WOMAN IN PURITAN THOUGHT

by

Jean Lawrence L'Espérance

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in
partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts.

Department of History,
McGill University,
Montreal

August, 1965.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Calvinism invested the institution of marriage with a dignity and importance it had never before enjoyed. With its enforcement of sacerdotal celibacy and its early established tradition of regarding marriage as nothing more than a remedy for lust, the Roman Church had devalued both human sexuality and matrimony throughout the Middle Ages. Consequently woman was regarded simply as a sexual being, necessary to man only as an outlet for sexual desire and as a partner in the procreation of children, or as an overpowering temptation to be shunned by the celibate. In the secular world, woman was well regarded only by the devotees of chivalric love, who worshipped their chosen mistress as the inspirer of every virtue in them. As chivalry was the ideal of a small aristocratic class, its ideas had little effect on public opinion.

The Reformers, inspired by their study of the Bible, taught that marriage was equally pleasing to God as celibacy, and that married love was as pure as virginity. They also taught that marriage was not a sacrament and consequently that divorce should be allowed, with the right to remarriage. Among the Reformers, Jean Calvin wrote the best and most influential exposition of these views. The English Calvinists, popularly known as Puritans, discussed and expanded Calvin's ideas on marriage and the family in a series of popular guides to domestic life, published throughout the second half of the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth century. This thesis is an attempt to assess the effect that Puritan views of marriage and sex had on their ideas of woman's essential nature and her rôle and status in the family and in society at large. An attempt is also made to discover if the Renaissance ideas of woman had any influence on Puritan thought and how far the Puritan view of woman corresponded to the ideals of the largely middle-class adherents of Puritan preachers.

In my research I have concentrated on the works of sixteenth and seventeenth century classical English Puritanism, prior to the Civil War. I also refer to conditions in the New England colonies, to the writings of John Milton and to general works on woman's life and condition in this period.

My greatest debt is, of course, to Dr. W. Stanford Reid, not only for his consistent help and attention, but also for his remarkable patience and unfailing kindness over the long period it has taken me to complete this thesis.

I am also indebted to the staff of the Library of the Faculty of Divinity and to the Redpath Library Staff, especially Mrs. Shaila Nijhowne of the Inter-Library Loan Department, whose prompt and unobtrusive aid has considerably lightened my burden. I must also thank Miss Patricia Reddy, whose intelligence and wit have made the preparation of the typescript a much more rewarding experience than such tasks usually are. I would also like to thank my colleagues, Mrs. Enid Rutland and Miss Janet Holmes, for their invaluable help in preparing the bibliography.

THE PURITANS AND MARRIED LOVE

CHAPTER I

It is difficult to define the exact nature of Puritanism by looking back to its origins. It has, after all, formed many attitudes and ideas which are still an integral part of our society. If one can regard it from a narrowly political point of view, it can be seen as a movement proliferating throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, concerning itself with forms of ecclesiastical government and with the relationship between that government and the civil powers. It was, however, more than this; it was, in fact, a new way of life,

> "overrunning all the divisions which from time to time seamed its surface and threatening in each of its manifestations to disrupt the existing society." [1]

In the course of its existence it formed an attitude of mind, a code of conduct, and a manner of expression which have long outlasted the particular form of religious organization which was its original demonstration.

The Puritan character was found in all strata of society and in many different moulds. It included those classified as

[1] Haller, William, The Rise of Puritanism (New York, Columbia University Press, 1937), p. 18

Presbyterian, Independent and Leveler, commercial squire, city merchant, petty bourgeois and craftsman. In all classes, however, certain characteristics can be isolated. There was an overwhelming predominance with the ethical aspects of any problem.[2] The Good was sought before the True and the Beautiful. The Puritan accepted the necessity of food, sleep, clothing and family life to man if he were to fulfill his Christian duty in the world, but he did not encourage an appreciation or love of the natural world for its own sake. The Puritan lived in a constant state of aspiration, straining to reach the state of "godliness" in which he would be ever ready to fulfill his Christian obligations. The concept of duty dominated the Puritan mind. "Godliness" led not to mystical exaltation but to meaningful action in the world. It was for this reason that Puritan thought is concerned with every aspect of man's life including his domestic relations. The Puritan concept of the marriage relationship, which had a profound effect upon women's status in the home and in society, was a result of careful deliberation upon the Christian's duty in this area. Haller asserts that:

> "Puritanism, so called, was nothing new or totally unrelated to the past but something old, deep-seated, and English, with roots reaching far back into medieval life."[3]

The Puritan movement, however, was born of the disappointment experienced by the Protestant Reformers on Elizabeth's accession in 1558. These men had returned from the new Jerusalem of Geneva

[2] Knappen, M. M. (ed.) Tudor Puritanism Diaries (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 341.

