlined, says Cooke, in the second verse of his opening text. Just rulers will enjoy the approbation and applause of the people. Quietness and peace will reign in the land.

The Applications

With an expression of thankfulness to God for the return of another election, "tho' not according to the general desire, in the city of our solemnities,"[1] Cooke opens his applications by discussing the election per se. The New England colonists have always considered themselves Englishmen, and though their rights as such were temporarily withdrawn during the Andros regime, most of these rights had been restored by the new charter. Trusting in the "paternal tenderness" of the sovereign, the province submitted to having the governor appointed by the crown. But now efforts are afoot to make the Council wholly dependent upon the governor. "Should this ever be the case . . . liberty here will cease."[2] In view of the great responsibilities of the Council the electors are to make their choice with care.

The address to the governor expresses the appreciation of the people at having a leader of "distinguished abilities, who knows our state, and naturally, must care for us."[3] The governor is expected to use his office for the "welfare of the people."

The General Assembly are exhorted to perform their functions in the fear of God. Attention is also directed to the situation of the African slaves. Asserting that slavery is contrary to the spirit of Christianity, the

---

[1]Samuel Cooke, Election Sermon (Boston: Edes and Gill, 1770), p. 31.

[2]Ibid., p. 37.

[3]Ibid., p. 39.

speaker urges that further importation of slaves into the province be prohibited by law.

Referring again to the current political crisis, Cooke points out that the province is not wealthy and that the crisis is due to misinformation in London in this connection. America has no desire to be independent of Great Britain but pleads "her right to her possessions."[1] Recent actions have forced the colonies to become independent in industry. Cooke adds, however, that the advantage of trade with England is appreciated in America, and expresses the hope that good relations would soon be restored.

Finally Cooke appeals to the people to be submissive to the rulers, yet "let every attempt to secure our liberties be conducted with manly fortitude; but with that respectful decency, which reason approves, and which alone gives weight to the most salutary measures."[2]

The Conclusion

The forefathers no longer hear the voice of the oppressor, and we also are but sojourners on earth. All are, therefore, to improve their talents so that at last an inheritance may be received which cannot pass away.

Analysis of the Sermon

The Invention

Choice of sermon text.-Bearing in mind the nature of the occasion and of the audience Cooke's choice of text

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 44.

[2]Ibid., p. 46.

is both appropriate and pertinent.

> He that ruleth over men be just, ruling in the fear of God.
> And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.

The opening of the text.-Contrary to the general practice Cooke says very little about the setting of the text. He merely states that the words of the text are

> given by inspiration from God, -- and as containing the last -- the dying words, of one of the greatest and best of earthly rulers;-- who by ruling in the fear of God, had served his generation according to the divine will -- Transporting reflection! --when his flesh and his heart failed, and his glory was consigned to the dust.[1]

Without giving his theme or announcing his partition, the speaker plunges immediately into a discussion of his first proposition.[2]

The Arrangement: Supporting the Theme

First main division.-The context indicates that Cooke based the main divisions of his sermon upon the various parts of the text. The first division considers the partial sentence, "He that ruleth over men . . ." from which the following proposition is formulated:

> From this, and many other passages, in the sacred oracles, it is evident, that the supreme Ruler, tho' he has directed to no particular mode of civil government, yet allows and approves of the establishment of it among men.[3]

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 5.

[2]Cooke's sermon organization follows the Perkins-Ramus pattern.

[3]Cooke, op. cit., 6.

Divine revelation, says the speaker, clearly points out the functions of government and the duties of rulers. Men are left, however, to determine the form of government best suited to their needs. Cooke's explanation of the origin and development of government follows in outline form:

A. In a pure state of nature government is unnecessary.
   1. Private property is inconsiderable.
   2. The people inhabit desert areas.
   3. The people are nomadic in nature.
   4. Each person is a law unto himself.
B. In a social state different circumstances prevail.
   1. Individual rights must be protected.
   2. Temptations to violence multiply.
   3. The laws of nature are insufficient to protect against evil people. Rules and laws become necessary.
   4. Rulers are necessary to execute the laws. They are accountable to the people.
C. The best form of government is that which best promotes the ends of government.
   1. The various branches of government are necessary as a mutual check.
      a. The king rules over a free people.
      b. The House of Peers constitutes the King's Council.
      c. The House of Commons is a check upon the highest offices of the state.

This is a clear and succinct statement of the doctrine of natural law and government by compact. The references to the king and parliament in such glowing terms is indicative of the attitude of the colonists, despite the colony's displeasure at the presence of British troops in Boston and the Boston Massacre.

Second main division.-Amplifying the second part of his text, "He that ruleth over men must be just," Cooke cites a supporting text: "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked beareth

rule, the people mourn."[1] The proposition to be discussed here is stated as follows:

> The Most High, therefore, who is just in all his ways -- good to all -- and whose commands strike dread, has strictly enjoined faithfulness upon all those who are advanced to any place of trust.[2]

The development of this proposition is opened by carefully defining the terms "ruler" and "justice."

> By the ruler in the text is intended, not only the King as supreme; but also every one in subordinate place of power and trust, whether they are in legislative or executive capacity, or both:- In whatever station men act for the public, they are included in this general term -- and must direct their conduct by the same upright principle.
>
> Justice as here expressed, is not to be taken in a limited sense, but as a general term, including every quality necessary to be exercised for the public good, by those who accept the charge of it.[3]

Rulers are "to be ministers of God for good," not as an act of grace, but because it is the "unquestionable due" of the people. "They are obliged to seek the welfare of the people, and to exert all their powers to promote the common interest."[4]

Cooke's further development of the subject of faithfulness to God and justice to the people on the part of rulers, is as follows in outline form:

A. The ruler's first interest should be the citizens.
   1. They are of the same species as himself.
      a. Offspring of God.
      b. Have like passions and feelings.
   2. They are the source of his power.

---

[1] Proverbs.29: 2.

[2] Cooke, op. cit., p. 11.

[3] Ibid., p. 12. [4] Ibid., p. 13.

3. They are creatures of reason, and
   a. Must be convinced regarding all proposed restrictions.
   b. Cannot yield unlimited subjection to rulers.
   c. Have the right to present their grievances.

B. A just ruler's laws will be as plain and explicit as possible.
   1. Mysteries in law may be a cloak of unrighteousness.
   2. All must enjoy the benefits of the constitution and laws.

C. A just ruler will fill the various offices of government with men of merit.
   1. He will not multiply offices without reason.
   2. He will apportion emoluments in terms of the office and the service rendered.

D. Rulers are guardians of the constitution in their respective stations.
   1. Balance between the various bodies of the legislature must be maintained.
   2. No branch of the government should require military support. A standing army is dangerous in a free state.

E. Just rulers will attend to the operations of their own acts, and repeal those that are found to be contrary to the laws of God and nature.
   1. God only can make perfect laws.
   2. Supposed infallibility in rulers is contemptible.
   3. Rulers should not fear to have their conduct critically examined.

The five sub-heads were apparently chosen because they focused attention on the problems which were paramount in the public mind. The first is an eloquent statement of the rights of the individual. Cooke was a "leveler" with unbounded confidence in the ability of each individual to participate intelligently in government. Men as reasoning creatures cannot be subjected to arbitrary restrictions, and are entitled to air their grievances and seek redress.

Cooke's insistence that laws should be as plain and explicit as possible is a further plea for the rights of the common man. In taking this position he was following Samuel Adams, America's "great commoner," who vigorously at-

tacked the principle of secret government.[1]

The appointment of officers of the government should be without partiality, the choice being based upon merit and integrity. Lucrative offices are not to be multiplied. In making these statements Cooke was doubtless referring to the activities of the Commissioners of Customs and their numerous appointees whose actions were thoroughly abhorred by the people of Massachusetts. It has been stated that

> No one of Townshend's measures brought British "tyranny" home to the colonial merchant as did the Commissioners of Customs. They were, swore the merchants, "so many blood suckers upon the trade"; the king had no right to impose such a "set of miscreants" upon free Americans than he had to establish a court of inquisition. The commissioners, "by their dissolute Lives and Evil Practices," exclaimed a Whig, threatened America "with a curse more deplorable than Egyptian darkness." They drew such vast sums from the colonists that their money chests were declared to be the "common receptacle of the earnings of industrious yeomen, merchants and tradesmen of North America.[2]

As a guardian of the constitution a just ruler should preserve the balance between the various bodies of the legislature. This balance was about to be disturbed, in the colonial view, by efforts to make the Council a crown-appointed body,[3] and by a new policy whereby the governor would receive his salary from the crown rather than from the

---

[1]Vernon Louis Parrington, The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800 (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954), p. 245.

[2]John C. Miller, op. cit., pp. 266-267.

[3]Governor Francis Bernard had made a proposal to this effect in 1767, according to George Bancroft in his History of the United States (New York: Appleton and Company, 1883), III, 248.

General Assembly.[1] The principle of balance of power was further seriously violated said Cooke, when one branch of the government was being supported by the army:

> Military aid has ever been deemed dangerous to a free state; and often has been used as an effectual engine to subvert it.
> Those,who in the camp, and in the field of battle, are our glory and defence; from the experience of other nations, will be thought, in time of peace, a very improper safe-guard, to a constitution, which has Liberty -- British Liberty, for its basis.
> When a people are in subjection to those, who are detached from their fellow citizens,-- under distinct laws and rules -- supported in idleness and luxury -- armed with the terrors of death -- under the most absolute command -- ready and obliged to execute the most daring orders -- what must! -- what has been the consequences!--
>
> Inter arma silent leges.--[2]

Cooke's fifth point stresses the importance of revising the laws that are repugnant to the laws of God and the laws of nature. This is probably a reference to two parliamentary acts which were considered an infringement of the rights of the colonies, namely, the Declaratory Act of 1766 which asserted Parliament's authority to make laws binding on the colonies "in all cases whatsoever,"[3] and the residue of the Townshend Acts which imposed a tax on tea. Cooke reminds those who contend that these statutes could not be changed, of the fate of the "laws of the Medes and the Persians" and of the claims of the Papacy to infallibility.

---

[1]Samuel Adams had been in correspondence with Benjamin Franklin about this matter. Cf., Wells, op. cit., pp. 387-388.

[2]Cooke, op. cit., p. 18.

[3]Commager, op. cit., p. 61.

Both allusions would impress the Bible-loving, Papacy-hating majority of the audience.

The remarks concerning the attitude of rulers towards criticism of their actions were also pertinent to a current situation. Cooke's statement was:

> The just ruler will not fear to have his conduct critically examined; but will choose to recommend himself to the approbation of every man.--As he expects to be obeyed for conscience sake, he will require nothing inconsistent with its dictates; and be desirous that the most scrupulous mind may acquiesce in the justice of his rule.
>
> As in his whole administration, so in this, he will be ambitious to imitate the supreme Ruler-- who appeals to people, Are not my ways equal?
>
> Knowing therefore that his conduct will bear the light, and his public character be established by being fully known -- he will rather encourage than discountenance a decent freedom of speech, not only in public assemblies, but amony the people.
>
> This liberty is essential to a free constitution, and the ruler's surest guide.[1]

In contravention of these principles Bernard had tried to prevent the convention of September, 1768, which was called to protest against the landing of troops in Boston. Likewise Hillsborough and Bernard had endeavored to stifle the criticism of their acts in the Circular Letter. Efforts were also made to silence criticisms through the press.[2] The issue of freedom of speech was therefore very much alive, and Cooke's remarks would have been understood without difficulty.

Thus the second division of Cooke's sermon touched on the main political issues of the day, and his comments

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

[2]Cf. Arthur M. Schlesinger's Prelude to Independence: The Newspaper War on Britain (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958), pp. 95-100.

revealed him to be a thorough patriot and democrat. Doubtless the many Whigs in his audience enjoyed hearing the speaker's thinly veiled allusions to political situations and his comments which were so significantly weighted to their liking.

The third main division.-Cooke introduces his third division by saying that "rulers of every degree, are in a measure above the fear of man; but are equally with others under the restraints of divine law."[3] He is therefore considering the third part of his text, "ruling in the fear of God." The speaker maintains:

A. That there is no justice when rulers do not fear God.
B. That the fear of God will produce in rulers a conformity to God's moral perfection.
C. That the Christian religion teaches the true fear of God.
D. That the effects of religion in and for a ruler are:
   1. His person is reverenced.
   2. Attention is paid to his counsels.
   3. His laws are respected and his authority recognized.
   4. His people are obedient and happy.

This material is presented as self-evident truth requiring no proof of support. The people would accept them as matters regarding which the minister is presumed to be an authority.

The fourth division.-This part of the sermon is based upon the second verse of the opening Scripture:

> And he shall be as the light of the morning when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds: as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.

Claiming that this verse indicates the effects of a just ad-

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

ministration of government,[1] the speaker makes the following points in amplifying the subject:

A. A just ruler is assured of public approbation.
B. When rulers are just the people are quiet because,
   1. They feel safe in their persons.
   2. Their liberties are preserved.
   3. Their properties are safe.
   4. They have confidence in their rulers.
C. A just administration ensures a flourishing state.
   1. There will be peace at home.
   2. The nation will be respected abroad.
   3. Virtue will be encouraged and vice banished.
   4. Industry will be promoted.
   5. The arts and sciences will be patronized
   6. True religion will be encouraged.

These statements describe ideal conditions which would presumably follow should the state, formed and administered in terms of the compact doctrine of government, be governed by Godfearing rulers.

Arrangement: The Applications

Cooke makes the transition to this phrase of his election sermon by saying: "But the affairs of this important day demand our immediate attention."

First application.-Here the speaker deals with the election per se. After expressing thankfulness to God for another election anniversary, "tho' not according to the general desire in the city of our solemnities," Cooke proceeds to give the basis upon which the people of Massachusetts claim the rights and privileges due to all Englishmen. He

---

[1]Cooke interprets this text as referring to the rewards of ruling justly, whereas it actually refers to the benign effects upon the people of ruling justly. The Revised Standard Version of the Bible reads: "When one rules justly over men ruling in the fear of God, he dawns on them like the morning light, like the sun shining forth upon the cloudless morning, like rain that makes grass to sprout from the earth."

does this by tracing the history of the charters. The provisions of the first charter support the claim of the early settlers that they were Englishmen. This charter was withdrawn, however, and a despotic rule instituted under the governorship of Edmund Andros, a regrettable episode which happily soon ended with the "glorious revolution" of 1688.

The new charter which was then granted to Massachusetts did not restore the right of the colonists to elect their own governor; but stipulated that the office was henceforth to be filled by royal appointment. The people retained the privilege, however, of electing the members of the Governor's Council. The province, says Cooke, submitted to this new form of government

> trusting under God, in the wisdom and paternal tenderness of our gracious Sovereign -- That in all appointment reserved to the crown, a sacred regard would be maintained to the rights of British subjects;-- and that the royal ear would always be open to every reasonable request and complaint.[1]

The implication is, of course, that George III had failed to live up to the expectations of the signers of the charter in this respect.

Cooke further asserts that the confidence of the colonists in the crown was in danger of being betrayed by plans to withdraw the right of election. This scheme seeks

> to render this invaluable branch of our constitution, wholly dependent upon the chair.
> Should this ever be the case, which God forbid-- Liberty here will cease.-- This day of the gladness of our hearts, will be turned into the deepest sorrow.[2]

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 36.

[2]Ibid., p. 37.

Under the prevailing circumstances it probably took very little effort on the part of the speaker to arouse the emotions of his audience concerning these issues. Several of the matters touched upon had considerable emotional potential:

1. The reference to the fact that the General Court was meeting in Cambridge instead of in Boston, "the city of our solemnities," probably aroused the emotion of indignation.

2. Feelings of patriotism and pride were probably evoked when Cooke referred to the forefathers and their struggles to maintain their liberties.

3. The charters were considered sacred documents, and to quote from them was tantamount to quoting from the Bible, in terms of emotional impact.

4. A direct appeal to the motives of patriotism, religious sentiment, the sense of fairplay, and the desire for approval is made in the passage urging the electors to exercise care:

> It is with pleasure that we see this choice in the hands of a very reasonable part of the community, and nearly interested in the effect of it.
>
> But our reliance, Fathers, under God, is upon your acting in his fear.
>
> God standeth in the assembly of the mighty, and perfectly discerns the motives by which you act -- May his fear rule in your hearts, and unerring counsel be your guide.
>
> You have received a sure token of respect, by your being raised to this high trust;-- but true honor is acquired only by acting in character.
>
> Honor yourselves, Gentlemen,-- Honor the Council-board -- your King -- and your God, by the choice you this day make.
>
> You will attentively consider the true design of all civil government; and without partiality, give your voice for those you judge most capable and disposed to promote the public interest.-- Then you will have the satisfaction of having faithfully discharged your trust -- and be sure of the approbation of the Most High.[1]

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

The language of this emotional appeal is not passionate, except in the fifth paragraph. Here the omission of the conjunctive particles (asyndeton), and the climatic arrangement combine with the sentiment expressed to make a powerful passage.

Second application.-The address to Governor Thomas Hutchinson refers to the fact that he possessed distinguished abilities and an extensive knowledge of the affairs of Massachusetts, and exhorts him to exercise his authority with wisdom, justice, and paternal tenderness.

Third application.-The address to the General Assembly presents the following ideas relative to the current political situation:

1. It is the responsibility of the House to find the solution to the present crisis.
2. The rulers are to be examples in matters of religion.
3. There is need of legislation to prevent the further importation of slaves.

The appeal for action to resolve the crisis in the relations with Great Britain is based upon a sense of duty and upon confidence in God. The language of the appeal is reinforced with a dramatic Old Testament text.

> Our present distress, Civil Fathers, loudly calls upon us all, and you in special, to stir up ourselves in the fear of God -- Arise, this matter belongeth unto you, be of good courage and do it.[1]

An appeal to the emotions of fear and shame and to the motives of honor and prestige are employed in support of a plea for some measure to prevent the further importation of African slaves:

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 40. The Bible text quoted is Ezra 10:4.

> Let the time past more than suffice, wherein we, the patrons of liberty, have dishonored the Christian name,-- and degraded human nature, nearly to the level of beasts that perish.
>
> Ethiopia hath long stretched out her hand to us-- Let not sordid gain, acquired by the merchants of slaves, and the souls of men -- harden our hearts against her piteous moans. When God ariseth, and when he visiteth what shall be our answer.
>
> May it be the glory of this province -- of this respectable General Association -- and we could wish of this session, to lead in the cause of the oppressed.-- This will avert the impending vengeance of heaven -- procure you the blessing of multitudes of your brethren ready to perish -- be highly approved by our common Father, who is no respector of persons, -- and we trust, an example which would excite the highest attention of the sister colonies.[1]

Fourth application.-This final application is an address to the general public. It consists of a plea for the people to "practice the things of our peace." Three matters are discussed:

1. The present "disquiets" due to misinformation in England regarding the American position.
2. Justification for the non-importation plan.
3. The need of fortitude and decency in the struggle for liberty.

Cooke here appears to be pleading for a continuation of the non-importation plan, despite the repeal of the Townshend Acts. First he shows that the colonists are a peace-loving people who possess their land as a result of the sacrifice of their forefathers, and that, though generally poor, they are contented "and disposed to lead peaceable lives." The strongest emotional appeal of this passage is used when the struggles of the fathers is referred to:

> These adventurous worthies, animated by sublime prospects, dearly purchased this land with their

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 42.

> treasure -- They and their posterity have defended it with unknown cost,-- and in continual jeopardy of their lives -- and with their blood.[1]

The appeal is to the emotion of love for the forefathers, and this emotion is linked with the motive to maintain their dearly bought properties and heritage.

Like Andrew Eliot, Cooke ascribes England's tax policy to misinformation regarding the situation in America. Cooke's statement of this conviction probably served to intensify feelings of indignation.

> From misinformations, only, we would conclude, recent disquiets have arisen -- they need not be mentioned -- they are too well known --their voice is gone out thro' all the earth -- and their sound to the end of the world. --The enemies of Great-Britain hold us in derision -- while her cities and colonies are thus perplexed.[2]

The speaker proceeds to show that by means of the non-importation plan the colonies were pleading the justice of their cause. Note the appeal to the desire for fairplay, the love of justice, and the sentiments of loyalty and patriotism.

> America now pleads her right to her possessions-- which she cannot resign, while she apprehends she has truth and justice on her side.
>
> Americans esteem it their greatest infelicity, that thro' necessity, they are thus led to plead with their parent state -- the land of their forefathers' nativity, whose interest has always been dear to them -- and whose wealth they have increased by their removal, much more than their own.
>
> They have assisted in fighting her battles, and greatly enlarged her empire -- and God helping, they will yet extend it thro' the boundless desart (sic), until it reach from sea to sea.
>
> They glory in the British constitution, and are abhorrent to a man, of the most distant thought of withdrawing their allegiance from their gracious

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 43. [2]Ibid., p. 44.

> Sovereign, and becoming an independent state.
>
> And tho' with unwearied toil, the colonies can now subsist upon the labors of their own hands-- which they must be driven to, when deprived of the means of purchase, --yet they are fully sensible of the mutual benefits of an equitable commerce with the parent country; and chearfully (sic) submit to regulations of trade, productive of the common interest.
>
> These their claims, the Americans consider, not as novel, or wantonly made, but founded in nature -- in compact -- in their right as men -- and British subjects -- The same which their fore-fathers the first occupants made, and asserted, as the terms of their removal with their effects into this wilderness -- and with which the glory and interest of their King, and all his dominions, are connected.
>
> May these alarming disputes be brought to a just and speedy issue -- and peace and harmony be restored.[1]

The emotional appeal of this passage lies largely in the sentiments expressed. The language, though clear, used few rhetorical devices to enhance the passion of the plea.

The address to the people concludes with a plea for "respectful decency" even while the political rights and privileges are being contended for.

> Let every attempt to secure our liberties be conducted with a manly fortitude; but with that respectful decency, which reason approves, and which alone gives weight to the most salutary measures.
>
> Let nothing divert us from the paths of truth and peace, which are the ways of God -- and then we may be sure that he will be with us as he was with our fathers -- and never leave nor forsake us.[2]

The emotional appeal here is to the sense of confidence and to motives based upon the sentiments of religion and fair play.

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

[2]Ibid., pp. 46-47.

The Conclusion

The sermon is closed with a reminder that the rulers, like their worthy forefathers, are but sojourners on earth, and an exhortation to improve the various talents committed to their trust.

Language of the Sermon

Clarity.-Cooke's language is relatively less clear than that of Mayhew or Eliot. Fourteen percent of his vocabulary consists of words of three or more syllables, whereas Mayhew's average is ten to eleven percent and Eliot's eight percent. The following passage illustrates Cooke's predilection for less familiar language.

> Justice requires, that the emoluments of every office, constituted for the common interest, be proportioned to their dignity, and the service performed, for the public:-- Parsimony in this case, enervates the force of government, and frustrates the most patriotic measures. A people therefore for their own security, must be supposed willing to pay tribute to whom it is due, and freely support the dignity of those under whose protection they confide.
>
> On the other hand, the people may apprehend they have just reason to complain of oppression and wrong, and to be jealous of their liberties, when subordinate public offices are made the surest step to wealth and ease.
>
> This not only increases the expenses of government, but is naturally productive of dissipation and luxury-- of the severest animosities among candidates for public posts,-- and of venality and corruption; the most fatal to a free state.[1]

Many of the longer words with Latin etymologies were probably beyond the comprehension of those in the audience who had not graduated at Harvard. The following list, chosen at random, is a sampling of such words:

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 16.

reciprocal	acquiesce
concentric	repugant
patrimony	capricious
lucrative	resplendant
parsimony	opulence
enervate	refulgent

About forty percent of the words of three or more syllables are not found in the Bible. Since, however, the sermon has a total of about 7,000 words, only 0.5 percent falls within this category.

The average sentence length is approximately thirty-three words, which is somewhat lengthy for oral comprehension. Furthermore, occasional minor incongruities of syntax appear to hamper the clarity of the sermon. For example, in the first three lines of the quotation on page 167 the pronoun "their" does not agree with its antecedent "every." In the following sentence the subject and the verb do not agree in number: "A society emerging from a state of nature, in respect to authority, are all upon a level . . ." Note the ambiguity in the rest of the sentence. ". . . no individual can justly challenge a right to make, or execute laws, by which it is to be governed, but only by the choice, or general consent of the community."[1]

The organization of the sermon as a whole is not always clear. No clue is given at the opening of the sermon as to how the Biblical text is to be used, and there are no clear transitional statements to indicate the movement from one part of the sermon to the next, except in the case

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 8.

of the movement from the body into the applications. Otherwise the sermon is well organized. The outline of the theory of natural law and the origin of government is particularly good. Cooke was also careful to define the key words of his text. Furthermore the theme of the sermon remains clear throughout, and the development of the theme is logical.

Forcefulness.-The frequent use of abstract expressions tends to deprive the style of the quality of forcefulness. The following list of such expressions which are taken from the applications of the sermon, have a poetic quality, but are certainly not forceful:

"ever memorable worthies"
"delightful native land"
"these uncultivated ends of the earth"
"in wanton triumph"
"paternal tenderness"
"with unwearied toil"
"manly fortitude"
"transitory abodes"

Verbs are frequently used in the passive voice, and very seldom are vivid, vigorous verbs employed. The following expressions illustrate this weakness:

"it is far from my intention to determine. . ."
"the present occasion will permit me to say . . ."
"I may be permitted to affirm . . ."
"I trust . . . I may without offence plead the cause . . ."

Rarely do strong expressions like the following occur:

"Honor yourself . . . Honor the Council . . ."
"we have a right to expect . . ."
"Arise, this matter belongeth unto . . ."
"the shocking terrors of the more infamous kirk"
"the impending vengeance"
"delivered from the merciless sword"

Forceful sentences are used, on the other hand, in the more emotional parts of the applications. Note specifically the short sentences, the use of tropes and figures, and the quotations of strong Scriptural passages in the following excerpts:

> Should this ever be the case, which God forbid -- Liberty here will cease.-- This day of the gladness of our hearts will be turned into the deepest sorrow.[1]

> God standeth in the assembly of the mighty, and perfectly discerns the motives by which you act -- May his fear rule in your hearts, and unerring council be your guide.[2]

> Honor yourselves, Gentlemen,-- Honor the Council-board -- your country -- your king -- and your God, by the choice you this day make.[3]

> Our present distress, Civil Fathers, loudly calls upon us all, and you in special, to stir up ourselves in the fear of God -- Arise, this matter belongeth unto you, we also will be with you, be of good courage and do it.[4]

> From misinformation, only, we would conclude, recent disquiets have arisen -- they need not be mentioned, -- they are too well known -- their voice is gone out thro all the earth -- and their sound to the end of the world.-- The enemies of Great-Britain hold us in derision -- while her cities and colonies are thus perplexed.[5]

Impressiveness.-Emotional appeals lend impressiveness to a speech and in this respect Cooke's sermon may be classified as moderately impressive. Perhaps, however, Cooke's strongest claim to impressiveness lies in his use of

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 37. [2]Ibid., p. 38.

[3]Ibid., p. 38. [4]Ibid., p. 40.

[5]Ibid., p. 44.

tropes and figures. Some are noted below:

Metaphor: "hear the impotent thunders of the Vatican."[1]

"We trust the fountain of light who giveth wisdom freely."[2]

Simile: "As in nature we best judge causes by their effects -- So rulers, hereby will receive the surest information of the fitness of their laws."[3]

"The several branches of civil government, as point pillars, each bearing its due proportion, are the support . . . of the political structure regularly formed."[4]

Personification: "Our present distress, Civil Fathers, loudly calls upon us all . . . to stir ourselves in the fear of God."[5]

"Thro' the good hand of our God upon us, we have for a few years past been delivered from the merciless sword of the wilderness."[6]

Synecdoche: ". . . and that the royal ear would always be opened to every reasonable request."[7]

Some use is also made of figures of words for the purpose of ornamentation:

Contrast: "Fidelity to the public requires that the laws be as plain and as explicit as possible; that the less knowing may understand and not be ensnared -- while the artful evade their force."[8]

Parallel structure: "Their rulers' time -- their abilities -- their authority."[9]

"He will not forget that he ruleth over men-- Men who are of the same species with himself, . . . Men who are the offspring of God, . . .

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 19.

[2]Ibid., p. 40.

[3]Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[4]Ibid., p. 17.

[5]Ibid., p. 40

[6]Ibid., p. 43.

[7]Ibid., p. 36.

[8]Ibid., p. 13.

[9]Ibid., pp. 13-14.

Men of like passions and feelings with himself. . . . Men who have raised him to power. . . . Men who are reasonable beings. . . . Men who are moral agents. . . . Men whom the Son of God . . ."[1]

Repetition: "And it is known to every person of common observation, that few -- very few . . . acquire more than a necessary subsistence."[2]

"Military aid . . . will be thought, in time of peace, a very important safeguard to a constitution which has liberty, British liberty, for its safeguard."[3]

Climax: "Honor, yourself, Gentlemen, -- honor the Council-Board, your country, your King, and your God, by the choice you make this day."[4]

"The Christian temper, wro't in the heart by the Divine Spirit, restores the human mind to its primitive rectitude, -- animates every faculty of the soul -- directs every action to its proper end -- extends its views beyond the narrow limits of time, and raises its desires to immortal glory."[5]

Exclamation: ". . . What must, what has been the consequence! Inter arma silent leges --"[6]

"arise, this matter belongeth unto you, we also will be with you, be of good courage and do it."[7]

"Ethopia has long stretched out her hands to us -- Let not sordid gain . . . harden our hearts against her piteous moans. When God ariseth, and when he visiteth, what shall we answer!"[8]

Impressive language is used in the extended simile with which Cooke restates the second part of his two opening

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 43.

[2]Ibid., p. 18.

[3]Ibid., p. 38.

[4]Ibid., p. 25.

[5]Ibid., p. 18.

[6]Ibid., p. 40.

[7]Ibid., p. 40.

[8]Ibid., p. 42.

Biblical Texts:

> Truly the light is good, and a pleasant thing to behold is the sun. Thus desirable, thus benign, are wise and faithful rulers to a people. The beautiful allusion in the text naturally illustrates this. The sun as the center of the solar system, connects with the planetary worlds, and retains them in their respective orbits. They all yeald (sic) to the greater force of his attractive power, and thus with the greatest regularity observe the laws impressed upon the material creation. The ruler of the day, as on a throne, shines in his strength, nearly preserves his station, and under the prime Agent directs all their motions, imparting light and heat to his several attendants and the various beings which the creator has placed upon them. His refulgent rays dispel the gloomy shades, and cause the cheerful light to rise out of thick darkness, and all nature to rejoice. The planets with their lesser attendants, in conformity to their common head, mutually reflect with feebler beams their borrowed light for the common benefit; and all, in proportion to the distance and gravity, bear their part to support the balance of the grand machine.[1]

The tropes and figures used by Cooke constitute the most effective factor contributing to the impressiveness of the style of the sermon. Very little else is done to make the language memorable or vivid.

To summarize the findings on style: the relatively difficult vocabulary, the obscurity in certain phases of the organization, and the long sentences are factors which militate against the clarity of style. The preponderance of weak or passive verbs, and the paucity of vigorous expressions, together with the factors which hamper the clarity conspire to make a style which could hardly be characterized as forceful. While tropes and figures are used in fair numbers and variety, the language in which they are ex-

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 37.

pressed cannot be said to be vivid or memorable. This adverse criticism of Cooke's style must, in fairness, be counterbalanced by drawing attention to the speaker's concern with great principles and his evident integrity and dignity.

The Sermon and Later Developments

Cooke concerned himself primarily with three political issues:

1. The threat to make the Governor's Council a crown-appointed legislative body.
2. The importance of continuing with the non-importation agreements.
3. The slavery question.

Concerning the first issue the speaker expressed the opinion that

> Should this (the plan to render the Council "wholly dependent upon the governor) ever be the case --Liberty here will cease.-- This day of the gladness of our hearts, will be turned into the deepest sorrow.[1]

These fears were to be sadly realized six years later when the Coercive Acts, which ruled that the Council was to be appointed by the crown and that the members of the Council were to hold office at the royal pleasure, were passed by Parliament. This action was one of the immediate causes of the Revolution of the American colonies against Britain.

Though most of the American colonies abandoned the non-importation agreements immediately The Repeal Act of 1770 came into effect. Cooke urged that Massachusetts extend the agreements inasmuch as London, by retaining the tax on

---

[1]Cooke, op. cit., p. 37.

tea, virtually repudiated the colonial position regarding taxation. His appeal may have had some effect, for Massachusetts continued with the non-importation plan for another six months. Cooke's position is vindicated by later developments since the tea question led directly to the Revolution.

Cooke's stand on the slavery question and his suggestion that the further importation of slaves be prohibited by law was acted upon by the First Continental Congress. It is difficult to determine whether a cause-effect relationship exists here, but the possibility cannot be ruled out entirely.

Clearly Cooke was a disciple of Samuel Adams. The arguments used by Cooke against a standing army had been used previously by Adams in an article published in the Boston Gazette of December 12, 1768.[1] Cooke's stand regarding non-importation was also the stand of the patriots in the face of pressure on the part of a large number of Boston merchants for the lifting of the ban against trade with England.[2]

By following Samuel Adams Cooke revealed himself to be a true patriot as well as an astute political thinker. His sermon gives evidence of a deep love for democratic and other great principles which are characteristic of great oratory. Unfortunately the style and organization of the sermon are such as to prohibit the critic from classifying

---

[1]Wells, op. cit., pp. 261-262.

[2]John C. Miller, op. cit., p. 258.

Cooke's election sermon as a great oration.

Summary

(1) Samuel Cooke (1709-1783) became pastor of a Congregational church in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1739, after having received the M. A. degree from Harvard College. He was a staunch Whig, and as such contributed towards the struggle for independence by voice and action. Cooke preached the election sermon in 1770.

(2) In May, 1770, New England in general and Massachusetts in particular was deeply stirred because of the Townshend Acts. The colonists opposed the taxes imposed by this law on the same grounds on which they had opposed the Stamp Act -- the violation of the prinicple of no taxation without representation. As a result of demonstrations by the people of Boston against the customs commissioners British troops were brought into the town, and the presence of these troops led to the Boston Massacre of March 5, 1770. Other matters that further strained relations between England and Massachusetts were the transfer of the General Court to Cambridge, the Circular Letter episode, and the persistent rumors that London was about to change the charter so that the Governor's Council would become a crown-appointed body. These problems loomed large in the minds of his audience when Sameul Cooke preached the election sermon.

(3) Cooke's sermon text was well suited to the occasion and to the audience. He did, however, give his own special interpretation to part of the text in order to be

able to use it in developing his theme. In the sermon proper the speaker discussed the need of justice in rulers, the importance of ruling in the fear of God, and the assurance that those who ruled justly and in the fear of God would be rewarded.

The first proposition considers justice in the light of the current political problems. No proofs are offered in support of the ideas presented, but the ideas are treated as axioms. The second main division seeks to impress the audience with the importance of ruling in the fear of God. Finally Cooke asserts that the rewards for ruling justly are public approbation, a peaceful and contented people, and a flourishing state.

(4) Four applications are made: The first concerns the threat to the status of the Council. The second is an address to the governor in which he is exhorted to rule wisely, justly, and with fatherly tenderness. The third draws the attention of the General Assembly to the responsibility of finding the solution to the current crisis, stresses the importance of the influence of the members in matters related to the church, and calls for action on behalf of the African slaves. The final application offers justification for the continuation of the non-importation policy of the colonies.

Cooke s appeals for action are reinforced by stirring such motivating forces as religious sentiments, patriotism, the love of fairplay, the desire for prestige and honor, and the love of justice. Efforts are also made to stir the

emotions of indignation, pride, fear, and love. The appeals to these emotions and motives are not, generally speaking reinforced by emotional language.

(5) The style of the sermon lacks clarity in parts because of difficult vocabulary and faulty sentence constructions. On the other hand these weaknesses are counter balanced by the use of illustrations and examples. A degree of impressiveness is achieved by emotional appeals and by the evident seriousness and integrity of the ideas presented. With the exception of figures of speech the qualities of forcefulness and impressiveness are not marked.

(6) Cooke addresses himself to three current political problems: (a) the reports of plans to make the Council a crown-appointed body, (b) taxation by parliament and the non-importation policy, and (c) the slavery question.

CHAPTER VIII

GAD HITCHCOCK'S ELECTION SERMON - 1774

Biographical Sketch

Gad Hitchcock, son of Ebenezer and Mary Hitchcock, was born in Springfield, Massachusetts, on February 12, 1718/1719. He completed his studies at Harvard College, receiving the M. A. degree in 1743. The College also conferred the doctor's degree on him in 1787.

Hitchcock was ordained pastor of the West Church in Pembroke, Massachusetts, and continued in the same church until his death fifty-five years later. His theology was liberal and his political sentiments were decidedly Whig. Hitchcock's Revolutionary activities were considerable:

> The first minister of the new church (Pembroke's West Parish) was the Reverend Gad Hitchcock of Revolutionary fame, who proved himself a strong spiritual and political leader for this part of Pembroke. The boldness of his great Election Sermon delivered in the presence of Governor Gage and his distinguished services in the State Constitutional Convention are matters of history.[1]

Five of Hitchcock's sermons were published: a sermon to a military company (1757), a sermon at the ordination of E(dward) Hitchcock (1771), the election sermon (1774), an anniversary sermon at Plymouth (1774), and the Dudleian

---

[1]H. W. Litchfield, The First Church in Pembroke, 1708-1908 (Pembroke: The Pembroke Parish, 1908), no pagination.

Lecture at Harvard College (1779). A diarist wrote concerning Hitchcock's election sermon:

> May 25. General Election. I attended and went to meeting this morning. The Revd. Gad Hitchcock of Pembroke preached a High Discourse suitable to his Party fr (om), Proverbs 29th. v. 2nd.[1]

It is said that the election sermon angered Governor Gage.[2]

In disposition Hitchcock was "sociable, friendly and hospitable. He was esteemed as a man of talents."[3] It is said that in his old age many profited by his instruction. He died on August 8, 1803.

The Political Situation in 1774

After the collapse of the non-importation agreements in 1770 there was a political lull which lasted until the customs schooner, the Gaspee, was burnt near Providence on June 9, 1772. A royal order appointing a commission to investigate the affair and to hold suspects for trial in England was considered a gross violation of the rights of the colonies. "The burning of the Gaspee thus opened the dispute between England and America."[4]

---

[1]Anne Rowe Cunningham, ed., Letters and Diaries of John Rowe, Boston Merchant, 1759-1762, 1764-1779 (Boston, 1903).

[2]Baldwin, op. cit., p. 122, note 3.

[3]Emerson Davis, "Biographical Sketches of the Congregational Pastors of New England" (Unpublished manuscript, Congregational Library, Boston, Massachusetts, February 12, 1930), III, 1.

[4]John C. Miller, op. cit., p. 329.

Another political development which served to revive the enthusiasm of the Massachusetts patriots was Governor Hutchinson's announcement on June 13, 1772, that thereafter he would receive his salary from the crown. This action by Parliament rendered the governor entirely independent of the General Court and deprived the house of its power of the purse. Seizing upon these actions as a means of arousing the flagging patriotic movement, Samuel Adams persuaded a Boston town meeting to appoint a committee of correspondence under the chairmanship of James Otis for the purpose of informing the other towns of Massachusetts concerning Boston's position on these issues.

In the same year certain letters written by Hutchinson to a friend in England were discovered by Benjamin Franklin and sent to Boston. The letters were declared to be subversive of "the constitution and to introduce arbitrary power."[1] The house therefore voted to request that Hutchinson be recalled. The petition was refused, but Hutchinson was nevertheless replaced a few months later.

Parliament's Tea Act of April 27, 1773, passed in order to save the East India Company from bankruptcy, was another British action which disturbed the colony. The Act gave the East India Company a monopoly of the tea trade and seriously interfered with American business interests. Consequently a Boston town meeting voted that all East India

---

[1]John C. Miller, op. cit., p. 331.

Company tea arriving in Boston should be returned to England forthwith. Soon three ships arrived, but when ordered to leave, the governor declined to sign the order granting permission to sail. The townspeople then took the law into their own hands and during the night of December 16, 1773, dressed as Indians, they tossed 342 chests of tea overboard.

When news of the Boston Tea Party reached England Parliament determined to take punitive action. On March 31, 1774, the first of the Coercive Acts, the Boston Port Bill, was passed. The bill closed the port of Boston until such time as the East India Company should be compensated for the loss suffered. News of the bill reached Boston on May 11, upon which Boston decided to reaffirm the colony's rights and called upon the rest of the colonies for moral support.

About a week before the 1774 election day General Gage, Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in America, arrived in Boston to take up his new appointment as Governor of Massachusetts. It was known that several regiments would soon arrive as support in implementing the Boston Port Bill. Thus the situation in Boston was one of tension and apprehension when Gad Hitchcock rose to preach the election sermon.

Précis of the Sermon

The Text

> When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people

mourn.[1]

The Opening of the Text

The words of the text are those of a wise ruler speaking of civil government and the effects of its administration by wise or by wicked rulers. Having been asked by the rulers of Massachusetts to give the counsel of God regarding "the great affairs of this anniversary, and the general conduct of government," the sentiments contained in the text have been chosen as the subject of the discourse. From the text the following matters will be considered:

1. The nature and end of civil government.
2. Some of the qualifications of rulers.
3. The application of the subject "to the design of our assembling at this time."

Body of the Sermon

It may be inferred from the text that government was already established in Israel, and that it was formed by the method of compact, as all governments probably were. The text takes for granted that the people were judges of the good or ill effects of administration. Since the purpose of government is to promote the happiness of the people, rulers are entitled to the submission of the subjects only so long as they rule as "ministers of God." Whatever form of government a people may have, righteousness in its rulers brings security and contentment; vice results in oppression and ruin.

In a mixed form of government, such as in Great

---

[1]Proverbs 29:2.

Britain and her colonies, each element of the government must seek to promote the happiness of the people. Should one of the legislative bodies fail to do so, the whole suffers. Calamity and distress have come to Boston, Hitchcock asserts, precisely for that reason.

Rulers are given their authority by the people and the people may also withdraw their authority. Though this doctrine may disturb the peace and cause revolutions, it is better to have this happen than to allow evil rulers to ruin and enslave the nation. This doctrine is not at variance with the apostle Paul's statement that "there is no power but of God; powers that be are ordained of God." God ordained that there should be government, but left it to men to determine what kind it should be. Rulers are therefore accountable to both God and the people, and should strive to be accounted righteous.

The second main division of the sermon concerns three qualifications of rulers:

1. A good ruler will have superior knowledge regarding action to be taken in critical times, of the constitution and rules of government, of human nature, and of the best methods of giving force to the laws.

2. A good ruler will be public spirited and have a compassionate regard for mankind and for the interests of the people.

3. A good ruler will be a Christian.

The third division of the sermon consists of the applications of the theme to the purpose of the present assembly.

Considering first the election itself, the speaker expresses the opinion that the recent general conduct and measures of the Assembly have been satisfactory to the people. The election of the Council is a privilege and right which has never been forfeited and which never will be resigned voluntarily.

The second application concerns the governor. Hitchcock expresses the hope that the new governor, "of whose candor and moderation" the people had heard with pleasure, will ever seek to make the happiness of the people "the great object of his administration."

The third application reminds the electors that much is at stake in the colony and that care should therefore be exercised in the election. Furthermore, the legislators should be men who will strive to prevent the increase of vice and immorality and encourage religion by precept and example.