[3] Haller, op. cit., p. 5.
See also Leonard J. Trinterud, "The Origins of Puritanism", Church History, XX, no. 1, March 1951, p. 37.

hoping to see the triumph of Calvinism. Elizabeth certainly affirmed the Protestantism and independence of the English Church, but beyond that she was not prepared to go. She asserted her control over Church government but refused to interfere with the souls of her subjects. The reformers, thwarted in their attempt to establish the English Church they desired, were nevertheless free to advocate their ideals and develop their programme. Only those whose actions could be construed as openly disloyal were actually penalized by the government. Puritan preachers concentrated their attention on the absorbing problems of everyday life. The sins which troubled ordinary men were described and remedies suggested, in simple, straightforward but nevertheless dramatic language. These "Physicians of the Soul" preached simple sermons avoiding the preciosity and excessive display of erudition which distinguished their Anglican contemporaries. Congregations composed of the merchants, shopkeepers and artisans of the rising middle class were deeply concerned with self improvement in every area of life. The ordinary man turned to his pastors for guidance, not through the intricacies of theological controversy, but in the proper regulation of his business and his household.

Every area of human life could supply opportunities for godly experience, and surely few human occasions call more compellingly upon the soul than love and marriage. The preachers therefore attempted to show aspiring saints how they could expect to feel and act in every respect of that relationship.

Many treatises were written dealing with every aspect of marriage, from the correct choice of mate to the proper running of a household.

The beginnings of such books of advice go back to the origins of commercial society. Books on manners were translated into English in the Middle Ages from foreign originals and contained suggestions about domestic problems, and the fourteenth century treatise attributed to Wycliffe, Of Weddid Men and Wifis and of Here Children, also dealt with the duties of husbands and wives. With the advent of printing this typically middle-class type of treatise proliferated, stimulated by the growing social consciousness of the average citizen. One of Caxton's early publications, The Book of Good Manners, contained material found in many later domestic treatises. Popular works on marriage and family life ranged from ballads through general books of advice to sermons and treatises by popular preachers. It was through the two latter that Puritan writers propagated their views on marriage and family life.

The late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries saw considerable changes in the position of women in English society, and the literature of the period reflects these changes. A lively popular controversy over women's position, usually referred to as the "Querelle des femmes", continued throughout the period. Popular attacks on women had always been a part of the literary tradition in Europe where the common attitude prevailed that woman was a necessary evil. These attacks rose to a high point in the sixteenth century, when several serious prose works were written attacking woman's nature, habits and manners, or, more rarely, defending her virtues.[4] In England, the interest in woman's position and nature was undoubtedly stimulated by a political situation which gave the country a queen who realized the power she wielded over the popular imagination by reason of her sex.[5] Interest in woman was also stimulated by the influence of the conventional lady-worship of Italian Renaissance poets whose works were popular in this period. "Amor courtois", first brought to England by aristocratic young men for the entertainment of the Court, slowly reached the new middle-class public through the press and the theatre. On its way downwards, the convention of courtly love gradually changed in accordance with the taste, the moral standards and the religious convictions of its new audience.[6] "Significantly enough," Louis B. Wright remarks, "while aristocratic poets were busy discovering goddesses with whom they might compare their mistresses, burgher writers were arguing about woman's place in society and were setting up early landmarks in the literature of woman's rights."[7]

A large number of books on women were written during this period, beginning in the 1540's when Sir Thomas Elyot's Defense

[4] Kelso, Ruth, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana, Ill., University of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 6

[5] Wright, Louis B., *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill, N. C., University of North Carolina Press, 1935), p. 466.

[6] Haller, William, "Hail Wedded Love" *ELH, A Journal of English Literary History, XIII* (1946), pp. 81-82.

[7] Wright, op. cit., p. 465.

of Good Women appeared, only to be followed by a popular attack, The Schole House of Women, attributed to Edward Gosynhill. This was a diatribe against the vanity, talkativeness, extravagance, faithlessness and general frailty of woman from Eve to Jezebel. The latter half of the sixteenth century saw a proliferation of satiric books attacking the increasingly free conduct of women.[8] Even if much of the disparagement represented the conventional and age-old complaint against feminine vanity, some of it was undoubtedly inspired by the increasing display of wealth by middle-class women like the wives of London citizens. The early years of the seventeenth century saw the controversy become increasingly more acrimonious, partly as a result of King James's open dislike of the female sex. In 1615 a work appeared that aroused a furious controversy and remained a popular pamphlet for more than a hundred years. This was Joseph Swetnam's The Arraignment of Lewd, Idle, Froward, and Unconstant Woman: Or the vanitie of them, choose you whether. With a commendation of wise, vertuous and honest women. Pleasant for married Men, profitable for Young Men and hurtfull to none. This pamphlet rails at the sins of extravagance and pride that ruin husbands. These, of course, were the faults that the average shopkeeper and craftsman, especially one with a Puritan cast of mind, regarded as woman's besetting sins. A spate of pamphlets followed, answering, attacking or agreeing with Swetnam. The interest the controversy aroused reveals

[8] Ibid., p. 473.

two facts. First, that the demands of the average middle-class woman for a degree of social independence was arousing alarm, and, secondly, as many of the counter-attacks were actually written by women, that the female sex was becoming articulate in its own defence. In the 1620's and 1630's, other books appeared, such as Thomas Heywood's Gunaikeion; or Nine Bookes of Various History Concerning Women, which treated women sympathetically. Heywood maintained that the book had practical utility, for

> "Wives may reade here of chast Virgins, to pattern their Daughters by, and how to demeane themselves in all Coniugall love towards their Husbands: Widowes may finde what may best become their solitude, and Matrons those accomplishments that most dignifie their gravitie." [9]

The debate which took place in print during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on the nature and position of women reflected the contemporary interest in, and uneasiness with, social change. Although much of the writing took the form of attacks on the weaknesses and foibles of the opposite sex, others attested to her dignity, intelligence and nobility of soul.