Finally, the people are admonished to be submissive to their rulers. At the same time they are to assert their rights though not with "a spirit of licentiousness."

The Conclusion

Both people and rulers are subjects of "the divine universal kindgom which is administered in righteousness. First place should therefore be given to the cultivation of the rational and immortal part of the being. "Then shall our righteousness go forth as brightness, and our salvation as the lamp that burneth."

Analysis of the Sermon

The Invention

Choice of the sermon text.-The prevailing mood was that of indignation at England's callousness towards the colony. Samuel Adams described the feelings of the people in a letter dated May 18, 1774:

> They feel humanely to those who must suffer, but, being innocent, are not the objects of their revenge. . . . Calmness, courage, and unanimity prevail. While they are resolved not tamely to submit, they will, by refraining from any acts of violence, avoid the snare that they discover to be laid for them by posting regiments so near them.[1]

Under such circumstances the text of the sermon was apropos to both the mood of the audience and to the purpose of the occasion.

> When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.[2]

On the face of it the use of this text may appear to be a discourtesy to Governor Gage, since he represented the "wicked" rulers who were responsible for the Boston Port Bill. The general feeling was, however, that "Gage was a mild-mannered man with an American wife, and it was hoped he would not be very strict in the performance of his disagreeable duty."[3] Hitchcock certainly shared this hope, for he said in the course of his sermon that

---

[1]Wells, op. cit., pp. 167-168.

[2]Proverbs 29:2.

[3]Oliver Perry Chitwood, A History of Colonial America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948), p. 644.

> On these principles it is reasonable to expect that his Excellency who is lately appointed to the government of this province, and of whose candor and moderation we have heard with pleasure, will enter on the duties of his high station with honor to himself and advantage to the public, and make the happiness of this people the great object of his administration. . . .[1]

The theme of the sermon.-Hitchcock proposes to make the message of the text the theme of his sermon. He adds that since his listeners "have a veneration for revelation" the theme would not be thought improper.

Announcement of the main divisions.-In a brief paragraph the main divisions are set out:

> Accordingly I shall take occasion from it (the text) to make a few general remarks on the nature and end of government -- point out some of the qualifications of rulers -- and then apply the subject to the design of our assembly at this time.[2]

Thus two divisions are allocated to supporting the theme and one to applying the theme to the audience.[3]

The Arrangement: Supporting the Theme

The first main division.-Hitchcock develops his "remarks on the nature and end of civil government" by considering individually the important words of the text. The following outline sets out his reasoning:

A. The people of the text represent a body politic.
   1. Civil government is represented as established.
      a. It had rules.
      b. It had officers vested with authority.

---

[1]Gad Hitchcock, Election Sermon (Boston: Edes and Gill, 1774), p. 44.

[2]Hitchcock, ibid., p. 6.

[3]Hitchcock follows the Perkins-Ramus pattern of organization.

2. Being a Hebrew government, it was based upon compact, for God was not an absolute ruler.
   a. When Israel foolishly asked for a king the request was granted.
   b. The people were left to choose their own officers of government.

B. The text "supposes the people to be judges of the good or ill effects of administration."
   1. They are happy when their rulers are upright, honorable, and humane.
   2. They mourn when their rulers are inhuman, tyrannical, and wicked.
   3. The purpose of government is to insure the happiness of the people and thus to secure their submission.
      a. St. Paul said that rulers are "the ministers of God to thee for good."
      b. Only such rulers are worthy of the obedience of the people.

C. Righteousness in rulers or the lack of it "promotes happiness or the contrary in the people.
   1. Religious rulers are the fittest.
      a. Their laws are just and good.
      b. They have sincere affection for their people because of their veneration for God.
   2. Vice in rulers causes the people to mourn.

D. Righteous rulers will rule with equity. (when the righteous are in authority . . .)
   1. Administration in every form of government is important, whether
      a. Absolute monarchies. (often dangerous to liberties of the people.)
      b. Oligarchies. (Can be evil.)
      c. Mixed government, as in England. (The best form if power is properly distributed.)
         (1) Should one element of government fail the whole is in jeopardy.
         (2) This has happened in Massachusetts.
   2. Rulers are under obligation to consult the good of the people.
      a. In a state of nature men are equal.
      b. Civil authority is the production of combined society.
      c. The people give authority to men of their choice.
      d. Should rulers fail the people can replace them.
   3. Objection: This doctrine will lead to revolution or disturbances.
      Answer: a'. Bad rulers need to be disturbed.
      b'. People have the right to save themselves from ruin.
      c'. The doctrine will motivate the worst of rulers to promote the happiness of

the people for the sake of self-interest.

d'. Good rulers promote this doctrine. Evil rulers hate it.

e'. If resistance is wrong rulers will have no restraint; misery and slavery will follow.

f'. The doctrine of resistance is not in conflict with Paul's statement that "There is no power but from God . . ." God did not fore-ordain a certain type of government; therefore all rulers must give an account to both God and the people.

Hitchcock develops his ideas on the purposes of civil government by amplifying the expressions used in, and deductions made from, the opening Biblical text. Basic to the speaker's thinking are a belief in the Bible as divine and authoritative and in the theory of government by compact. In the third sub-division indirect reference is made to the current conflict with the British government and justification is offered for resistance to England's acts.

Specific examples are sometimes employed to substantiate positions taken. It is shown, for instance, that though rulers who are religious are usually just and good administrators, there are notable exceptions:

> The observation of our text is grounded on the truth of this assertion, though it ought to be acknowledged that there have been many wicked rulers, such as Nero, and others of later date, who, for a while, have governed well.[1]

The sons of Samuel are cited as examples of the fact that even in the best forms of government the rulers are liable to misuse their power.[2] Britain's revolution of 1688 is

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 13. [2]Ibid., p. 9.

used to illustrate the power of the people to overthrow tyrannical government.[1]

An effective use is made of enthymemes in the answer to the objection that the doctrine of resistance to rulers may lead to disturbances and revolution. A footnote indicates that these arguments were taken from Bishop Hoadley.[2]

Second main division.-The speaker's purpose here is to "point out some of the qualifications of rulers." Good rulers will have:

1. Superior knowledge of:
   a. How to conduct themselves in critical times.
   b. The constitution and the rules of government, and how to make laws that are plain and intelligible.
   c. Human nature, natural rights, the rules of equity and reason, the laws of nations, and the genius, temper, customs, and religion of the people.
   d. How to give force and operation to the laws.
2. A public spirit and a compassionate regard for men.
3. Membership in the Christian church.

For most of these points no support is offered. They are in the nature of axioms. Some arguments are advanced, however, in support of the assertion that all laws should be plain:

> Were not this the case, the people's entering into society, and erecting government could not be justified on the principle of reason, or prudence; as government instead of protecting them in the peaceable and quiet enjoyment of Liberty and property, might be made an engine of their destruction, and put it in the power of rulers of evil dispositions,

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 13.

[2]The footnote does not give the source of the material. The author is probably Bishop Benjamin Hoadley, and the work An Enquiry into the Reasons for the Conduct of Great Britain.

> under the specious pretext of pursuing constitutional measures to introduce general misery and slavery among them.[1]

Hitchcock continues that when the people understand the laws they are able to "check on such ruinous conduct," as the English people did by means of the revolution of 1688. This is cogent reasoning, granting the major premise which is, of course, the compact theory.

To summarize the findings on forms of support: the first main division is amplified by the use of Scriptural authority, enthymemes, borrowed and original, and examples. The second division is developed by means of a series of axioms or generalizations, and by an enthymeme based upon the compact theory of government. The first main division occupies twenty-five pages of the text; the second takes merely seven pages.

The Arrangement: Applications

First application.-Hitchcock opens his applications by considering the election itself:

1. The general conduct and measures of both branches of government have been acceptable to the people, especially in recent times. The same is hoped for in the coming year.
2. The election constitutes "a great security of our natural rights; and one of our most invaluable privileges -- a privilege, which we have never forfeited, and we are resolved we never will, or voluntarily resign into the hands of our fellow-men."[2]

This expression of strong determination constitutes a power-

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 33.

[2]Ibid., p. 42.

ful appeal to the motives of loyalty, respect for fair play, and honor. The rumor regarding a threat to alter the status of the Council probably made these remarks particularly poignant. The style is strong: note the verbs forfeited, resolved, and resign; the repetition of the adverb never; the predominance of the consonant "r."

Second application.-Addressing the governor, General Gage who had just arrived in Boston, the speaker makes the following remarks:

1. Though the colony is not disposed to complain because the governor is appointed by the crown, the people remember the first charter with affection.
2. The colony has always had confidence that the governor's appointment would be based upon the appointee's desire to promote the welfare of the colony.
3. Since the good of the colony is synonymous with the pleasure of the king regarding the colony, the governor should consider himself under the prior obligation to God when the ministers of the king order actions that are inconsistent with the welfare of the colony.
4. Prerogative is "a power to do some things for the good of the community, in such cases as promulgated laws are not able to provide for."[1]
5. In such circumstances it is expected that the governor will enter upon his duties,
   a. With honor to himself.
   b. To seek the advantage of the people.
   c. To make the happiness of the people the objective of his administration.

The reference to the first charter and its provision which authorized the province to appoint its own governor was bound to arouse indignation in view of the unpleasant experience the colony had just had with Bernard and Hutchinson. Moreover the allusion to the Edmund Andros affair

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 44.

(of 1686) would arouse poignant fears of a recurrence of that unhappy episode now that a military dictatorship was about to be instituted in Boston.

An appeal is made to the governor's sense of fair play by reminding him of the justice of the cause of the colony and by referring to his reputation for "candor and moderation." Appeals are also made to the governor's sense of loyalty to his new charge, to his religious feelings, and to his natural desire for a good reputation:

> . . . it is reasonable to expect that his Excellency . . . will . . . make the happiness of this people the great object of his administration, which is the surest way to conciliate their affections, and establish his own authority. We wish his Excellency much of the divine presence, and guidance -- the supports of religion -- and the plaudit of his final judge.[1]

Third application.-Hitchcock here addresses the electors regarding their responsibility.

1. Much is at stake in the province and in America; therefore much depends upon the choices made.
2. The union with and sympathy for Massachusetts on the part of the rest of the American colonies must be cherished by every prudent and constitutional method.
3. The dangers threatening the province are real:
   a. Liberty and property are at stake.
   b. Plans are being formed and executed which are "subversive of our natural rights and privileges, and incompatible with every idea of liberty."
   c. The colony's complaints and petitions have been fruitless.
   d. Privileges and rights which are the colony's by the terms of natural law and of the charter have been denied the colony, in spite of the well known loyalty to the crown and of the toil of the pioneers.
4. The rulers are to seek redress for these grievances.

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 44.

5. Elect men who,
   a. Will restore and establish the rights of the colony.
   b. Will assert and uphold the constitutional powers of the Council.
   c. Will maintain the constitution "undimished and entire."
6. The members of the General Assembly should remember that they act for the people and for God; that the public good, peace, and prosperity must ever be kept in view; that they should seek to prevent vice and promote religion by precept and example.

By reiterating the wrongs and injustices suffered by the province the emotion of indignation is stirred. The references to the dangers threatening the people are calculated to arouse the emotion of fear. The appeal on the part of the rulers is reinforced by an appeal to the sense of duty:

> . . . we place great confidence in the wisdom and patriotism of our civil rulers -- Our eyes are fixed on them, and under the smiles of heaven we expect a redress of our grievances by their instrumentality. Or, at least, that they will not be wanting, in any thing in their power, consistent with the duties of their station, to effect it.[1]

Fourth application.-The final address is to the body of the people. After quoting Scriptures which admonish the people to be submissive to their rulers, the speaker observes:

1. The people of Massachusetts have always been sensitive regarding their civil and religious liberties.
2. They have always been submissive except when their liberties were threatened.
3. Government must not be despised, but supported, and the rulers must be honored.

The application closes with an appeal to religious confidence, and to a sense of duty, and patriotism:

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 48.

> Under the pressing, growing weight of our public troubles and difficulties, our hearts, tho' perplexed, have not fainted -- We wait for the salvation of God-- it is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in princes -- Let us go on to trust in him 'till God himself shall rise to save us -- Let us not divide and crumble into parties, on little irregularities, which, however aggravated by some, are in our circumstances, almost unavoidable! But may we have that wisdom which is profitable to direct, and distinguish between what has and what has not, a tendency to remove our burdens, and prolong our just rights and liberties; especially let us be on our guard against a spirit of licentiousness which is the reproach of true liberty, and has been the overthrow of free government.[1]

In summary: Hitchcock's election sermon has four applications. The first comprises reflections concerning the election of the Council, and the others are addresses to the governor, the electors, and the general public respectively. Mild efforts are made to stir the emotions of religious confidence, indignation, and fear. The language, however, does little to increase the impact of the emotional appeals.

Motives appealed to for action are the sense of duty, patriotism, loyalty, desire for reputation, love of fair play, and religious sentiment.

The Language of the Sermon

Clarity.-Between nine and ten percent of the vocabulary employed by Hitchcock consists of words of three or more syllables each, an average which compares favorably with that of the previous speakers considered. Of the longer words used the following are perhaps the most difficult

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 56.

appropriate
capacity
enormities
indubitable
investiture
promulgate
auspicious
compendium
efficacious
ineffable
remonstrance

Few of these would have been beyond the comprehension of those with better than average education. No foreign language is used or quoted in the sermon nor do unfamiliar theological terms appear.

The average sentence length is about forty words, which is long for immediate comprehension. Some sentences are also rather complex in structure, generally because the speaker tried to crowd too much into them. Note the following example:

> To what lengths natural benevolence, desire of fame, education, love of power, and the emoluments of place may be supposed sometimes to carry men, in acting for the public advantage, it is certain, and in several instances it has been sadly verified, that these are feeble motives -- principles, that can give no security of lasting happiness to a people, where the superior invigorating aides of religion are wanting.[1]

This type of sentence is not used too frequently, however. Usually the lengthy sentences are of the loose type, and thus easily comprehended despite their length.

The relative clarity of the sermon becomes evident in its general structure. The theme of the sermon is announced early and remains clear throughout. The main divisions are also announced, and the transitions from division to division are indicated by clear transitional statements:

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 15.

"First I shall make a few remarks . . ."
"But this brings us to the second place . . ."
"We come now -- thirdly -- to apply . . ."

The transitions between the applications are not as clear as these, but the fact that a new phase is being discussed becomes apparent in the first sentence.

The clarity of the sermon is marred to some degree because of the difficulty of discovering the method employed in amplifying the first main division. While the speaker does state that the text is to be the "subject . . . of consideration," he gives no clue as to how he plans to use it. What he actually does is to use the important words of the text as bases upon which to build his ideas regarding government. However, he also develops ideas deduced from, rather than expressed in the text. The second main head has little connection with the text. Taking into consideration the fact that Hitchcock was discussing vital matters of immediate concern to his hearers, it is probable that his oral presentation was easier to follow.

Forcefulness.-Many expressions which appear to be abstract to the modern reader doubtless carried considerable connotative significance to the contemporary reader. They tend, nevertheless, to weaken the style. Some examples are given to illustrate the type of expression referenced to:

"the growing weight of public opinion."
"our continued complaints."
"repeated humble, but fruitless unregarded petitions."
"deep inwrought affection."
"unremitting attachment (to the House of Hanover.)
"ineffable toils, hardships, and dangers."
"all writers . . . but those of a rank, arbitrary, popish complexion."

Occasionally vigorous, colorful verbs add some forcefulness to the style, as for example:

> "Gladness fills their hearts and sparkles in their countenances."
> "Let us not divide and crumble into parties."
> "It greatly wounds the state."
> "the way to conciliate the affections."
> "when our liberties have been evidently struck at."
> "we have never forfeited . . .or voluntarily resign."

Long sentences usually tend to militate against forcefulness of style. In Hitchcock's sermon, however, the length is not due to diffuseness or mere verbiage, but to their being packed with pertinent material. This, together with good variety in the construction of the sentences, makes for a style that is strong and interesting. A few striking and strongly worded figures of speech add to this effect:

> But the united voice of America, with the solemnity of thunder and with accents piercing as the lighting, awakes your attention, and demands fidelity.[1]

> As a people we have ever been remarkably tender both of our civil and religious liberties; and 'tis hoped, the fervor of our regard for them, will not cool, till the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light.[2]

Taken as a whole therefore, Hitchcock's style can be said to be moderately forceful.

Impressiveness.-If it is true to say that style "will be subject to . . . the peculiar conditions surrounding the occasion,"[3] then an ornamental style certainly was out of place in May, 1774. Never had Boston been faced with

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 46.

[2]Ibid., p. 53.

[3]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 430.

such injustice and cruelty as would become its part on June 1, when the Boston Port Bill was to come into operation. The "people" wrote Samuel Adams, "receive this cruel edict with abhorrence and indignation."[1]

Under these conditions there was no need for "rhetoric." A clear and forceful setting forth of the justice of the colony's position was Hitchcock's purpose. Hence not many of the devices which make for impressiveness are employed.

Attention has already been drawn to a few forceful figures of speech used in the sermon.[2] Other figures of speech employed are:

Metaphor: ". . . to lead, advise in the more boisterous and alarming, as well as in the calm and temperate seasons."[3]

Simile: "The public good, the peace, and the prosperity of this province, ought ever to lie near to your heart, and be kept in view, as the pole star, by which all your debates . . . are to be directed."[4]

Aporia (doubting) "If I am mistaken in suspecting plans are forming and executing, subversive of our natural and charter rights, and privileges, and incompatible with every idea of liberty, all America is mistaken with me."[5]

Occasionally figures of language are brought into play, especially in the more emotional parts of the address:

Parallel structure: "And <u>if</u> they make use of their authoritity or the influence of their rank for

---

[1]Wells, <u>op. cit.</u>, II, 163. [2]Cf., <u>supra</u>, p. 198.

[3]Hitchcock, <u>ibid.</u>, p. 32. [4]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 50.

[5]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 47.

> any aim to aggrandize themselves, their posterity or friends by means thereof; if the selfish passions predominate and guide and determine their public conduct; if they are slaves to covetousness, ambition and effeminacy; if, led by flattering proposals, they are devoted to the meer (sic) will and arbitrary mandates of others greater and higher than themselves; if there be anything they are more solicitous to obtain or promote than the good of society . . ."[1]

Antithesis:

> "Our danger is not visionary, but real--Our contention is not about trifles, but about liberty, and property.[2]

Climax:

> "Our continued complaints, our repeated humble, but fruitless unregarded petitions and remonstrances -- and if I may be allowed the sacred allusion, our groanings, which cannot be uttered, are at once indications of our sufferings . . ."[3]

Frequently Hitchcock weaves well-known Biblical passages into the texture of his discourse without giving any indication of doing so. Such quotations are, of course, to be expected in a sermon; nevertheless, they also add to the impressiveness of the style:

> As a people we have ever been remarkably tender both of our civil and religious liberties; and 'tis hoped, the fervor of our regard for them, will not cool, till the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light.[4]

In summarizing the findings regarding Hitchcock's style, it can be said that though the vocabularly is reasonably simple and the sentence structure perspicuous for the

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 37.

[2]Ibid., p. 47.

[3]Ibid., p. 48.

[4]Ibid., p. 53.

most part, an occasional excessively long and complicated sentence, together with some obscurity in the structure of the sermon, prohibits classifying the sermon as clear.

The style is only moderately forceful because of the frequent use of abstract expressions and weak verbs. While devices which make a speech impressive are employed to some degree, their relatively infrequent occurrence does not justify classifying the style as impressive.

The Sermon and Later Developments

Hitchcock made three proposals regarding the political crisis which was developing as a result of the Coercive Acts. The first suggested to Governor Gage that he should side with the colony in repudiating "such orders from the higher servants of the crown, as would be inconsistent with our rights and privileges . . ."[1] That the appeal would fail was probably a foregone conclusion, though some did feel that the governor was a fair and lenient man.

The second proposal was addressed to the electors of the day. Unlike Andrew Eliot and Samuel Cooke, Gad Hitchcock was convinced that petitions and reasoning with parliament were useless procedures for securing redress of wrongs. He urged, nevertheless, that men be elected to the Council who were (1) disposed to restore the rights of the province, (2) acquainted with the powers of the Council and determined to maintain those rights and the constitution "undiminished

---

[1]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 43.

and entire." This advise was followed, for later the same day eighteen new men were elected to the Council though thirteen of these names were vetoed by the Governor because of their strong patriotic interests. Of course Hitchcock was not the first to take this position regarding the election and the futility of negotiating with Britain, but for a minister to take such a position, and that on such an important occasion, and in the presence of the governor, was indeed a bold and courageous act. It is not surprising that Gage took umbrage at the sentiments expressed.[1]

The third proposal is made in the address to the general public. While the citizens are to guard against a spirit of licentiousness, they are, nevertheless, to stand firmly for their rights and liberties. The speaker warned, "Let us not divide and crumble into parties. . . ."[2] There was danger of such division developing. Some felt that the East India Company should be compensated for the lost tea; on the other hand, Samuel Adams and his colleagues were calling for a strong stand against the British demands, and meeting with remarkable success.

In this election sermon Gad Hitchcock offered nothing new by way of solution for the dreadful plight in which the colony found itself. He was, however, casting his personal prestige and influence on the side of the people and their cause. His sermon while offering the church's justification

---

[1]Baldwin, op. cit., p. 122, note 3.

[2]Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 55.

for opposition to Great Britain, is also a fine example of a keynote address which probably crystallized the thinking of the great majority of the people of Massachusetts and of the American Colonies.

Summary

1. Gad Hitchcock (1718-1803) received the degrees B. A., M. A., and D. D. from Harvard College, and served as pastor of the West Church, Pembroke, Massachusetts, for over fifty years. In political sentiments he was an ardent Whig before the Revolution, and during that war served as a chaplain of the Revolutionary forces. He was also a member of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention. On May 25, 1774, Hitchcock delivered the election sermon at the invitation of the House of Representatives.

2. The burning of the "Gaspee" marked the beginning of a revival of the patriotic movement which had languished since the Boston Massacre. Following in quick succession were crises brought about by Hutchinson's decision to accept his salary from the crown, his subsequent removal from office, the Boston Tea Party, and the passage of the Boston Port Bill news of which reached the city a few days before the annual election. General Thomas Gage, the newly appointed governor, was in attendance at the election sermon.

3. Hitchcock's election sermon, based upon the text, "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn," considers the nature and end of civil government, and some

of the qualifications of rulers. The discussion of the first point leads up to a defence of the right of the people to resist tyranny, which was a vital issue just then. The second main division of the sermon considers four qualifications of good rulers: knowledge of the processes of government, knowledge of human nature, public spiritness, and Christian virtue.

4. Four applications are made of the doctrine of the sermon. The first concerns the election which was about to take place, its significance, and the importance of retaining the right of electing the Council. The second is an appeal to the governor to advance the good of the people even if this should involve rejecting orders from England. In the third application the electors are reminded of the seriousness of the times and of the importance of electing men to the Council who support the constitution and the rights of the people, and who will continue to foster the sympathetic interest of the other American colonies. Finally the people are called upon to stand for their rights but to retain their traditional respect for good government.

5. The speaker sought to get action in the matters urged upon rulers and people by stirring the feelings of indignation, fear, and religious confidence; and by appealing to such motives as the sense of fair play, justice, honor, the desire for a good reputation and to sentiments of patriotism and religious faith.

The style of the sermon is reasonably clear, moder-

ately forceful and impressive, and well suited to the temper of the audience, and to the political climate.

6. Little can be determined concerning the political impact of the sermon on the trend of events. The effort to win the governor to the side of the colony in its struggle with Parliament probably convinced Gage of the province's uncompromising attitude. Whether or not Hitchcock's appeal to the electors influenced them to choose eighteen patriots as councillors, the fact remains that he was urging a position of great political significance in the face of parliamentary action. Hitchcock recognized the futility of petitions and arguments, and though he does not state it in so many words, he implies that war with Great Britain was inevitable.

It seems fair to conclude that Hitchcock was a keen follower of Samuel Adams, and that his stand probably helped Adams to rally the people in their struggle which was so soon to follow.

CHAPTER IX

SAMUEL LANGDON'S ELECTION SERMON - 1775

Biographical Sketch

Samuel Langdon was born to Samuel and Esther Langdon in Boston on January 12, 1723. He attended the North Grammar school and entered Harvard College at thirteen years of age, graduating with honors in 1740. After a brief period of graduate study with the aid of a Thomas Hollis endowment he left to be the head of a grammar school in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Langdon pursued his theological studies privately, however, and acquired "a reputation of learning and piety."[1]

In 1745 Langdon was present as chaplain of a New Hampshire regiment at the capture of Fort Louisburg. On returning to Portsmouth he was asked to serve as the assistant pastor of the North Church, and was ordained the sole pastor two years later, a position he held until 1774. He became the leading minister in the area.

Langdon was skilled in geography and mathematics. In 1756 he drew a map of the state of New Hampshire at the request of the governor and this map became the basis of a

---

[1]Dumas Malone, ed., Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), X, 588.

map published in London in 1761. The latter map was dedicated to Charles Townshend, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, a "compliment which led directly to the degree Doctor of Theological Studies granted by the University of Aberdeen in 1762."[1]

In 1774 Langdon was elected President of Harvard College, an honor which, according to John Hancock, was awarded him because of his strong Whig sentiments.[2] His administration was, however, "a perpetual struggle with difficulties and embarrassments, amid the dangers of civil wars and the excitement of a political revolution."[3] After six years he resigned the presidency and spent the remaining years of his life as pastor of the Hampton Falls Church in New Hampshire.

Hampton Falls elected Langdon a representative to the State Constitutional Convention "where he manifested great ability as a debator, and did much towards removing prejudices that then existed against the Federal Constitution."[4]

The Reverend Langdon tended towards liberalism in his theology and was once charged with holding Arian views. As a teacher he was faithful and successful, though reported to have been severe in discipline. Regarding his intellectual powers it is claimed that:

---

[1]Malone, op. cit., p. 588. [2]Ibid.

[3]Josiah Quincy, quoted by Sprague, op. cit., I, 456.

[4]Ibid., p. 457.

> he was probably in 1774, at the age of fifty-one in most branches of knowledge the most learned and exact scholar of all New England. He had been eminent in college and a successful teacher, had cultivated mathematics and geography, astronomy and history, and collected a valuable library.[1]

As a minister Langdon was well liked by his congregation. The Reverend Dr. Benjamin Colman of the Brattle Street Church, Boston, commented on his "high character as a preacher."[2] Sprague says that

> his sermons were prepared with great care, and evinced no small ability. They were generally written in shorthand, with the exception of the text, and here and there a brief passage, which was in an uncommonly fair and legible character.[3]

Samuel Langdon died on November 29, 1797 at nearly seventy-five years of age. He was the author of fourteen published sermons, and of several essays and letters to the press.

The Political Situation in 1775

On June 2, 1774, the day after the Boston Port Bill went into effect, official word of the Boston Government Act was received. The act stated:

> Effective 1 Aug., members of the Council . . . were to be appointed by the king and hold office at royal pleasure. Effective 1 July, the attorney general, inferior judges, sheriffs, and justices of the peace, became appointable and removable by the Governor. The Governor was also empowered to nominate the Chief Justice and superior judges for appointment by the king. Juries were to be summoned by the sheriff rather than elected by the people of the towns. Finally, in a move designed to deprive the radicals of their most effective medium, the town meeting, the

---

[1] Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, Second Series (Boston: The Society, 1905), XVIII, 206.

[2] Sprague, op. cit., II, 456. [3] Ibid.

> act provided that meetings in addition to the annual election session could not be held without the prior written consent of the Governor and, if approved, must be confined to the agenda which he approved.[1]

Immediately after the official opening of the 1774 session of the General Court, Governor Gage announced his decision to transfer the General Court to Salem. In Salem the lower House, meeting behind locked doors, passed a resolution calling for a general congress of the American colonies. This was agreed to and the first Continental Congress convened in Philadelphia September 5 to October 26, 1774. Congress approved Massachusetts' decision not to pay for the tea, voted to cease all commercial intercourse with England, petitioned the king to intervene with Parliament on behalf of the colonies, warned Gage that force would be met with force, and laid plans for another meeting of the Continental Congress on May 10, 1775.

Meanwhile the Massachusetts General Court, which had been prorogued by the governor on October 7, 1774, constituted itself a Provincial Congress and proceeded to lay plans for the defence of the colony against Gage. A Committee of Safety was created under the leadership of John Hancock and the militia and Minutemen were orangized as fighting units. Before dissolving itself the First Provincial Congress sent out instructions for the election of representatives to the Second Provincial Congress which was to be convened on February 5, 1775.

---

[1]Richard B. Morris, ed., Encyclopedia of American History (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953), p. 82.

On April 19, General Gage dispatched a task force to Concord with orders to destroy supplies of arms and ammunition belonging to the patriots. Warned by Paul Revere, the Minutemen were lined up on the Lexington Common when the British forces arrived. The latter opened fire, killing and wounding a number. Thus the war for independence began. On April 23, the Provincial Congress authorized raising of an army of 13,600 men and also appealed to the other colonies for assistance. On May 10, 1775, General Ethan Allen captured Fort Ticonderoga and Crown Point on the Canadian border and a few days later Benedict Arnold captured St. John, which was over the border in Canada.

On the last Wednesday of May, 1775, the Provincial Council met in Watertown, Massachusetts, to open the legislative year according to custom, though there could, of course, be no election of Councillors. Harvard's President, Doctor Samuel Langdon preached the sermon of the day.

Précis of the Sermon

The Text

> And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called the City of Righteousness, the faithful City.[1]

The Opening of the Text

The speaker opens his sermon by rehearsing the events which led up to the Battle of Lexington, and is careful to prove that the British forces had fired the first shots. The

---

[1]Isaiah 1:26.

theme of the sermon, that God rules in all events, "setting up or pulling down, the kings of the earth," is developed under three heads:

1. For the sins of a people God may suffer the best government to be corrupted or entirely dissolved.
2. Nothing but a general reformation can give good grounds to hope that the public happiness will be restored.
3. Divine providence will interpose to fill every department of government with wise and good men.

Body of the Sermon

Originally the Jews had a perfect republic; the heads of the tribes and of the towns constituted the Council, public affairs were managed in harmony with the will of the people, God was the head and lawgiver. Because of incurable corruption, however, part of the Jewish people, the Kindgom of Israel, were carried away into captivity. The rest of the nation, Judah, is described by Isaiah as also being in a corrupt state. For this she suffered exile but was returned to her homeland when a reformation took place.

Similarly Great Britain is experiencing trouble because of corruption; religion is a mere form, vice is rampant among the people and rulers, luxury is indulged in to excess, and now she is making war on her own colonies. England is therefore doomed unless a reformation takes place.

America also suffers because of such evils as formality in religion, luxurious living, and corruption in government. Reformation will surely bring relief.

The Massachusetts government has been replaced by an arbitrary military government. To this kind of slavery

which is worse than death the colony is determined not to yield. In terms of the laws of nature a people without government may form themselves into a society satisfactory to themselves; if the existing form of government proves unsuitable the people may, by common consent, put an end to it and set up another; furthermore, if rulers betray their trusts they may be discarded and others placed in their positions.

Providential guidance has been evident in the affairs of Massachusetts: the Committees of Correspondence have proven to be remarkable instruments for the preservation of free governments, the people have accepted the advice and direction of the Continental Congress as if they were authentic acts of a long established parliament, and despite ten months without government there have been no serious crimes or civil cases.

It is necessary, however, that a proper government be formed soon for the purpose of prosecuting the war as well as for the regular conduct of the affairs of the state. To constitute such a government is the responsibility of the Provincial Congress.

The Conclusion

God is to be praised for the successes of the army, especially at the recent action of Chelsea. If God is for us, who can be against us? It is essential, however, that the people and the army keep themselves free from wickedness for then God will hear and save the nation.

Analysis of the Sermon

The Invention

Choice of the sermon text.-

> And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called the city of Righteousness, the faithful City.

The choice of text was particularly appropriate. Less than a year previously Massachusetts had been deprived of her charter right to elect the Governor's Council, a right which had always been considered a guarantee of the province's liberty within the British commonwealth. Thus the text touches upon a question most vital to the audience and for which the Assembly was hoping to find some answer at this session.

Introductory statement.-Instead of following the usual procedure of opening the sermon by giving the setting of the text, Langdon commences by narrating the events which had led up to the meeting of the Provincial Congress in Watertown. The following points are made:

1. The colony is sad because of the present situation regarding the annual election of the Council.
2. The constitution of the colony is undermined.
3. New England is threatened with oppression.
4. The election privilege has been destroyed.
5. Boston's trade has been destroyed.
6. The people of the colony were attacked and killed at Lexington.
7. The leaders did their best to avoid this situation.
   a. Arguments were published in the newspapers.
   b. They made humble petitions and remonstrances.
   c. British friends interceded on their behalf.
8. The king has given Massachusetts up to the rage of his ministers.

The narration of the Lexington affair was in itself sufficient

to arouse indignation at the oppressive actions of the British government. The feeling is intensified, however, by the use of emotionally loaded words and expressions. Note, for example, the emotional language with which the sermon opens:

> Shall we rejoice, my Fathers and Brethren, or shall we weep together, on the return of this Anniversary, which from the first settlement of the Colony has been sacred to Liberty, to perpetuate that invaluable privilege of chusing, from among ourselves, wise men, fearing God, and hating covetousness, to be honorable Counsellors, to continue our essential branch of that happy government which was established on the faith of the royal Charters.[1]

The following list of expressions further illustrates Langdon's effort to arouse the indignation of his hearers:

> our Metropolis, which now is made, alas! is made a garrison of mercenary troops, the stronghold of despotism.
>
> they have . . . endeavored to terrify us with fleets and armies . . .
>
> they (the British troops) acted the part of Robbers and Savages by burning, plundering, and damaging . . .
>
> the machinations of wicked men
>
> But our King . . . is resolved to reason with us only by the roar of his Cannon, and the pointed arguments of musquets and bayonets.[2]

The theme of the sermon.-The preacher, after asking his audience to excuse him from considering the words of the text in "a doctrinal way," states that he will discuss the matter to which the text leads:

---

[1]Samuel Langdon, Election Sermon (Watertown: Edes, 1775), p. 5.

[2]Ibid., pp. 6-10.

> We must keep our eyes fixed on the supreme government of the Eternal King, as directing all events, setting up or pulling down, the kings of the earth at his pleasure, suffering the best forms of human government to degenerate and to go to ruin by corruption; or restoring the decayed constitutions of kingdoms and states, by reviving public virtue and religion, and granting the favorable interposition of his providence.[1]

Main divisions of the sermon.-Langdon announced the main heads under which he proposed to discuss his theme in the following passage:

> Let us consider -- That for the sins of a people God may suffer the best government to be corrupted, or entirely dissolved; and that nothing but a general reformation can give good ground to hope that the public happiness will be restored by the recovery of the strength and perfection of the state, and that divine providence will interpose to fill every department with wise and good men.[2]

The Arrangement: Supporting the theme

The first main division.-The background of the text upon which the sermon is based serves to support Langdon's first proposition which asserts that "for the sins of a people God may suffer the best government to be corrupted, or entirely dissolved."

a. The situation in Israel when Isaiah prophesied.
   1. The northern kingdom had been destroyed because of iniquity.
   2. The southern kingdom was carried into captivity because of corruption, but was restored after reformation.

B. The political history of Israel briefly reviewed.
   1. Originally the Jews had a perfect republic.
      a. The heads of the tribes and the elders of the towns constituted a Council.
      b. Public affairs were managed in terms of the voice of the people.

---

[1] Langdon, op. cit., p. 10.

[2] Ibid., pp. 10-11.

c. Virtue prevailed.
d. Originally there was no king.

2. The effects of this form of government were:
   a. The rulers were concerned with the public good.
   b. The strictest regard was paid to the qualifications of those who held office.
   c. Virtue prevailed.
   d. Everything was managed with justice, prudence, and frugaltiy.
   e. Laws were founded on principles of equity.
3. Isaiah describes the increase of vice and corruption practiced in Judah.
   a. Religion became a mere ceremony.
   b. Laws of common justice and humanity were disregarded in the courts.
   c. The councillors and judges were corrupt and tyrannical.
4. The people felt the conequences of corruption, and doubtless complained, suffered, and hoped for a change.
5. The ruin of the nation came when Judah was carried into captivity.
6. When the nation repented God allowed it to return to Palestine.

This narration of the history of the Jews is a matter of Biblical record and was well known to the audience. The speaker significantly prefaces his description of the results of corruption by saying: "Doubtless they (the people) complained much of men in power, and very heartily and liberally reproached them for their notorious conduct." This statement indicates that the description which follows is based upon conjecture and is obviously an effort to make the Biblical history an exact parallel of the current situation. The same is done in connection with his description of the corruption of the rulers in the following parallel passages in the first chapter of Isaiah to which the speaker refers:

Isaiah	Langdon
Thy princes are rebellious, and companions of	Their princes were rebellious against God, and the

> thieves: every one loveth gifts, and followeth after rewards: they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come up unto them.
>
> constitution of their country, and companions of thieves, giving countenence for every artifice for seizing the property of the subjects into their own hands, and robbing the public treasury. Every one loved gifts and followed after rewards; they regarded the perquisites more than the duties of their office; the general aim was at profitable places and pensions; they were influenced in everything by bribery; and their avarice and luxury were never satisfied but hurried them on to all kinds of oppression and violence, so that they even justified and encouraged the murder of innocent persons to support their lawless power, and increase their wealth.[1]

The second main division.-The purpose of this part of the sermon is given in the transitional statement:

> By all this we may be led to consider the true causes of the present remarkable troubles which are come upon Great-Britain and these colonies: and the only effectual remedy.[2]

A. The cause of Great Britain's troubles.
   1. She has rebelled against God, and the gospel.
      a. Worship is a mere form.
      b. Immortality abounds.
   2. Her political system is corrupt.
      a. Titles of dignity are without virtue.
      b. Public money is lavished on corrupt practices.
      c. The monarch has become absolute.
      d. Liberties of the people are destroyed.
      e. The balance of power is destroyed.
      f. Votes are purchased.
   3. Public luxury and pleasure seeking squanders money which could be used to pay the national debt.

---

[1]Isaiah 1:23, and Langdon, op. cit., pp. 15-16.

[2]Langdon, op. cit.

4. She is making war on her own colonies.
5. The only remedy lies in reformation.

B. The cause of America's troubles.
1. Much of the religion of the fathers has been lost.
2. Religion has become mere formality.
3. Luxury is indulged to excess.
4. Profaneness, intemperance, unchastity, love of pleasure, fraud, and avarice are prevalent.
5. Rulers are influenced by bribery, and flattery. There is no integrity and impartiality.
6. As a result America is being punished.
a. The nation is forced to make war.
b. Many are being held captive in Boston.
7. The remedy lies in reformation and the revival of true religion.

No evidence is offered for statements regarding the corruption in English politics probably because American papers had been publishing stories concerning the luxury, vote buying, and other evils for some time.[1] Of course the Boston Port Bill and the Government of Massachusetts Act constituted evidence of depravity and corruption of Parliament.

The misdemeanors and sins of America as described by Langdon seem formidable. He is careful to note, however, that America's sins "are not as bad as among other nations."[2] It is interesting to observe that Langdon's catalogue of evils is similar to the lists which were reiterated year after year in the election sermons of the late seventeenth century when "jeremiads" were popular.[3]

Despite his misgivings regarding England's moral

---

[1]J. C. Miller, op. cit., pp. 424-427.

[2]Langdon, op. cit., p. 19.

[3]Perry Miller, The New England Mind: From Colony to Province, Chapter 2.

rectitude, Langdon follows the Continental Congress in hoping that a reconciliation between Britain and her colonies will be effected "so that the colonies may again enjoy the protection of their sovereign, with perfect security of their natural rights, and civil and religious liberties."[1] The rulers are exhorted to pray for the blessing of heaven, but also to use "their best endeavors to preserve and restore the civil government of this colony, and defend America from slavery."[2]

Contrary to the common practice of Puritan preachers, Langdon's sermon is not devoid of emotionalism in the first part of the body. By pointing out the sinful condition of England and the dire results of that condition, especially the result of her tax policy, the emotion of indignation was undoubtedly stirred. Strong language intensifies the material presented. Note the exclamations, the forceful verbs, and the colorful nouns and adjectives.

> Into what fatal policy has the nation been impelled by its vices! To wage a cruel war with its own children in these colonies, only to gratify the lust of power, and the demands of extravagance! May God, in his great mercy recover Great Britain from this fatal infatuation; shew them their errors; and give them a spirit of reformation. May the eyes of the king be opened to see the ruinous tendency of the measures into which he has been led, and his heart inclined to treat his American Subjects with justice and clemency, instead of forcing them still farther to the last extremities! God grant some method may be found out to effect a happy reconciliation, so that the colonies may again enjoy the protection of their sovereign, with perfect security

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 19.

[2]Ibid., p. 22.

of all their natural rights, and civil and religious liberties.[1]

By referring to the Governor's refusal to allow many Bostonians to leave the city as a violation of his plighted honor, Langdon again appeals to the emotion of indignation. The rest of the second sub-division consists of appeals to the motive of religious duty and fidelity.

Third main division.-Finally Samuel Langdon undertakes to show that "divine providence will interpose to fill every department (of government) with wise and good men."[2]

A. A new government for Massachusetts is now necessary.
   1. The late government has become a military dictatorship.
   2. Those in opposition to the dictatorship have been labelled rebels, and can expect no mercy except "by yielding property and life at discretion."
   3. The colony has taken up arms in self defence.
B. In terms of natural law this situation can be rectified.
   1. "A body of people destitute of order, may form themselves into a civil society . . . and so provide for their common safety and advantage."
   2. The people may alter their form of government if it is found to be unsuitable.
   3. Officers of government may be discarded if "they forget their duty, betray their trust, and sell their country."
C. Supernatural influences have preserved a form of free government in the interregnum.
   1. The universally adopted plans of committees of correspondence and congresses have preserved order.
   2. The judgments and advice of the Continental Congress have been universally respected.
   3. Though ten months have elapsed since Massachusetts had a General Court session, order has be remarkably preserved.
   4. The Provincial Congress has enjoyed the respect and confidence of the people.
D. It is necessary to institute a proper form of government in Massachusetts.

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 19. [2]Ibid., p. 11.

1. This is the task of the present Provincial Congress.
2. Providence indicates that God approves of such a plan.

Here Langdon presents what he apparently considers the most important task of the session -- the initiation of a new government for Massachusetts. Justification for the break with Britain had been presented, and now he presents the rational basis for the authority to form a new government. Langdon finds his rationale in the law of nature and government by compact. Self preservation and reputation are the motives appealed to for action.

> But is it proper or safe for the colony to continue much longer in such perfect order? Must it not appear rational and necessary, to every man that understands the various movements requisite to good government, that the many parts should be properly settled, and every branch of the legislative and executive authority restored to that order and vigor on which the life and health of the body politic depend?[1]

The reputation of the rulers for wisdom, public spiritedness, and virtue is also used as motivating elements in his appeals:

> On your wisdom, religion, and public spirit, Honored Gentlemen, we depend, to determine what may be done as to the important matter of reviving the form of government, and settling all necessary affairs relating to it in the present critical state of things . . .[2]

An effort to stir the emotions of confidence in divine leadership to assist with the task is made by reference to the "evident tokens of the divine presence with the former congress; that they were led to foresee present exigencies,

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 26. [2]Ibid.

and make such effectual provision for them."[1]

The Conclusion

A. God is to be praised for the advantages already given, especially the victory at Chelsea.
B. "If God be for us who can be against us."
   1. God is for America because
      a. Their cause is righteous.
      b. They are serious Christians.
   2. God is against the English forces because "their mouths are full of horrid blasphemies, cursing and bitterness, and vent all the rage of malice and barbarity."[2]
C. The Lord will support the cause of Massachusetts as,
   1. He did for his people in ancient days.
   2. He did for the early fathers of America.

The conclusion of the sermon is a highly emotional appeal to religious confidence and to anger at the enemy. The language here borders on vituperation. The following passage with its references to ancient miraculous deliverances and its stirring Biblical passages is an example of the emotionalism employed.

> Then the Lord will be our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble; and we shall have no reason to be afraid though thousands of enemies set themselves against us round about,--tho' all nature should be thrown into tumult and convulsions. He can command the stars in their courses to fight his battles, and all the elements to wage war with his enemies. He can destroy them with innumerable plagues, or send faintness into their hearts, so that the men of might shall not find their hands.[2]

The sermon is closed with a prayer that God will help as "we . . . rejoice in his salvation, and in the name of our Lord we will set up our banners."[3]

Language

Clarity.-Langdon's vocabulary is relatively simple,

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 27. [2]Ibid. [3]Ibid.

only about seven percent being of words of three or more syllables. The following list of such words indicates that even the longer words could not have been, for the most part, beyond the immediate comprehension of an audience consisting of New England legislators:

essential
melancholy
subjugate
interposition
perquisites
extravagance
metropolis
subversive
machinations
pageantry
infatuation

Many of the nouns and adjectives employed are highly connotative, especially when read with the political situation in mind:

"our metropolis is made a garrison of mercenary troops."
"the stronghold of despotism."
"melancholy change"
"formidable military preparation"
"the inhabitants were murderously killed"
"rapacious commanders"
"enormous vices"
"devouring servants"
"fatal policy," "fatal infatuation,"
"plighted honor"
"popish machinations"

The speaker tends to use long sentences. The average number of words per sentence is about twenty-seven, and the range is from three words to eighty-seven. Occasionally many ideas are packed into a sentence. Two examples follow.

> That we might not have it in our power to refuse the most absolute submission to their unlimited claim of authority, they have not only endeavored to terrify us with fleets and armies sent to our capital, and distressed and put an end to our trade -- particularly that important branch of it, the fishery -- but at length attempted, by a sudden march of a body of troops in the night, to seize and destroy one of our magazines, formed by the people merely for their own safety.[1]

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 7.

The following sentence of eighty-seven words is further complicated by separating the two main parts of the sentence by several adverbial clauses:

> We have used our utmost endeavors, by repeated humble petitions and remonstrances, -- by a series of unanswerable reasonings from the press, in which the dispute has been fairly stated, and the justice of our opposition clearly demonstrated. -- and by the mediation of some of the noblest and most faithful friends of the British constitution, who have powerfully plead (sic) our cause in parliament, -- to prevent such measures as may soon reduce the body politic to a miserable, dismembered, dying trunk, though lately the terror of all Europe.[1]

Notwithstanding a few such lapses into highly involved style, Langdon's sentences are more often the loose type and eminently suited to the formal type of address he was delivering.

The general organization of the sermon remains to be considered as a factor of clarity. Langdon's rhetorical order does not conform to the Ramus-Perkins type, but rather to the classical pattern as adapted by Keckermann.[2]

The theme of the sermon is clearly stated after the narration of the Battle of Lexington. This is followed by an announcement of the partition of the sermon, and the transitions between each part is indicated by a transitional statement, though these statements could have been clearer in some cases. The theme remains clear throughout.

To summarize: The vocabulary is relatively simple and probably well adapted to the audience. Clarity is some-

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 9.

[2]Cf. supra, p. 43.

what impaired, however, by the occasional use of excessively long and sometimes complicated sentences. Furthermore, some poor transitional statements and a lack of internal summaries tend to make comprehension difficult in parts. Nevertheless the theme remains clear, and the announced partition is followed faithfully.

Forcefulness.-The general impression received on first reading the sermon is that the language is forceful. Closer examination reveals that Langdon uses vivid, vigorous verbs.

> "They have multilated the charter"
> "bravely attacked and repulsed the enemy"
> "the arm of power is stretched out"
> "to compel us to submit"
> "whose noblest plan is to subjugate the colonies"
> "to terrify us with fleets and armies"
> "acted the part of robbers by burning, plundering and damaging almost every house"

The fact that an excellent use is made of connotative nouns as well as of bold and vital adjectives has already been referred to.

Vivid descriptions (hypotyposis) also contribute to the forcefulness of the sermon. This is particularly well illustrated in the beginning of the sermon where Langdon narrates the battle of Lexington. Exclamation, optatio, and ominatio are employed with good effect. An example follows:

> Into what fatal policy has the nation been impelled by its public vices! To wage a cruel war with its own children in these colonies, only to gratify the lust of power, and the demands of extravagance! May God in his great mercy recover Great Britain from this fatal infatuation; shew them their errors; and give them a spirit of reformation, before it is too late

to avert impending destruction.[1]

Impressiveness.-A factor which makes for impressiveness in Langdon's style is his quotation of sublime Biblical passages. Occasionally the quotations are given as such, as for example:

> Let us address you in the words of the prophet -- O Israel, return unto the Lord, thy God, for thou hast fallen by thy iniquity.[2]

Sometimes the Biblical language is woven into the text of the sermon itself:

> May we truly a holy people, and all our towns cities of righteousness! Then the Lord will be our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble; and we shall have no reason to be afraid though thousands of enemies set themselves against us round about,-- Tho' all nature shall be thrown into tumult and convulsion, he can command the stars in their courses to fight his battles, and all the elements to wage war with his enemies. He can destroy them with innumerable plagues, or send faintness into their hearts, so that men of might shall not find their hands. In a variety of methods he can work salvation for us, as he did for his people in ancient days . . .[3]

Langdon also employs the Old Testament type of parallelism, a parallelism of clauses:[4]

> On this day the people have from year to year assembled, from all our towns, in a vast congregation, with gladness and festivity, with every ensign of joy displayed in our Metropolis, which is now made, alas! is made a garrison of mercenary troops, the stronghold of despotism.[5]

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 19. [2]Ibid., p. 22.

[3]Ibid., pp. 27-28.

[4]For a discussion of Biblical parallelism cf. Richard G. Moulton's The Modern Reader's Bible (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945), pp. 1518-1524.

[5]Langdon, op. cit., p. 6.

The following is an example of the speaker's use of both modern and Hebrew parallelism.

> We have lived to see the time when British liberty is just ready to expire:-- when that constitution of government which has so long been the glory and strength of the British nation, is deeply undermined and ready to tumble into ruins;-- when America is threatened with cruel oppression, and the arm of power is stretched out against New England.[1]

Impressiveness is also achieved by the very frequent use of the rhetorical question (eperotesis). In fact the sermon opens with such a question.[2] An excellent example occurs in connection with the discussion of Britain's alleged degradation:

> But in what does the nation now glory?--in a mere shadow of its ancient political system?-- in titles of dignity without virtues?-- In vast public treasures continually lavished in corruption, till every fund is exhausted, notwithstanding the mighty stream perpetually pouring in?-- In the many artifices to stretch the prerogatives of the crown beyond all constitutional bounds, and make the king an absolute monarch, while the people are deluded with a meer phantom of liberty? What idea must we entertain of that government, if such an one can be found, which pretends to have made an exact counterbalance of power between the sovereign, the nobles and the commons, so that the three branches shall be an effectual check upon each other, and the united wisdom of the whole shall conspire to promote the national felicity; but which, in reality, is reduced to such a situation that it may be managed at the sole will of one court favorite? What difference is there betwixt one man's choosing, at his own pleasure, by his single vote, and his purchasing in such a majority, according to his own nomination, with money out of the public treasury, or other effectual methods in influencing elections?-- And what shall we say, if in the same manner, by places, pensions, and other bribes, a minister of state can be entirely subservient to his purposes; and moreover persuade his royal master to resign himself up wholly to the directions of

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., p. 6.

[2]Supra, p. 214.

> his counsels? If this should be the case of any nation from one seven years end to another the bargain and sale being made sure for such a period would they still have reason to boast of their excellent constitution?-- Ought they not rather to think it high time to restore the corrupt dying state to its original perfection?[1]

Figures of speech and examples also add to the impressiveness of Langdon's style:

Personification: "British liberty is just ready to expire."[2]

Illustration: ". . . he that arms himself to commit robbery, and demands the traveller's purse, by the terror of instant death, is the first aggressor, though the other should take the advantage of discharging his pistol first, and killing the robber."[3]

Metaphor: . . . to prevent such measures as may soon reduce the body politic to a miserable, dismembered, dying trunk, though lately the terror of all Europe.[4]

Personification combined with a pun: But our king . . . is resolved to reason with us only by the roar of his cannon, and the pointed arguments of musquets and bayonets.[5]

Simile: The king . . . has given us up to the rage of his Ministers, to be seized at sea by the rapacious commanders of every little sloop of war and piratical cutter, and to be plundered and massacred by land by mercenary troops, who know no distinction betwixt an enemy and a brother, between right and wrong; but only, like brutal pursuers, to hunt and seize the prey pointed out by their masters.[6]

To summarize the findings on Langdon's style: the vocabulary is accurate and relatively simple. Sentences

---

[1]Langdon, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

[2]Ibid., p. 6.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid., p. 9.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., p. 10.

tend to be long and complicated at times, but not enough to hamper comprehension. The general organization of the sermon is a negative factor with respect to clarity because of a lack of clear transitions and internal summaries. By the use of many strong verbs, colorful adjectives, and connotative nouns the sermon conveys a feeling of forcefulness. With regard to impressiveness the sermon may be classified as better than average. The rich Biblical language, frequent use of figures of speech and tropes serve to add to this quality of style.

The Sermon and Later Developments

Langdon's chief political objective in his election sermon was to have the Second Provincial Congress institute a new provincial government. This matter had been agitating the minds of the leaders for some time. On September 25, 1774, Samuel Adams had written to Joseph Warren from Philedelphia, "But whether they (Continental Congress) will ever be prevailed upon to think it necessary for you to set up another form of government, I very much question . . ."[1] On his way to Philadelphia for the Continental Congress John Adams had urged that Massachusetts make some such move, and on May 14, 1775, Warren wrote to Samuel Adams in Philedelphia suggesting that the Continental Congress then in session should sanction a new civil government in Massachusetts.

On June 2, 1755, Dr. Benjamin Church appeared in

---

[1]Wells, op. cit., II, 236-237.

Philadelphia with a letter from Watertown "asking advice and help in the formation of a new and permanent government for Massachusetts."[1] The Continental Congress responded a week later:

> Let Massachusetts . . . order an election of representatives to a new Provincial government in June of 1776. Then let these representatives name an upper house of twenty-eight from among their own number, to take the place of the old Governor's Council -- "which assembly and Council shall exercise the powers of Government, until a Governor, of His Majesty's appointment, will consent to govern the colony according to its charter.[2]

Since Langdon preached his sermon on May 30, the letter carried to the Continental Congress must have been written before that date. Thus Langdon was not advocating anything new or original.

The sermon as a whole is strongly patriotic and probably served to feed the fires of indignation against the British in Boston. The sermon was published and doubtless helped to consolidate the New Englanders whose patriotism was being called in question by a considerable loyalist element.

Summary

1. Samuel Langdon (1723-1797) received the B. A. and M. A. degrees from Harvard College and the D. D. degree from the University of Aberdeen. He taught grammar school, served as a pastor till 1774, and as President of Harvard College

---

[1]Catherine D. Bowen, op. cit., p. 525.

[2]Ibid., p. 528.

till 1780. He preached the election sermon in 1775, before the Second Provincial Congress.

2. The Boston Port Bill and the Government of Massachusetts Bill drove the patriot members of the General Court to organize a Provincial Congress and to call for a Continental Congress. The latter met in Philadelphia in September of 1774 and approved the stand taken by Massachusetts, warned General Gage that force would be met with force, voted to stop all intercourse with Great Britain until the Coercive Acts were repealed, and petitioned the king to intervene with his parliament on behalf of the colonies.

The Battles of Lexington and Concord took place on April 19, 1775. It was felt that these hostile acts on the part of General Gage constituted a complete break with England, though some of the representatives attending the Continental Congress believed that a reconciliation would eventually take place.

3. Langdon's election sermon was based on a prophecy by Isaiah that God "will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning." The sermon opens with an account of the political events leading up to and including the skirmish at Lexington. Judah and Israel are cited as examples of the results of corruption of a state -- destruction when no reformation takes place, but restoration when the nation repents. Great Britain and the colonies are taking a course similar to ancient Israel and the present suffering is the punishment for this deliquency.

The task before the Provincial Congress is to organize a new permanent government for Massachusetts.

Little or no argument is used in support of the assertions made in the sermon. Doubtless little was necessary since the speaker was repeating philosophies and doctrines well known to the audience, and referring to events of recent occurrence.

4. Langdon's strongest emotional appeal was to feelings if indignation against Great Britain and to religious confidence. Appeals for action are reinforced by stimulating the desire for national security and for a good reputation on the part of members of the house.

5. An analysis of the style indicates that though the vocabulary is relatively simple, the lengthy and sometimes complicated sentences, the lack of internal summaries, and the poor transitional statements combine to make the sermon somewhat difficult to comprehend. On the other hand Langdon used a style more forceful and impressive than did three of the previous preachers investigated in this study.

6. Langdon's chief political plea is for the formation of a permanent government in Massachusetts. It was found, however, that the colony had already taken steps to this end. Nevertheless the sermon probably served to strengthen the morale of the patriots.

PART IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER X

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLSUIONS

This study investigated Massachusetts election sermons from two points of view. The first dealt with the origin and development of the sermon; the training, prestige, and political interests of the preachers; the nature of the activities and ceremonies connected with election days in Boston; and the type of audiences which normally attended election day services.

The second phase of the study consisted of a rhetorical analysis of the election sermons delivered by Jonathan Mayhew (1754), Andrew Eliot (1765), Samuel Cooke (1770), Gad Hitchcock (1774), and Samuel Langdon (1775).

General Summary

Election sermons were delivered annually before the Massachusetts General Court just prior to and in preparation for the election of the Governor's Council. The preachers for the occasion were appointed alternately by the Council and the House of Representatives. The sermons sought to give guidance concerning spiritual, social, and political problems confronting the legislators as they opened the legislative year. Furthermore, the speakers sought to influence the electors to make a wise choice of members to serve on

the Governor's Council.

In some measure the election sermons incorporated features of the deliberative type of address. That is to say, the sermons often developed points of view relating to legislative policy. To facilitate the investigation of this element, sermons were selected for analysis which were delivered at critical junctures in pre-Revolutionary Massachusetts, as indicated in the following table:

Speaker	Date	Political Crisis
Jonathan Mayhew	1754	The threat of war between England and France in North America.
Andrew Eliot	1765	Parliament passes the Stamp Act and Quartering Acts.
Samuel Cooke	1770	The Boston Massacre and the Repeal of the Stamp Act.
Gad Hitchcock	1774	Parliament passes the Boston Port Bill. Other Coercive Acts expected.
Samuel Langdon	1775	The opening of the Revolution with skirmishes at Lexington and Concord.

Mayhew's sermon, based on the text, "Well done thou good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful . . .," asserts that God originated government, that the purpose of government is to insure the happiness of the people, and that rulers are to fulfill their responsibilities with fidelity. He urges that in order to meet the French threat of war an effort should be made to form a closer union for self-defense, and the General Assembly should provide funds liberally in preparation for war.

Andrew Eliot, with an Old Testament incident as the basis for his sermon, discusses the qualifications of rulers

and the attitude of submission necessary in the people. He assumes that England imposed the Stamp tax because she had been misinformed concerning the situation in the colonies, and calls upon the leaders to rectify this matter. He further urges the electors to choose tried and capable men to serve on the Governor's Council

Samuel Cooke uses as his text, "He that ruleth over men, must be just, ruling in the fear of God," and emphasizes the importance of justice and righteousness in rulers. He warns against changing the constitutional status of the Council, urges the continuation of the non-importation policy until the tax inequity is completely rectified, and pleads for the abolition of slavery.

Gad Hitchcock addressed the General Court at the time when England began imposing the Coercive Acts as punitive measures against Massachusetts. He chose very aptly to comment on the text, "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice: but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn," and proceeds to consider the nature of civil government and some of the qualifications of rulers. To open his applications Hitchcock appeals to Governor Thomas Gage to support the Province in her protest against the Coercive Acts. He then calls upon the electors to choose councillors who will be sympathetic to the patriotic cause and admonishes the people to stand for their rights but nevertheless to maintain their respect for law and government.

Langdon delivered his election sermon very soon af-

ter the engagements at Lexington and Concord. He warns of the inevitable doom of corrupt nations and of the need of reformation in England if she is to avert that doom. Langdon further calls upon the Provincial Congress to institute a permanent government in Massachusetts and upon the people to refrain from evil while engaged in the struggle for liberty and honor.

The analysis of the five sermons involved an investigation of the forms of support used, the organization of the addresses, the motives appealed to for action, the emotions the speakers sought to stimulate, and the stylistic devices used to reinforce these persuasive efforts. Finally, attention was drawn to subsequent political events related to matters discussed in the sermons.

Conclusions

1. The practice of opening the legislative year with a religious service appears to have commenced in 1634 which was very soon after the first General Court was convened in Boston. The exact reason for the institution of a religious service to open the Massachusetts legislative year has not been determined. Since, however, the Puritan theory of government made the civil powers subservient to the church in matters of morals and religion, it would be logical for the General Court to have such a service. Moreover, the much revered Protestant Queen Elizabeth I attended such services in Westminister Abbey, and it would therefore be natural for the first rulers of Massachusetts, some of whom

lived during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to imitate the pious custom.

2. Election sermons had a place of importance in the Massachusetts political system. Since the clergy commanded so much authority in the Massachusetts theocracy, their public utterances would carry considerable weight. The first sermon of which there is a record was delivered by the Reverend John Cotton, and in it he tried to exercise his persuasive abilities in a political matter.

The election sermons were directly concerned with the election of the politically powerful upper house of the legislature, the Governor's Council. The preachers presented criteria to guide the electors in making their choices, and gave advice to prospective members of the Council concerning good government and legislation as related to religion and morals.

Another religio-political function of the clergy which came to be exercised through the election sermons was concerned with the doctrine of the covenant. In terms of this Puritan tenet, Congregational Church members were in covenant relationship with God. When the colony suffered reverses or calamities it was believed that these betokened divine displeasure because the terms of the covenant had been violated. It was the duty of the clergy to point out the particular violations and the steps that should be taken to regain divine favor. This duty of the clergy was initially undertaken on official fast days, but later became

a regular feature of election sermons. Though the covenant concept was changed when the new charter of 1691 removed the church-membership limitation of the franchise, the clergy continued to operate in terms of the old order for some decades, although with diminishing emphasis.

3. The Massachusetts election sermon preachers functioned as prophet-statesmen when delivering their sermons. The Puritans came to America with the purpose of setting up a Genevan type of theocracy in which the clergy would of necessity be the "spokesmen for God. A good deal of evidence exists to indicate that the Congregational clergy were regarded in this light at least up to the Revolution. The work of the ministry was known as the "exercise of prophecy." It will be recalled that William Perkins' work on preaching was titled The Art of Prophecying. It requires only a casual reading of Puritan sermons to realize the preachers greatly admired and imitated the Old Testament prophets and political system.

The New England clergy were expected to be more than pastors. The General Court looked to the clergy for guidance in legislative and legal matters very much as the rulers did to their prophets in Old Testiment times. A few instances are cited: in 1634, a question relating to the re-election of magistrates was referred to the ministers for consideration and advice; a year later a flag question was also referred to the ministers; in 1643, they were called upon to advise in a difficult legal case involving a widow's sow;

as late as 1679 the General Court, deeply concerned because of hardships suffered in the colony, called upon the body of the clergy to seek an answer to the questions, "What are the provoking evils of New England?" and "What is to be done that these evils may be reformed?"

The election sermons offered a unique opportunity for the preacher's function as a national prophet: the immediate audience was composed of the rulers of the colony and many of the most influential people; the message of the sermon eventually reached out into every part of the land by means of the printing press. The sermons were national in character since they discussed principles of government in relation to the requirements of the Christian ethic, gave advice concerning stirring national issues and difficult political problems, and were deeply concerned with the morals of rulers and people. These broad themes are reminiscent of the messages of the Old Testament prophets.

4. The content of the election sermons underwent considerable change after the new charter of 1691 came into effect. Towards the last third of the seventeenth century election sermons had become Jeremiads and included long lists of national sins and calls for reformation. The new charter necessitated a change in the philosophy which seemed to make the jeremiad type of sermon necessary. Moreover, the "age of enlightenment" demanded a more liberal approach to religious concepts. The preachers could not, of course, abandon Revelation, but they found a way of adapting Revelation to

John Locke's theories of government and to contemporary thinking. The result was a change of emphasis in the election sermons: whereas seventeenth century sermons were predominantly spiritual in content as for example Higginson's sermon outlined in Chapter III, the eighteenth century sermons became much more secular in their treatment of government. Mayhew's sermon is wholly concerned with government and current problems; Eliot devotes only one sub-division of his sermon to spiritual matters; Cooke discusses the religion of rulers in only one of the four main divisions of his sermon; and Hitchcock does so only in the second subdivision of the first main head. In the case of Langdon, however, the sermon reverts to the seventeenth century form.

5. Four of the five sermons analyzed in this study are arranged in the Perkins-Ramus pattern. It was shown in Chapter III that Perkins' adaptation of the Ramean doctrines to the art of preaching was followed consistently by election sermon preachers from 1663 to 1724. The analysis of the sermons in this study revealed that the same form of arrangement was evident in the sermons of Mayhew, Eliot, Cooke, and Hitchcock. Langdon's sermon, on the other hand, seemed to follow the classical arrangement as adapted to preaching by Keckermann. An effort was made to discover if Langdon was influenced by works in the classical rhetorical tradition such as John Witherspoon's Lectures on Moral Philosophy and Eloquence which was published just seven years

previously, but this could not be determined. All other sermons by Langdon which were available for examination, whether published before or after 1775, were found to be patterned after Perkins.

The custom of casting all election sermons in the Perkins mold certainly restricted the speakers' means of adapting their sermon arrangement to the data of their invention -- a process which is one of the criteria of effective speech composition.

6. The ideas advanced in the sermons were standardized to some extent. Individual ministers apparently felt that their discourses should include a discussion of the origin of government, the qualifications of good rulers, the duties of subjects towards their rulers, and the rewards of faithfulness in rulers. To meet these requirements the preachers were sometimes obliged to give "private interpretations" to their texts. Mayhew used his text in a truncated form, Cooke completely misapplied one of the two texts upon which the sermon is based. Hitchcock found it necessary to tack on some material after he had exhausted his text, and Langdon announced that he would not follow the custom of drawing his doctrine from the text.

7. In his capacity as spiritual advisor to the electors the preacher usually discussed the qualifications of good rulers. The thinking of the preachers in regard to the qualities requisite to good rulership was based upon concepts of government derived from the Bible and John Locke.

God was, they maintained, the originator of government and rulers are "ministers of God." Furthermore, God's purpose in instituting government was to secure the happiness of His creatures, and therefore rulers who are in reality "ministers of God" will strive to achieve the happiness of their subjects. Happiness, according to Locke, consists of (a) the enjoyment of natural rights such as life, property, and freedom of conscience, (b) the exercise of civil rights including freedom of speech and of assembly, the right to resist arbitrary power, the right of migration, and civil supremacy over the militia, and (c) government by consent of the governed. Good rulers will guard all these rights of the people and apply them with justice and impartiality.

The preachers maintained further that only men of Christian virtue can successfully administer proper government. Good rulers will therefore support the church by legislation and personal example.

After discussing these general qualifications of rulers the speakers each considered qualifications necessary to meet the specific political problems facing the legislators: inasmuch as Mayhew sought to prepare the rulers for the conflict with France, he called for patriotism, faithfulness, and religious integrity as desirable qualities in rulers. Eliot's burden was that certain tried and capable men should be re-elected to the Council in view of the Stamp Act crisis. He therefore emphasized such qualities as knowledge of the constitution and processes of government as well

as wisdom to govern in difficult times. Cooke delivered his sermon when relations with England were severely strained because of the Boston Massacre and the tax situation. He therefore stressed patriotism, justice, and the fear of God as necessary qualities in rulers. Hitchcock faced a situation arising out of the passage of the Boston Port Bill and the apparent inevitability of a break with Great Britain. Hence Hitchcock emphasized such qualities as patriotism, public spiritedness, and knowldege of the constitution, government, and the people. Langdon urged the Provincial Congress to organize a new government for Massachusetts and in doing so to appoint rulers who are wise, public spirited, and possessed of Christian integrity.

8. There are indications that by mid-eighteenth century the preachers no longer strictly dichotomized their sermons into distinct conviction and persuasive elements. The Perkins-Ramean dichotomy is readily seen in Higginson's election sermon of 1663 where emotional appeals are confined to the applications. Mayhew, on the other hand, injects motivating ideas into the conviction part of the sermon when he gives "arguments whereby rulers should be induced to exercise their power with fidelity." The "arguments" are actually motivating ideas. Eliot stays very close to the Ramean form though he does digress once or twice in order to warn or advise when the development of his theme impinges on a critical political situation. Cooke so develops his theme as to speak quite directly and with emotion of the Boston

massacre. Hitchcock could not resist the temptation to speak of current events and problems; he refers to the "operation of ministerial unconstitutional measures" which cause the people to mourn. Langdon departs completely from the Ramean system by opening his sermon with a fine example of the classical exordium and by weaving emotional material into every part of the sermon.

9. Technically speaking, the election sermons were not deliberative addresses. In some respects the election sermons resemble deliberative address and measure up to the highest standards for this type of public speaking. Applying Thonssen and Baird's criteria for deliberative oratory that the speaker recognizes his obligation to embrace a knowledge of the facts and that he have worthy ethical standards together with a sense of the public good, it is clear that the five sermons studied are representative in these respects. A review of current political events was undertaken prior to analyzing each sermon and in each case it was found that the preachers were keenly aware of developments and did not fail to address themselves to the pressing problems of the day.

As clergymen and patriots the speakers could not and did not employ unethical methods of persuasion, or suggest procedures which were not of the highest moral caliber. While it is true that Mayhew employed vituperative language against Catholic priests, and Langdon did similarly against the British forces in Boston, it must be remembered that they were railing against organizations considered to be enemies

of their country. Doubtless this language was employed to arouse the indignation of the people and served as a morale-stiffening device. It was not demagoguery, but was done in all sincerity and with a patriotic interest in the welfare of the province.

That the speakers had the welfare of the people at heart hardly needs comment. Mayhew's concern was to preserve the British-American colonies from foreign dominance; Eliot supported the popular outcry against "taxation without representation," and sought to preserve unity and peace within the province; Cooke seems to have foreseen the effects of taxation, no matter how insignificant, and sought to avert further unrest. He also took a strong position against slavery. Hitchcock, the arch-patriot among election sermon preachers, realizing a break with England was inevitable, called for the electors to choose councillors who would be true patriots. He also urged the people to stand for their rights and liberties without abandoning their respect for law and government. Langdon was concerned for the safety of the state and called for the early formation of a permanent government in Massachusetts so that the righteous cause of the colonies could be effectively defended.

While the five election sermon preachers successfully met the highest demands set for deliberative oratory, the fact remains that they were not politicians who could be required to defend their policies in the rough-and-tumble of political debate, nor was their political life staked upon the quality of their statesmanship. On the contrary,

the preachers possessed a prestige, tenure, and an ethical advantage which elevated them above criticism and contradiction. Moreover their policies were not really debatable, as will be shown in the next section.

10. The solutions offered by the preachers for political problems were not, in most instances, original or new. The proposals for the solution of political problems made in the election sermons had either been made previously by other persons, or had been discussed by the General Court: Mayhew's proposals had been made first by The Board of Trade in London and had also been discussed by the General Court earlier that year; Eliot repeated ideas which had been set forth in a pamphlet by James Otis some months earlier; Cooke's concern for the status of the Council and his plea for the continuation of the non-importation plan merely echoed the stand taken on these matters by Samuel Adams. Hitchcock also followed Adams even to the extent of advocating a break with England. Langdon's burden for the formation of new government had been proposed by John Adams and discussed by the Provincial Congress some months before.

A probable justification for this procedure on the part of the preachers was that the political problems they discussed had been so thoroughly explored in pamphlets, broadsides, essays in journals, and sermons that little that was new remained to be added.

A further reason may lie in the clergy's training in the use of Biblical authority as a basis for all their think-

ing. Following the Ramean method and in harmony with their function as prophets, they would choose, from among various policies being advocated, those which conformed to the dictates of Revelation and sound reason, and then present them as representing divine will.

11. The effect of the pre-Revoluntionary crises was to revitalize and envigorate the election sermons. Before approximately 1750, the sermons consisted of abstract theorizing about government in a rather perfunctory though able manner. But beginning with Mayhew in 1754, the sermons play an active part in public affairs. No longer are the preachers content to theorize. They now apply their theories to the problems of the day and offer suggestions and solutions. Consequently the style became more direct, vigorous, and forceful.

The nature of the election sermons precludes comparison with the world's great oratory. The sermons were neither deliberative, forensic, nor epideictic. They were, rather, a unique phenomenon, peculiar to New England. The subject matter gave opportunity for deliberative oratory, but in method of composition and structure they were hamstrung by the speakers' loyalty to Ramus. Thus the sermons belonged to an era which had been superceded by the eighteenth century "enlightenment."

Furthermore the rationale for election sermons was initially based upon theocratic principles of government. In 1691, the process of separating church and state was initiated by the Crown in Massachusetts and, though the imple-

mentation of the concept was slow in being realized, its relentless progress finally destroyed the election sermon tradition in 1884. Nevertheless, election sermons continued to play a part in Massachusetts political life for nearly two hundred years after the new charter took the first step in favor of religious tolerance and political liberty. Through the years covered, at least until the Revolution, the sermons provide useful commentaries on contemporary events and demonstrate how, by the art of public speaking, the clergy were able to rally the populace in the struggle for independence.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LIBRARIES HOLDING ELECTION SERMONS

American Antiquarian Society
British Museum
Boston Public Library
Connecticut Historical Society
Congregational Library, Boston
Connecticut State Library
Essex Institute
Harvard College Library
Harold G. Rugg
Hall Park McCullough
John Carter Brown Library
John Hinsdale Scheide
Lemuel A. Wells
Library of Congress
Library Company of Massachusetts
Massachusetts Historical Society
New Hampshire Historical Society
New Hampshire State Library
Newberry Library
New York Historical Society
New York Public Library
Piquot Library
Union Theological Seminary
University of Vermont
University of Vermont, Wilbur Collection
Vermont Historical Society
Vermont State Library
Watkinson Library
William G. Mather Collection (Tracy W. McGregor), University of Virginia
William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan
Yale College Library

APPENDIX B

MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION SERMONS 1634 - 1775

1634 John Cotton
1635 None preached
1636 None preached
1637 Thomas Shepard
1638 Thomas Shepard
1639 None preached
1640 None preached
1641 Nathaniel Ward
1642 None preached
1643 Ezekiel Rogers
1644 Richard Mather
1645 John Norton
1646 Edward Norris
1647 None preached
1648 Zechariah Symmes
1649 Thomas Cobbet
1650-1655 None preached
1656 Charles Chauncy
1657 John Norton
1658 Jonathan Mitchel
1659 John Eliot
1660 Richard Mather
1661 John Norton
1662 None preached
1663 John Higginson-first printed
1664 Richard Mather
1665 John Russell
1666 Thomas Cobbet
1667 Jonathan Mitchel
1668 William Stoughton
1669 John Davenport
1670 Samuel Danforth
1671 John Oxenbridge
1672 Thomas Shepard
1673 Urian Oakes
1674 Samuel Torrey
1675 Joshua Moody
1676 William Hubbard
1677 Increase Mather
1678 Samuel Phillips
1679 James Allen
1680 Edward Bulkley
1681 William Brimsmead
1682 Samuel Willard
1683 Samuel Torrey
1684 John Hale
1685 William Adams
1686 Michael Wigglesworth
1687-1688 None preached
1689 Cotton Mather
1690 Cotton Mather
1691 None preached
1692 Joshua Moody
1693 Increase Mather
1694 Samuel Willard
1695 Samuel Torrey
1696 Cotton Mather
1697 John Danforth
1698 Nicholas Noyes
1699 Increase Mather
1700 Cotton Mather
1701 Joseph Belcher
1702 Increase Mather
1703 Solomon Stoddard
1704 Jonathan Russell
1705 Joseph Easterbrooks
1706 John Rogers
1707 Samuel Belcher
1708 John Norton
1709 Grindal Rawson
1710 Ebenezer Pemberton
1711 Peter Thacher
1712 Samuel Cheever
1713 Samuel Treat
1714 Samuel Danforth
1715 Jeremiah Shepard
1716 Benjamin Wadsworth
1717 Roland Cotton
1718 Benjamin Colman
1719 William Williams
1720 Nathanael Stone
1721 Samuel Moodey
1722 John Hancock
1723 Benjamin Colman

1724 Joseph Sewall
1725 Ebenezer Thayer
1726 Peter Thacher
1727 Joseph Baxter
1728 Robert Breck
1729 Jeremiah Wise
1730 Thomas Prince
1731 Samuel Fisk
1732 John Swift
1733 Samuel Wigglesworth
1734 John Barnard
1735 John Prentice
1736 Edward Holyoke
1737 Israel Loring
1738 John Webb
1739 Peter Clark
1740 William Cooper
1741 William Williams
1742 Nathaniel Appleton
1743 Nathanael Eells
1744 James Allen
1745 Ebenezer Gay
1746 John Barnard
1747 Charles Chauncy
1748 Daniel Lewis
1749 William Balch
1750 Samuel Phillips
1751 William Welsteed
1752 None preached
1753 John Cotton
1754 Jonathan Mayhew
1755 Samuel Checkley
1756 Samuel Cooper
1757 Ebenezer Pemberton
1758 Thomas Frink
1759 Joseph Parsons
1760 Samuel Dunbar
1761 Benjamin Stevens
1762 Abraham Williams
1763 Thomas Barnard
1764 None preached
1765 Andrew Eliot
1766 Edward Barnard
1767 Ebenezer Bridge
1768 Daniel Shute
1769 Jason Haven
1770 Charles Chauncy
1771 John Tucker
1772 Moses Parsons
1773 Charles Turner
1774 Gad Hitchcock
1775 Samuel Langdon
1775 William Gordon

APPENDIX C

MR. ELIOT'S

E L E C T I O N - S E R M O N

May 29, 1765

A

S E R M O N

Preached Before His Excellency

FRANCIS BERNARD, Esq;

GOVERNOR,

The Honorable

HIS MAJESTY'S COUNCIL

And The Honorable

HOUSE of REPRESENTATIVES,

Of the Province of the

MASSACHUSETTS-BAY in NEW-ENGLAND

May 29th 1765.

Being the Anniversary for the Election of

His Majesty's Council for the Province.

By ANDREW ELIOT, A. M.

Pastor of a Church in Boston.

Boston:

Printed by Green and Russell, Printers to the

Honorable House of Representatives

MDCCLXV

In the House of Representatives,

May 30, 1765.

Resolved, that Mr. Cushing of Boston, Mr. Gray, and Judge Russell, be a committee to return the thanks of this house to the Rev'd Mr. Andrew Eliot, for his sermon preached yesterday before the General Court, being the anniversary election of councellors, and desire a copy thereof for the press.

Attest

Roland Cotton, Cl. Dom. Rep.

A N E L E C T I O N - S E R M O N

---

1 CHRON. XII. 32.

> And of the children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do, the heads of them were two hundred; and all their brethren were at their command.

According to the original constitution of the Hebrew policy, "each tribe was under it's own proper and distinct government; and order'd it's affairs by it's own princes, heads of families, elders and courts." At the same time,-- there was a union of all the tribes, the whole congregation had a right to meet together, either personally or by their representatives, to consult the common good and the prosperity of the whole.

After the death of Saul there seems to have been a breach in this general union. The tribe of Judah set up David to be king, the other tribes adhered to Ishbosheth the son of Saul. Ishbosheth being dead, the other tribes, sensible how prejudicial such a disunion was to their common interest, by mutual consent made David king over all Israel. This was done, it's like, by a convention of the states from each province, or an assembly of the heads of each tribe.

David had long before been anointed, by a special commission from God, to be king of Israel. This was only an intimation from heaven of what would certainly take place. Neither David nor Saul before him claimed any authority in virtue of this divine appointment, until they were elected by the people, and solemnly inaugurated in their high office.

Among others, who came to Hebron to make David king, were the children of Issachar, who appeared by the heads of the tribe; of these it is particularly said, they "were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do, they were in number two hundred, and all their brethren were at their commandment."

It is an excellent character that is given of the heads of Issachar, and it was a singular favor to this tribe, that they had such a number who were able to guide them at this critical season.-- You are told the good effect of their wisdom and prudence, there was an entire union between them and the rest of the community. They who were in government were possessed of talents which qualified them for their trust, and their brethren were so satisfied of their prudence

and integrity, that they reposed an entire confidence in them, and submitted to their authroity without murmuring or opposition.

You have here the model of a happy state: What a prospect of peace and lasting prosperity, where rulers are wise and good, and the people are quiet and submissive!

What I propose in the following discourse is, First, To consider the character of a good ruler. And in order to determine when men are qualified to govern, it is necessary to take a general view of the great end of government.

It is not to be supposed that mankind would resign their natural freedom only for the sake of pomp and appearance, much less to gratify the pride and avarice of those they place in authority over them. The only rational view they can have is the common good. If men could subsist as well in a state of independency and absolute liberty, there is nothing in reason or conscience to oblige them to subjection. The necessity of government arises wholly from the disadvantages,which, in the present imperfect state of human nature, would be the natural consequence of unlimited freedom. This necessity is so apparent that the most savage and barbarous of mankind have been convinced of it; and wherever they have formed themselves into society, have erected some kind of government. In this sense all power is from God, as that constitution, which makes government necessary, originates with him who is the author of nature; and such a constitution is as certain an intimation of the divine will, as an express revelation. There is no positive appointment or command; we argue the design of heaven that there should be civil government, beause it is apparently for the advantage of mankind. "He is the minister of God to thee for good."

If the public good is the great, the only end of magistracy; it follows that they only are worthy to be entrusted with the powers of government, who know what the public interest is, and are capable of advancing it. The heads of every community should, like the heads of Issachar, "have understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do."

This character supposes, that rulers have a good degree of wisdom and knowlege -- That they are men of virtue and religion -- And that they have prudence to conduct affairs in seasons that are critical and alarming.

First. Wisdom and knowledge are very necessary qualifications of a public ruler. The ends of government will not be answered by committing the administration of affairs to one or more men, but by committing to those who are capable of discharging the trust reposed in them. The meanest office requires talents suited to that office, but when men are put in places of extensive authority, they ought to have extensive abilities.

Wisdom and knowledge are so necessary for every one who has a share in government, that nothing can supply their

place. The experience of all ages evidences the justice of that exclamation of king Solomon. "Wo to thee, O land, when they king is a child!" If weak or ignorant men are entrusted with power, what can you expect but universal confusion! If men were not wise before, they are not like to become wise by being placed in a station of eminence. Such exaltation will rather make them giddy and vain, and deprive them of the little understanding they had before.

If such magistrates mean ever so well, yet they know not how to execute their good purposes, and their administration is like to be a series of the most fatal errors. If they depend on others to manage the affairs of government, the event will not be better. Men of weak minds can seldom bear the checks and counsels of plain honest men, who know not how to disguise the truth, or to speak that which they do not think in their hearts. Parasites and flatters easily gain their favor, who will sooth their vanity, and accommodate themselves to their foibles. And the state of such people is often worse than where rulers are men of capacity, even tho' they are very dificient in their principles of action.

Bad men who can look to consequences are often under the restraint of fear, where they have no other. They are aware of danger from the resentment of an injured people, if they abuse their power. But men without knowledge are devoid of such fears; and they who have the management of them endeavour artfully to conceal their own share in the public misconduct, and make use of the power with which they are vested to gratify their base and sordid passions, to the ruin of the community, and often those who vested them with it.

It is not every kind of genius or of knowledge that qualifies a man to govern. Many a one has made a shining figure as a philosopher or mathematician, who has had no turn for politics, and been intirely ignorant of the art of governing. It is frequently the case, that great scholars have no acquaintance with men, than which no branch of knowlege is of greater importance in public ruler. It is necessary to know the various tempers of those he has to govern, to penetrate their particular views and interests, and even their foibles and passions, that he may make them all subservient to the public good. It is necessary to discern their different talents and capacities, that he may know whom to put into places of profit and trust, and may employ those who are fit to be employed.

Is a ruler called to act the part of a legislator? What need of a sound and exact judgment, that the laws he makes may be good and wholesome, accommodated to the temper and circumstances of the people for whom they are made; and that while he endeavors to restrain vice and licentiousness, he may not unreasonably infringe the liberties of the community?

When laws are made, it requires no small degree of understanding and of study to enter into their true spirit,

to know how to apply them in every case that occurs, and to execute them with prudence and impartiality.

Where government subsists, there must necessarily be burthens laid on the people to defray the charges of it. There is nothing that affects men more than when you touch their interests; people in general find it hard to procure the conveniencies of life; nothing will sooner alienate their minds from government, than when rulers needlesly deprive them of that which they have dearly earn'd, and wantonly dissipate the public treasures. Rulers ought ever to proceed in this part of their duty with caution and prudence, that people may feel the taxes they impose are not to gratify their pride, their avarice, or any other passion; not to carry on any private design; but that they are necessary for the support of government and the exigencies of the state.

Every large community is constituted of a number of little societies, in which there will be different connections, and form separate interests; it is vastly difficult for those who govern, to keep the balance so exactly poiz'd that neither part may be injured; but much more, to prevent jealousies and suspicions that things are carried by favor and affection.

The rulers of a people are seldom so happy as to please all who are under their authority: They have often personal enemies; or crafty and ambitious men find fault with government because they are not in place: They had need be wise as serpents as well as harmless as doves to counterwork the machinations of such men, to give no occasion of offence to those who seek occasion, or to prevent the bad effect of the misrepresentations they will industriously spread.

Almost every state has it's neighbors, who watch for a favorable opportunity to encroach on it's territories, or to gain some other advantage. A ruler ought to keep a watchful eye over them, to get knowlege of their motions and designs; to prevent insult, or to resent it when offered. In these cases there is need of a thoro' acquaintance both with their strength and our own; that we may not by an ill-timed opposition expose ourselves to greater injuries, or by mean submissions encourage them to despise and abuse us.

A ruler who suitably attends to the great end of government must look beyond present circumstances, and carefully consider the tendency and consequence of every measure. He cannot but be sensible how much the present times are affected by the transactions that are past, and the precedents that have been established. He will doubtless see that the community has received hurt from the mistakes, as well as advantage from the prudence of those who have gone before. He bears on his mind, that his administration is like equally to affect those that follow, and endeavours to take the whole interest of his country in view, the future as well as the present. He consults the good of distant generations, leaves as little as possible for them to correct, and as far as human wisdom can, lays his plans, not

meerly to keep things quiet while he is on the stage, but that the happiness of his country may be of long duration, may be perpetual.

You can easily see by these hints of the business and duty of rulers, that every man is not fit to govern; there must be a genius for government, and there must be constant study and application.

I have hitherto consider'd the wisdom and knowlege which are necessary for rulers in general, and under almost every constitution. Besides this, Secondly, It is necessary they should have a particular acquaintance with the constitution of the country they are called to govern.

Reason we say dictates that there should be government; and the voice of reason is the voice of God. But what form of government they will be under is left to the choice of those who are to be governed. God has never determ'd this. It becomes those who claim a divine indefeasible right, to make out their claim in a better manner than they have ever yet done, or it is absurd to suppose any, who have common understanding, or a tolerable sense of liberty, will submit to it.

All power has it's foundation in compact and mutual consent, or else it proceeds from fraud or violence. Where the latter take place, the dominion which men claim is no better than usurpation; and they, who by these methods raise themselves above their brethren, are so far from having a right to govern, that they ought to be punished as public disturbers and the enemies of mankind.

When government is founded in mutual consent, it is the undoubted right of the community to say who shall govern them; and to make what limitations or conditions they think proper. Perhaps the same comstitution is not best for all societies, or for the same society at all times. Be this as it may; it is very certain that mankind have established different forms of government, according to their own will and inclination: "Some have set up one or a few men to govern them, others have seen fit to retain the power themselves: --In some the supreme magistrates have been annually elected; in others the power is for life. In some they are merely elective, in others hereditary under certain rules or limitations". In Great-Britain there is a happy mixture of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. This is perhaps the most perfect form of civil government. It is the glory of Britons and the envy of foreigners.

But whatever form of civil government men have chose, there are certain constitutions, which are the basis and foundation of the state, and which are obligatory on those who govern, as well as those who are governed. These constitutions are a sort of fundamental laws, which cannot be violated without the greatest danger to a community. When either part attempts to invade the rights of the other, it usually produces convulsions, which sooner or later overturn the state.

It is necessary they who are in authority should be

well acquainted with these fundamental laws; they ought to make them one part of their study; and should not without the utmost necessity depart from them. If such a strict adherence to the constitution is sometimes attended with inconveniencies; yet a departure from it will be attended with much greater. Magistrates ought to know their own power, and not tamely give up those prerogatives with which the constitution has vested them. Such mean condescension will only expose them to contempt and further encroachments, till not even a shadow of authority is left. On the other hand, they ought to be tender of the privileges of those they govern. Even in absolute monarchies, the people may by oppression and tyranny come to know that they have rights, and to assert them in a way not very pleasing to those, who have insolently and unjustly invaded them.

In free governments people are apt to feel much quicker. To touch their liberties is to touch the apple of their eye; every attempt alarms them, makes demagogues, who hate government, and are ever watching for opportunities to embarrass public measures, and to introduce anarchy and confusion.

Where so much depends, and the danger of acting wrong is like to have such consequences to the community, and perhaps to themselves; rulers ought to know very well what it is to act right, where power ends and liberty begins. The more difficult it si to settle this point, so much the more wisdom and prudence do rulers need, and so much the more cautious should they be in acting; and where people observe such caution and tenderness in their rulers, they will make allowances for mistakes, and even for faults.

I will not say, that they who are in government may not propose an alteration in the constitution, when they see manifest inconveniencies; every member of the state may do this; and there may be extraordinary cases wherein it may be necessary to deviate from common rules; in such cases the safety of the people is to be preferred to every other consideration. But no wise ruler would desire a general power of dispensing with the laws; nor is it possible to proceed with too much caution in making any great alteration in the civil constitution of a state; especially when it has been long established, and the wisdom of ages has been employed to confirm it. Where there seem to be defects, there remedy may often prove worse than the disease; and by attempting to guard against one inconvenience, we may open the way to a great many which we do not now foresee. When a constitution is essentially bad, rulers and every one else ought to run every risque to make it better. But where the constitution is tolerably good, it is generally the wisdom of those in power, to maintain a sacred regard to it themselves; and to endeavour that it may not be violated by others. This is their safety, and very often the safety of those they govern. When a humour of changing once begins, no mortal can tell where it will end. One can scarce conceive of an alteration more just, more necessary, and that could tend

more to secure the public liberty, than the extablishment of tribunes at Rome; and yet this very regulation, seemingly so wise and good, laid the foundation of the destruction of their liberties, and the ruin of the commonwealth.

Thirdly, Rulers cannot come up to the character of the text, unless they are men of religion and virtue. Every condition has its temptations, none are exposed to more or greater, than those who are advanced to stations of power and eminence; none have greater need of a settled principle of action, and the assistance of divine grace. If there is no regard to God or the rules of virtue, wisdom degenerates into cunning, and rulers instead of endeavoring to know what Israel ought to do, only consider what they have to do themselves; instead of aiming at the public good, they consult only what is like to promote their own private interest, support their administration, and continue them in power. The selfish passions will have the dominion; and men will sacrifice conscience, and sell their country, to carry a favourite point, or gratify their vicious inclinations. The interest of such rulers, or what they imagine to be their interest, presently becomes separate from that of the community; of consequence they are obliged to make use of every art, to keep the people quiet; to make them insensible of their infelicity, or to compel them to bear it; to put a false gloss on their flagitious actions, or to secure a powerful party, who will support their measures, and be the instruments of their iniquity. They will choose those for their companions and counsellors, who will flatter their vanity, feed their avarice, or provide for their pleasures. These are the men they will endeavour to promote; whilst they disregard persons of a different character, who feel for their country, and have courage to oppose those measures which tend to destroy it. Vice contracts the mind, and quenches every spark of public spirit; it fills the soul with criminal prejudices, and the higher it is exalted, the mischief is so much the more extensive.

The case is quite different when power is in the hands of men of virtue and religion.

By religion I intend something more than an external shew, or a mere appearance of goodness. Hypocrisy is not only a character most detestable to God, but it makes a man more extensively mischievous to society. His sanctimonious pretences procure him the esteem and confidence of his brethren, by which means he has it in his power to deceive them, and to betray their interests. No confederation can be of force sufficient to bind him, who dares to prevaricate with heaven, and to trifle with the Lord his maker. The greatest prodigies of wickedness have been those who have put on the guise of religion: For a pretence they have made long prayers, that they might, with the greater ease, accomplish their detestable designs. Nor do I call it religion to contend for a few little rites and ceremonies, which are of no importance in themselves, and will not make men either wiser

or better. It does not consist in nice metaphysical distinctions, and in loud and cruel anathemas against all who will not profess to believe them. Much less is it religion to invade the rights of conscience, and to inflict pains and penalties on those who are mot of the magistrates sentiments, or presume to dissent from the principles established by law. On the other hand, no one can imagine there is any religion in a careless indifference about all principles; or in clamors for clarity and forbearance, while malice reigns in the heart, and we can censure, revile and persecute those whom we esteem less catholic than ourselves.

I call that religion which Jesus Christ taught, and which is made known to us in the sacred oracles. It is a belief of the truth, and a temper of mind correspondent to it.

A religious man, or which is now the same thing, a sincere christian, is purified in some measure from those corrupt principles, which too easily find a place in the human heart, and is deeply penetrated with the things of God. He has a supreme affection to this greatest and best of beings, and maintains a constant regard to him in all his actions. He remembers the divine presence and account every one must give to this Lord and judge of all. He heartily submits to Christ as his prince and saviour: He has some degree of that mind which was in Christ Jesus: He desires to approve himself to him, and is animated by those glorious prospects which the gospel opens to our view.

The religion of Jesus enlarges the mind; it divests us, so far as it prevails, of every criminal prejudice; it makes us willing to deny ourselves, to sacrifice our worldly ease, our temporal interest, to the honor of God and the good of men. It fortifies against temptation, it curbs our passions, it regulates our desires, it produces noble and generous sentiments, it inspires love and universal benevolence; it teaches us to look not every one on his own things, but on the things of others; not to confine our charity to ourselves, but to do good to all with whom we are connected, and especially to aim at the public advantage, in which the comfort and happiness of multitudes are involved.

This christian temper, which is produced by the Spirit of God, will more than any thing help us to distinguish between right and wrong; when private interests and private views are removed, "the public good appears naked and open, free from all difficulties and embarrassments." When rulers have such a happy disposition, they will study the true interest of those they govern, which is the way to understand it; they will watch against a little party spirit and every selfish sinister view; they will suppress the dictates of pride, covetousness, and ambition; and while with a manly firmness they support their own dignity, they will not invade the privileges of those who are subject to them; they will not hearken to the insinuations of flattery, nor meanly court the favor of the populace; they will not have respect to persons, nor take a gift; and will severely frown on those, who have the insolence to affront their virtue, or attempt

to pervert their judgment. No motive, no temptation will allure them to join in making bad laws, or to wrest the true intention of those that are in force. Their whole ambition will be to discharge their trust with fidelity, and to make the people happy who are under their care

I own there are other principles which may have very salutary effects. There is in some men a certain benevolence and greatness of mind, which leads them to do many worthy deeds, that others perform from a principle of religion. There are remains of conscience in men, who cannot be denominated sincere disciples of Jesus Christ. Even their ambition and self-interest may prompt men to actions which are greatly beneficial to the community, and to discharge the trust reposed in them with honor and fortitude. But the better principle, so much the greater, at least so much the more certain will be the effect. When the love and fear of God reign in the heart, men will rise to nobler heights, and to more distinguished acts of virtue, than from any other motive. When they consider the whole community as brethren, they will naturally seek the common good. When they set before them the example of our blessed Savious, when they contemplate his ardent love to mankind and disinterested benevolence, their minds will be inflamed with a bold ambition, to emulate the virtues of this amiable, this excellent person. When the greatest men carry their thoughts to that important hour, when they must leave these transitory scenes, and their honors will be laid in the dust, how sollicitous will they be that they may finish well, and have the approbation of their own minds, when they have nothing else to support them. When they look forward to that illustrious day, in which the Lord will be revealed from heaven, and the great as well as the small must stand before his tribunal: what a check is this to every sinister view and every iniquitous practice! What an incentive to justice, to integrity and universal virtue! If other qualities may render a ruler useful to society, yet surely nothing but religion, a regard to God in his public conduct, will insure him the acceptance of heaven, and the plaudit of the great ruler and judge of all.

I am far from supposing that religion is the only thing to be regarded in a ruler. The most religious character will appear contemptible in a public station, if there are not other accomplishments: But whatever qualities a man has, it can by no means be safe, to entrust our lives, our estates, our liberties, every thing that is dear and valuable, to one who evidences by his conversation, that he has no regard to God, and is destitute of virtue and goodness. What can we expect, but that he, who will sacrifice his own most important interest, will sacrifice the interests of others, if at any time they are opposite to his vicious inclinations?

Fourthly, Another accomplishment very necessary for a good ruler, is prudence to conduct affairs in seasons that are critical and alarming. Such a season it was in Israel when Ishbosheth was slain. And then it was that the heads of Issachar discovered their understanding and address, by

conducting with such prudence as to still every opposite faction, and bring their brethren quietly to submit to king David, which was the only expedient to save the kingdom from ruin. Affairs in a kingdom or in a province are sometimes brought to a dangerous and important crisis, from foreign enemies or internal tumults; from the mistakes of those who wish them well, or the intrigues of designing men; from their own vices and follies, or the wickedness of others. In such a critical situation, the friends of a people are called to arise, and to exert themselves to save them from impending ruin. This matter especially belongs to those who are in authority, the eyes of others are naturally to them, under that God who has the hearts of all men in his hand; from them they expect relief; and happy the people, whose rulers have at such time wisdom to discern, and virtue to pursue those measures, that tend to promote their welfare, and to prolong their tranquility.

A state cannot be sunk so low as to exclude all possibility of emerging and again flourishing. There have been so many instances of the interposition of heaven, in times of the greatest extremity, that it is unreasonable to despair, when there are the most threatning aspects. Rome was scarce ever in so dangerous a situation as after the battle of Cannae. Their army was annihilated, their allies forsook them. and they every moment expected the victorious Hannibal at their gates. But at this very time, when there seemed to be no resource, these noble republicans were so far from giving up all as lost, that, says the historian, no one dared so much as to mention peace: They even returned thanks to the consul whose temerity had reduced them to the brink of ruin, that he had not despaired of the common-wealth. By such magnanimity they rose out of adversity, retrieved their losses, made themselves terrible to their neighbors, and laid a foundation for that astounding grandeur to which they afterward arrived.

Nothing is so like to make our case desperate as to conclude it is so: This stops the springs of action, prevents all attempts to extricate ourselves out of difficulties, and to recover the community. Those of superior character ought to have superior steadiness, instead of determining that nothing can be done, they ought to enquire what is to be done; what they can do themselves, and what Israel ought to do. Some men are very happy in finding out expedients in the most difficult cases; they know how to steer in the most tempestuous times; are able to counterwork those who secretly endeavor to undermine the state, or to give them a just view of things, who are in danger of doing hurt for want of better information; to remove every unreasonable prejudice in the mind of those, who have power to injure us; or to govern our tempers, and regulate our passions, that we may not destroy ourselves. This is a talent very different from that wisdom which is profitable to direct in a common state of things. A man may be a good pilot in a moderate gale, who can do nothing in a storm. Some men who would make very good

rulers in a time of prosperity, are quite unfit to lead in times that are intricate and perplexed. They lose the possession of themselves; they are timorous and irresolute, and so neglect to do what ought to be done; or they are rash and violent, and by their imprudence precipitate and ruin they intend to prevent. It is of the greatest importance that rulers have understanding of the times in such critical seasons. While others are hurried by their fears and passions, and know not what to do, they ought sedately to consider the tendency and consequences of present events, and should endeavor to guide into measures, that will be most likely to prevent the evils that are feared, or to make them tolerable if they must come.

There is one course, which if it will not be a certain cure, will yet be a great relief in the most dangerous state we can be in; and that is the practice of piety and universal virtue. Virtue does in itself tend to promote public happiness. Frugality, temperance, industry will extricate us out of most difficulties that can arise; and if we are actuated by religion, God will be our God, our protector and friend; "it will be well with us and our children for ever." Whatever he does else, if a ruler has understanding in the times, he will promote the fear of God and obedience to his laws.

I have now considered some of the distinguishing qualities of a good ruler. It is not to be expected, in the present imperfect state, that rulers will be free from mistakes or faults; whoever looks for such a behaviour from any man or from any set of men, will undoubtedly be disappointed. But though you may not expect a perfect character, yet the great author of nature, whose tender mercies are over all his works, "has thought fit to mingle from time to time among the societies of men, a few of those on whom he is graciously pleased to bestow a larger proportion of understanding and integrity, than is given in ordinary course of his providence to the sons of men. There are superior spirits, men who are born to guide, to instruct, and to preserve"; their abilities and their virtues denote that they were formed for the public good, and it would be a fault not to improve those talents, with which the great Lord of all has entrusted them. They ought not to let slip any opportunity that presents to serve their country, or to do good to mankind.

There are indeed arts and intrigues, by which some men intrude themselves into stations of dignity, which are below one of a great and generous mind, and which no consideration will persuade him to make use of. But to say that men ought always to avoid such stations thro' a modest diffidence of their own abilities; or that a people ought to reject those, who discover a willingness to be employed, is to carry the matter much too far; and a correspondent practice might have very bad effects. It might deprive societies of the best heads and hearts, and leave them a prey to crafty and ambitious men, whose only care would be to aggrandize and enrich themselves. A true patriot cannot do his

country a more important service, than by taking it out of the hands of such devouring harpies. Conscious of his own superiority, and a generous regard to the public good, he ought to despise the little reflections of those who are only uneasy because they are not in place, and cannot accomplish their base designs. The history of Rome scarce affords a more illustrious character than that of Fabius Maximus. This great man, having finished the year of his consulate, when Rome was engaged in dangerous wars, found that the suffrages for a new consul were like to be in favor of one, who was quite raw and inexperienced. He stop'd their proceedings, set before the electors the danger of such a choice at such a time, and drew a character of the person they ought to choose, which they could apply to none but himself; the assembly was convinced, recalled their votes, and unanimously elected him. Such was the exigency of affairs, says the historian, that no one attended to the danger of the precedent, or had the least suspicion that the consul was actuated by a lust of dominion, but all rather extolled his greatness of mind, that when he knew the commonwealth stood in need of it's greatest commander, and that he was without exception the man, he would rather run the hazard of the most invidious reflections, than miss an opportunity of serving his country.

It is however much more agreable to a generous mind, to be called out by others to public service, than in any sort to offer himself: And a people who have any regard to their own safety, will endeavor to find out merit where ever it is hid, and to confer their honors on those who know how to improve them.

So far indeed, as government is by the constitution hereditary, a people are obliged to submit to the disposal of providence, and to pay homage to the lawful heir, whether his abilities are great or small: And in large communities, the advantage of hereditary monarchy is generally sufficient to balance every inconvenience; and where it is not, it is in their own power to do themselves justice, as they have generally done sooner or later. Witness among other instances, the glorious revolution in Britain, to which noble exertion of national virtue, we owe the preservation of our liberty, and the present happy establishment of the house of Hanover.

When a people immediately appoint their own rulers, they are to the last degree infatuated, if they fix on those, who are not capable of seeing with their own eyes, but are obliged to move by the direction of others, or who get into power to gratify their vanity, their luxury, or their avarice; and it requires no spirit of prophecy to foresee, that a community who are so lost to public virtue, are nigh to destruction. A people may be deceived, they may be betrayed, by men in whom they put confidence. But they deserve to be abondoned by providence, if they trust their interest with men, whom they know to be either weak or wicked.

I am in the second place to speak of the duty of subjects to their rulers; and the illustrating this will show, at the same time, the happy influence which good govern-

ment is like to have on the community. "The heads of Issachar were men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do, and all their brethren were at their commandment."

The duty of rulers and subjects is mutual; rulers ought to love their people and to seek their welfare; and the people on their part, ought to be subject to the higher powers, to obey magistrates, and to submit to their lawful commands, both are necessary to the public happiness. If people will not submit to those who are placed over them, there is an end of government, and to all the happy purposes for which it was instituted; the whole is thrown into a state of anarchy and confusion, which will soon terminate in the other extreme, tyranny and oppression. Submission to authority is supposed in the very nature of government, it is founded in the highest reason; without it, the most perfect virtue in rulers will not answer any valuable end.

Obedience to rulers is a matter of so much importance, that our Saviour and his apostles, who meddled very little with the kingdoms of this world, thought it necessary to enjoin it on christians. "Render" says our "Lord, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's". "Let every soul, says St. Paul, be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God, whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." St. Peter directs, "submit yourselves to every human constitution for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well; for so is the will of God." From such passages as these, some have argued the doctrine of passive obedience and nonresistance in all cases whatsoever; or that we are not to oppose those who are in authority, although they evidently act contrary to the design of their institution, and are bent to ruin the society, which it is their duty to defend and promote. A doctrine so big with absurdity, that one would think no one of common understanding could embrace it; certainly he must have the temper of a slave that can practice upon it. St. Paul very plainly teaches us how far subjection is due to a civil magistrate, when he gives it as a reason for this subjection, "for he is the minister of God to thee for good." The end for which God has placed men in authority is, that they may promote the public happiness: When they improve their power to contrary purposes, when they endeavor to subvert the constitution, and to enslave a free people, they are no longer the ministers of God; they do not act by his authority; If we are obliged to be subject, it is only for warth and not for conscience sake, and they who support such rulers betray their country, and deserve the misery they bring on themselves. Happy would it be if it was confined to them!

I am sensible, it is difficult to state this point

with precision; to determine where submission ends and resistance may lawfully take place, so as not to leave room for men of bad minds unreasonable to oppose government, and to destroy the peace of society. Most certainly people ought to bear much, before they engage in any attempts against those who are in authority; they ought to consider their rulers as frail and fallible men, who are liable to mistakes and faults, when their general aim is good and right; they should overlook their errors, and even their vices, if they are not such as tend directly to overturn the state, and to bring distress and ruin on the whole community. Better a particular person, yea many individuals should suffer, than to encourage civil broils and a public disturbance.

When rulers are wise and good, opposition is an high crime; men ought not to make their own jealousies, resentments, or private interest, a pretence for resisting authority, or to stir up factions and seditions against their rulers. Such men will be the faulty causes of the evils that follow, and will have an awful account to give at the bar of God; "whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive themselves damnation."

Men of such perverse and turbulent minds may possibly, by dark intrigues and false insinuations, raise suspicions of evil designs, and of schemes that never entered into any one's head but their own; and as rulers are imperfect, they may find oportunities from their mistakes to fill the minds of people with prejudices and uneasiness; they may possibly prevail to raise tumults and disturbances; but very often the fall into the pit they digged for others; God in his providence brings to light their dark designs, and they become the objects of universal contempt and abhorrence.

People are generally capable of knowing when they are well used. Public happiness is easily felt. Men cannot but perceive, when they enjoy their rights and privileges; when they sit at quiet under their own vines and fig-trees, and there is none to make them afraid; when the laws of the land have their course, and justice is impartially administred; when no unreasonable burthens are laid upon them; when their rulers are ready to hear their complaints and to redress their wrongs; when they treat them with condescension, tenderness and affection; when they sympathise with them under their difficulties, and like their great master are afflicted in all their afflictions. Such a temper and conduct in rulers are easily perceived without any extraordinary penetration.

It is not without design, that the sacred historian speaks of the heads of Issachar and the rest of the tribe as Brethren; and this suggests a good reason for their so ready subjection, "and all their brethren were at their commandment". When a people perceive, that they who have power in their hands still treat them as brethren, as partaking of the same common nature, and as having a right to their liberty and property; they will have a reciprocal affection to their rulers, they will be loth to grieve and

offend them, they will be quiet and peaceable, and will do what they can, to render their administration easy, who improve their power only to make them happy. If at any time the people clamour and find fault, as they sometimes do under the best government, in consequence of real or imaginary misconduct, or when heavy burthens are laid upon them, they soon recover their temper, they forget the faults of their rulers, they remember only their good deeds, and there is danger that to make amends for their past mistakes, they will run mad with loyalty and submission.

Rulers have so many ways of keeping up their influence, that it is not easy to effect a general opposition, even where they have the most pernicious designs. A good ruler is almost sure of love and esteem, of submission and obedience. "Men love their happiness too well to destroy and ruin it, by opposing those from whom they know it is derived to them." Experience shows, that if they, who are vested with power, have but a moderate share of public virtue, they are admired and honored while they live, and their memory is blessed long after they are dead. Rulers therefore always have it in their power, to secure the people in their interest, and to gain a place in their hearts. By attending to their duty, they will promote the happiness of the people, and at the same time fix their own authority. If the heads of a community have understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do, they will be like all their brethren at their commandment. But where men are grosly of a contrary character, and pervert their power to tyrannical purposes; submission, if it can be avoided, is so far from being a duty, that it is a crime. It is an offence against the state of which we are members, and whose happiness we ought to prefer to our chief joy. It is an offence against mankind, whose rights we meanly betray. It is an offence against God, who is good to all, and who has appointed government for the welfare and happiness, and not the destruction of his creatures.

How happy is Great-Britain in a Prince, who accounts it his glory to reign over a free people, and who, we trust, will always make the laws of the land the rule of his administration! How still more happy, in a constitution that scarce admits of tyranny, unless the people themselves become corrupt and venal; and when that is the case, nothing but omnipotence can save them!

It is the safety of the British nation that it's monarchy is hereditary, as that right is now understood. It is a favor of heaven, that our lawful Sovereign is possess'd of virtues, whçih ensure them the love and obedience of his subjects. "Because the Lord hath loved his people he hath made thee king over them." May that kind providence, which has so often appeared for our nation, still watch over it for good; disappoint every attempt to subvert their liberties, and preserve them from those internal vices and corruptions, which they have more reason to fear than any foreign enemy, or open violence!

The form of government in this province is a little

model of the British constitution. Our commander in chief, who represents the King, is not elected by ourselves. We do not complain of this as an infringment of our liberties, it rather frees us from many inconveniencies, which would attend frequent popular elections. Especially may we esteem it a privilege, while we have a Gentleman at our head, who so well understands our civil constitution, and who, we persuade ourselves, sincerely aims at the happiness of the people he is appointed to govern. May his Excellency's services for the public always find acceptance with an obliged and grateful people! and may he have the approbation of his great Lord, when he gives an account of the talents committed to him!

The other branches of our legislature are chose by ourselves. It refreshes our hearts to see the return of this anniversary, and we hope fills them with thankfulness to God. The presence of our General Assembly, and the business of this day, put us in mind of the liberties we enjoy, while more than nine-tenths of mankind are in the most abject slavery, and multitudes of them, to the basest and worst of the human race. We conclude it is from the experience their constituents have had of their wisdom and integrity, that so many are returned to serve in the present assembly, who formerly had a seat there. We cannot think this people are yet so corrupt, as generally to be influenced in their elections by other considerations. We trust that they, whom they have honored with this mark of their confidence, will have a sacred regard to their interest, and will not suffer any sinister views to byass or govern them.

One of our valuable charter privileges is this day to be exercised. A privilege, to which it is owing, that the province has of her sons at the councilboard; men who naturally care for our state, and who are deeply interested in the consequences of every public measure. God grant that this privilege may never be wrested from us! One way to prevent so fatal an event, is to make a wise use of this important trust, to choose "out of all the people able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness;" who understand our interest, and have virtue to pursue it. If our present Councellors are such men, their experience in public business will doubtless give them a great advantage.

Wisdom and integrity are always necessary to constitute a good ruler; but when the state of a people is perplexed and difficult, it requires more attention, and a greater exertion of abilities; and by their prudence and steadiness at such times, rulers make it evident, that they are qualified for the trust reposed in them. Such a critical season, if I mistake it not, is the present; and I cannot easily be mistaken, when all orders of men are so generally alarmed, in this and the other colonies, and apprehend their most valuable privileges in danger.

I am far from impeaching the justice of the British Parliament. If any acts have pass'd that seem hard on the colonies, we ought to suppose, they are not owing to any

design formed against them, but to mistakes and misrepresentations.--To you, our honored rulers, it belongs to rectify such mistakes, in such ways as you shall think decent and proper.

Our fathers dearly bought the privileges we enjoy. It is evident, when they left their native land, they thought the rights of Englishmen would follow them wherever they sat down, and be transmitted to their posterity; and we hope their posterity have done nothing to forfeit them. It was kindly and justly said by Bishop Burnet to a New-England agent, as I find it delivered before his excellent Son and the General Assembly of this province. "That he would openly stand up for us, and nowithstanding all the obloquy that would be cast upon him for it, he would plead our cause; and when our charter should come to be considered in the house of Lords, he would there publickly declare, that there was a greater sacredness in the charter of New-England, than in those of the corporations in England; for those were only acts of grace, whereas the charter of New-England was a contract between the king and the first patentees; provided that they and their posterity might enjoy such and such privileges: and now they had performed their part, for the king to deprive their posterity of the privileges granted to them, would carry a face of injustice in it." Thus that great and good man.

We highly value our connection with Great-Britain, there is perhaps not a man to be found among us, who would wish to be independent on our mother-country, we should regret the most distant thought of such an event; we are grieved that there is any thing to create the least suspicion of want of tenderness on their part, or of duty on our's. We hope there is no ground for either. We trust our King and his Parliament will yet hear us and confirm our liberties and immunities to us. And we earnestly pray that a happy union may subsist between Great-Britain and her colonies to the latest posterity.

Our rulers are a part of ourselves, they look on the whole community as their brethren, they have one common interest with us. We doubt not they feel for their people in this difficult day, and will exert all their abilities in the present exigency. Time has been, when even darker clouds hung over the British colonies than those which now threaten us; and the God of heaven has appeared and dissipated them. His arm is not shortned that he cannot save, his ear is not heavy that he cannot hear. The friends of Zion will not cease to pray, that our rulers may be lead in a safe and plain path; and we trust they will themselves implore the direction and assistance of him, who "giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowlege to them that know understanding." Happy will it be for you, our honored fathers, if you are the instruments of prolonging our tranquility. It will be an honor put upon you by the God of heaven: It will render you accepted of the multitude of your brethren: You will be esteemed and bless'd while you live; and your names will

be had in grateful remembrance long after you have enter'd the world of spirits.

But whatever aspect this important affair may have on our present or future prosperity, it is not all that calls for the attention of our rulers. He must have but little understanding of the times, who does not see that we are in more danger from our internal vices, than from any external impositions. Our luxury, extravagance and intemperance threaten our ruin. We live above ourselves, we have forsaken the simplicity of our fathers in our dress, our furniture and our tables. We import much that is absolutely superfluous, that tends only to feed our pride and vanity. Some little private efforts have been made to reform these evils, possibly the legislature may find out some more effectual method to suppress our vices, and to encourage industry, frugality and sobriety.

There was much enquiry, I am informed, in the last assembly, how they might raise a revenue from the spirituous liquors that are expended among us. Can nothing be done to prevent the so free use of them? if not, the glory is departed, we need nothing else to make us a poor miserable people.

Our fathers in the civil government can scarce be sensible how far and wide intemperance has spread, especially among the lower sort of people. I doubt not their readiness to apply a remedy, if it is in their power; whether any can be found, is not for me to say.

While our rulers are consulting the public good, and enquiring what this people ought to do, it becomes us to submit to their authority, and to lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty; we ought to be subject to these ministers of God, not only for wrath but for conscience sake. Obedience to rulers enters into religion; by an unreasonable opposition to them, we displease God by whose providence they are placed over us.

The business of rulers is difficult enough in itself, we ought not to encrease their difficulties by factious turbulent behavios. No good ruler will be averse to have his public conduct examined, or find fault with decent remonstrances when they act contrary to the sense of the community. But it is hard, when they have done their best to be censured and reviled, and to have government made uneasy by the jealousies and intrigues of discontented men, who think nothing right but what they do themselves; and delight to raise suspicions of designs which are the product of their own vain imaginations. We should remember that rulers are men of like passions, and are in a state of peculiar temptation. We ought not to magnify their faults, but to bear with their infirmities and overlook their mistakes, when we have reason to think they do not proceed from a bad heart. When God has honored them by making them instruments of good, we ought not only to reverence, but to esteem and love them for their works sake.

It would be well, if both rulers and people would consider the brevity and uncertainity of human life, and that account which they must all give of the things done in the body. What a happy influence would this have on their temper and conduct! It would lead rulers to improve every talent to the honor of God and the good of men. It would lead subjects so far as is possible, and as much as in them lieth, to promote peace and union. It would make us all sollicitous to approve ourselves to God, and to get that spiritual understanding, which only can make us meet for the inheritance of the saints in light.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. REFERENCES CITED

A. Primary Sources

1. Books

Mather, Cotton, Magnalia Christi Americana. London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1702.

_____. Ratio Disciplinae Fratum. Boston: S. Gerrish, 1726.

New England's First Fruits. London: Henry Overson, 1643.

Otis, James. The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved. Boston: Edes and Gill, 1764.

Perkins, William. The Art of Prophecying, tr. Thomas Tuke London: 1643.

Ramée, Pierre de la. The Art of Logic. London: Anthony Wotton, 1626.

Wise, John. The Churches' Quarrel Espoused. Boston: John Boyles, 1772.

2. Diaries and Journals

Cunningham, Anne Rowe. Letters and Diaries of John Rowe, Boston Merchant, 1759-1762, 1764-1779. Boston: W. B. Clarke Company, 1903.

D'Ewes, Sir Simonds. A Compleat Journal of the Votes, Speeches and Debates, Both of the House of Lords and House of Commons Throughout the Whole Reign of Queen Elizabeth of Glorious Memory. London: Jonathan Robinson, 1708.

The Holyoke Diaries 1709-1856. Salem: The Essex Institute, 1911.

Lincoln, C. H. (ed.) Correspondence of William Shirley. New York: Macmillan Company, 1912.

Winthrop, John. The History of New England. Vol. I. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1853.

3. Newspapers

Boston Evening Post. February 4, 1765; February 1, 1773.

Boston Gazette. February 4, 1765; January 25, 1768; February 14, 1774.

Salem Gazette. June 26, 1783.

4. Sermons

Chauncy, Charles. Funeral Sermon for Jonathan Mayhew. Boston: R. & S. Draper, Edes and Gill, T. & J. Fleet, 1766.

Cooke, Samuel. Election Sermon. Boston: Edes and Gill, 1770.

Eliot, Andrew. Election Sermon. Boston: Green and Russell, 1765.

Higginson, John. Election Sermon. Boston: Samuel Green, 1663.

Hitchcock, Gad. Election Sermon. Boston: Edes and Gill, 1774.

Langdon, Samuel. Election Sermon. Watertown: Edes and Gill, 1775.

Mayhew, Jonathan. A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers. Boston: D. Fowle & D. Gookin, 1750.

_____, Election Sermon. Boston: Samuel Kneeland, 1754.

_____, The Snare Broken. Boston: R. &. S. Draper, Edes and Gill, T. &. J. Fleet, 1766.

Thacher, Peter Funeral Sermon for Andrew Eliot. Boston: Thomas and John Fleet, 1778.

Turner, Charles. Election Sermon. Boston: Richard Draper, 1773.

B. Secondary Sources

1. Articles

Eliot, Andrew. "A Letter to John Eliot, August 1, 1775," Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 1878.

Goddard, Delano A. "The Pulpit, Press, and Literature of the Revolution," Memorial History of Boston. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1881, Vol. III, p. 124.

"Letters from Andrew Eliot to Thomas Hollis," Collections of The Massachusetts Historical Society. Vol. IV, Fourth Series, 1858.

Morison, Samuel E., "A Poem on Election Day in Massachusetts of about 1760," Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts Transactions. Vol. XVIII, 1917.

Norton, Orlo Arthur, "Harvard Textbooks and Reference Books of the Seventeenth Century," The Colonial Society of Massachusetts Publications, XXVIII (1953), 361-364.

Silver, Rollo G. "Government Printing in Massachusetts Bay, 1700-1750," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society. Vol. LXVIII, pt. 1, 1958.

Wheelwright, E. M. "Memoirs of the Honorable John Foster Andrew, "Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Vol. III, Transactions 1895-1897, 1900.

2. Biographies

Bowen, Catherine Drinker. John Adams and the American Revolution. New York: Grossets and Dunlap, 1949, 1950.

Bradford, Alden. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Reverend Jonathan Mayhew. Boston: C. C. Little and Company, 1838.

Hosmer, James K. Samuel Adams. Boston: Houghton, Miflin Company, 1900.

Shipton, Clifford K. Sibley's Harvard Graduates. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society. Vol. IX, 1956.

Sprague, William. Annals of the American Pulpit. 2 vols. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1859.

Tudor, William. Life of James Otis. Boston: Wells and Lily 1823.

Wells, William V. The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams. 3 vols. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1865.

3. Histories

Adams, Charles Francis. The Works of John Adams. Vol. I. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1856.

Bancroft, George. History of the United States. New York: Appleton and Company. 1883.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. Cities in the Wilderness. New York: The Ronald Press, 1938.

Brown, Robert E. Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691-1780. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955.

Cambridge Modern History, Vol, III. Eds. A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, Stanley Leathes. Cambridge: The University Press, 1903.

Chitwood, Oliver Perry. A History of Colonial America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Dexter, Henry M. Congregationalism: What it is; Whence it is; How it Works; Why it is better than any other form of Church Government. Boston: Noyes, Holmes and Company, 1871.

Ellis, A. B. History of the First Church in Boston, 1630-1880. Boston: Hall and Whiting, 1881.

Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938.

Hart, Albert Bushnell (ed.). Commonwealth History of Massachusetts. New York: The States History Company, 1928.

Headley, Joel Tyler. The Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution. New York: Charles Scribner, 1864.

Laboree, Leonard Woods, Royal Government in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930.

Litchfield, H. W. The First Church in Pembroke, 1708-1908. Pembroke: The Pembroke Parish, 1908.

Miller, John C. Origins of the American Revolution. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1943.

Miller, Perry. The New England Mind: From Colony to Province. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

_____, The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Morison, Samuel. The Puritan Pronaos. New York: New York University Press, 1936.

_____. Three Centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Parrington, Vernon L. The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954.

Ransome, Cyril. An Advanced History of England. London: Rivingtons, 1911.

Rossiter, Clinton, Seedtime of the Republic. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953.

Savelle, Max. The Foundations of American Civilization. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1942.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. Prelude to Independence: The Newspaper War on Britain. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958.

Thornton, John Wingate. The Pulpit of the American Revolution. Boston: Could and Lincoln. 1860.

Tyler, Moses Coit. The Literary History of the American Revolution. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1941.

Van Tyne, Claude H. The Causes of the War of Independence. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922.

Winsor, Justin (ed.). The Memorial History of Boston. Vol. II. James R. Osgood and Company, 1880.

4. Reference Works

The Catholic Encyclopedia. Vol. XII. New York: The Gilmary Society, 1911.

Commager, Henry Steele (ed.). Documents of American History. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949.

Grinnell, Charles E. Bibliography of Massachusetts Election Sermons. Charleston, 1871.

Johnson, Allen and Dumas Malone (eds.). Dictionary of American Biography. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957.

MacDonald, William (ed.). Documentary Source Book of American History. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.

Morris, Richard B. (ed.). Encyclopedia of American History. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Moulton, Richard G. The Modern Reader's Bible. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1945.

Vail, Robert W. G. Check List of New England Election Sermons. Worcester, Mass.: The American Antiquarian Society, 1936.

5. Unpublished Material

Counts, Martha Louise. "The Political Views of the Eighteenth Century New England Clergy as Expressed in their Election Sermons." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1956.

Davis, Emerson. "Biographical Sketches of the Congregational Pastors of New England." Unpublished Manuscript, Boston Congregational Library, 1930.

Gilgust, Dean Arthus, "The Massachusetts Election Sermon." Unpublished M. S. (Speech) thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1949.

6. Rhetoric and Homiletics

Howell, Wilbur Samuel. Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700. Princeton: University Press, 1956.

Keckermann, Bartholomew. Rhetoricae Ecclesiasticae. Hanover, 1606.

Mitchell, Frazer. English Pulpit Oratory from Andrews to Tillotson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932.

Perkins, William. Works. 3 vols. London: Thomas Tuke, 1631.

Ramée, Pierre de la. The Art of Logic. London: Anthony Wotton, 1626.

Thonssen, Lester and A. Craig Baird. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press, 1948.

Witherspoon, John. Lectures in Moral Philosophy and Eloquence. Philadelphia: William W. Woodward, 1810.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Biographies

Croust, Maurice. John Locke: A Biography. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.

Harlow, Ralph Volney. Samuel Adams, Promoter of the American Revolution. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1923.

Walker, George Leon. Thomas Hooker: Preacher, Founder, Democrat. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1891.

Wood, George Arthur. William Shirley, Governor of Massachusetts, 1741-1754. 2 vols. Ph. D. Thesis, Columbia University, 1920.

B. Diaries

Hutchinson, Peter Orlando (ed.). The Diary and Letters of Thomas Hutchinson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1884.

"President Wadworth's Diary." Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, Vol. 31, Collections

"Diary of Samuel Sewall." Massachusetts Historical Society Collections. Vol. III, 5th. Series. Boston: The Society, 1882.

C. Histories

Adams, James Truslow. A History of American Life, Vol. III Provincial Society, 1690-1763. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

_____. Revolutionary New England, 1671-1776. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1923.

Barry, John Stetson. The History of Massachusetts: The Provincial Period. Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company, 1856.

Beer, George L. British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765. New York.

Bradford, Alden. History of Massachusetts from 1764 to July 1775. Boston: Richardson and Lord, 1822.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America, 1743-1776. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Burns, John F. Controversies Between Royal Governors and Their Assemblies in the North American Colonies. Dissertation, Catholic University, 1923.

Channing, Edward. A History of the United States, Vols. I-III. New York: The Macmillan Company, ;905-1925.

Corbett, Julian S. England in the Seven Years War. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1907.

Curti, Merle. The Growth of American Thought. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Dickerson, Oliver M. American Colonial Government, 1696-1765. Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1912.

Drake, Samuel G. The Histories and Antiquities of Boston. Boston: Luther Stevens, 1856.

Hart, Albert Bushness. The American Nation: A History from Original Sources. 10 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1904-1918.

____. American History Told by Contemporaries, Vol. II, Building of the Republic. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1897-1929.

Minot, George Richards. History of the Province of Massachusetts-Bay, 1748-1765. 2 vols. Boston: Manning and Loring, 1788.

Osgood, Hubert L. The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

Palfrey, John G. History of New England from the Revolution of the Seventeenth Century to the Revolution of the Eighteenth Century. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1859-1890.

Robertson, C. Grant. England Under the Hanoverians. London: Methuen and Company, Limited, 1911.

Snow, Caleb H. A History of Boston: From its Origin to the Present. Boston: Abel Bowen, 1825.

Van Tyne, Claude H. The Loyalists in the American Revolution. New York: Peter Smith, 1929.

Willey, Basil. The Eighteenth Century Background. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

D. Political Theory

Carpenter, William Seal. The Development of American Political Thought. Princeton: University Press, 1930.

Clough, Wilson Ober. Our Long Heritage. Minneapolis: University Press, 1956.

Corwin, Edward S. The Higher Law; Background of American Constitutional Law. New York: Cornell University Press, 1929.

Dunning, William Archibald. A History of Political Theories. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

Engelman, Geza. Political Philosophy from Plato to Jeremy Bentham, tr. Karl F. Geiser. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1927.

Farrell, H. P. An Introduction to Political Thought. New York: Longmans, Greene, and Company, 1917.

Gettell, Raymond G. History of American Political Thought. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1928.

Gierke, Otto. Natural Law and the Theory of Society, 1500-1800, tr. Ernest Barker. Cambridge, Mass.: The University Press, 1934.

Locke, John. Of Civil Government. New York: Henry Regnery Company, 1955.

Mark, Jacobson J. The Development of American Political Thought. New York: The Century Company, 1932.

Merriam, Charles Edward. A History of American Political Theories. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

Sabine, George. A History of Political Theory. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.

Wright, Benjamin F.,Jr. American Interpretation of Natural Law. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931.

_____. A Sourcebook of American Political Theory. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.

E. Religion

Addison, Daniel Dulany. The Clergy in American Life and Letters. London: The Macmillan Company, 1900.

Cross, Arthur Lyon. The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1902.

Cummings, Preston. A Dictionary of Congregational Usages and Principles. Boston: S. K. Whipple and Company, 1853.

Earle, Alice Morse. The Sabbath in Puritan New England. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.

Greene, Evarts B. Religion and the State: The Making and Testing of an American Tradition. New York: New York University Press, 1941.

Levy, Babette May. Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History. Hartford: American Society of Church History, 1945.

Meyer, Jacob C. Church and State in Massachusetts from 1740-1883. Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press, 1930.

Perry, Ralph Burton. Puritanism and Democracy. New York: The Vanguard Press. 1944.

Protestant Episcopal Historical Society Collections, 1851. New York: Stanford and Swards, 1851.

Ray, Sister Mary Augustine. American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Simpson, Allen. Puritanism in Old and New England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Sweet, William W. The Story of Religion in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930.

Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson. The Puritan Oligarchy: The Founding of American Civilization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.