> "A serious undercurrent of intelligent thinking upon woman's status in a new commercial society is evident even in some of the jocular treatises. Nor was this vital social problem, which became the theme of an increasing number of writers eager to please a public interested in every phase of the relations of men and women, the sole concern of middle-classmen of letters...

[9] Quoted in Wright, op. cit., p. 502.

> but it is clear that the taste and opinions of the commercial elements in society had an important influence upon the development of new social ideas as well as upon the literature in which these ideas were reflected..... Not the least important of the influences of the literary controversies about women was the stirring of the public interest in still more discussion of the subject and the creation of an atmosphere favorable to the development of the drama and the novel of domestic relations. Of yet greater consequence were the new trends of thought this set in motion, which quickened the processes leading to the so-called freedom of women in modern society." [10]

From Renaissance courtly circles came another kind of interest in and concern about woman's position. I have already mentioned the interest young aristocrats who had visited Italy showed in the cult of lady-worship affected by the Italian sonneteers. This fashion was essentially a transformation of the chivalric "amor courtois" transferred to a middle-class Italian milieu, with the knights and ladies transformed into young men about town and ladies of pleasure. Many contemporary descriptions exist of the conduct of the "Italianite" young men, who adopted this fashion. Most of the descriptions are disapproving because such behaviour was seen as an expression of discontent with current social and political conditions. However,

> "The exaggerated laudation of the mistress and the complete humility of the lover in the Petrarchan sonnet do not represent an idealization of womanhood. Rather do they represent a degradation of women, for the literary and social convention which gave them this spurious

[10]Ibid., p. 507.

> elevation sprang from a point of view in which they were so many conquests to be gained." [11]

As there was much hostility to the Italian fashions of the court on the part of many Englishmen, it is not surprising that it was another kind of love, also originating in the Italian Renaissance courts, that influenced some Puritan writers. Castiglione's manual, The Courtier, profoundly influenced the new Tudor aristocracy. In this book a new ideal type, combining the virtues of the knight of chivalry with the humanistic interests of the new learning, is held up for emulation. When women and marriage are discussed, a new kind of lady-worship is mentioned, derived from the fashionable neo-Platonism of the period. Lord Magnifico, one of the discussants, considers how neo-Platonic love actually affects the relationship of the sexes in Italian society and comes to the revolutionary conclusion that love should only occur between two people when marriage is possible. Platonic love is not the anti-rational, anti-social passion of courtly love, but an emotion that allied itself with reason to help man rise above the world of the senses. It is obvious that this idea, propagated in an extremely influential book, strengthened the already existing tendencies towards increased respect for women and interest in marriage and family life among a largely Calvinist aristocracy; and that the one tendency strengthened the other.[12]

In their writings on the subject of marriage the Puritans came to a revolutionary conclusion. Traditionally, marriage was

[11] Siegel, Paul N., "The Petrarchan Sonneteers and Neo-Platonic Love", North Carolina Studies in Philology, XLII (1945) p. 170.

[12] Ibid., p. 175.

instituted for these purposes; namely, the procreation of children, the relief of concupiscence, and "mutual help, society and comfort." Puritan writers, while in no way denying the necessity for the first two, made the third much the most important:

> "God made the man Adam altogether perfect, set him in the Paradise or garden of pleasure and afterwards sayd immediatly: it is not good that man should be alone." [13]

The need for woman's companionship arose in man before the Fall, and the first intervention of divine providence on his especial behalf was to create a wife for him and to establish wedlock as the prime source and pattern of all human relationships to come. The procreation of children followed naturally upon the primary relationship. In Paradise, before the Fall, the happiness of marriage was perfect; sin marred the perfection but did not destroy the need that marriage fulfilled.

After the Fall, the material consequences of marriage made it so unpleasant a stage that celibacy came to be prized beyond its true worth. But, excepting those with a real vocation for celibacy, it was incumbent upon all to marry. The family, many writers emphasized, was a microcosm of the Church and the State, where everyone, be they of high or low degree, learned how to fulfill the duties incumbent upon his or her ordained state. In addition, the family was the foundation of all human society.

[13] Coverdale, Myles, The Christen State of Matrimonye (London, J. Awdeley, 1575), fol. i.

The most revolutionary change to be found in the Puritan attitude to women is their firmly held opinion that although inevitably subordinate, she was vitally important to man. She had to have many qualities incompatible with complete inferiority if she were to be a satisfying mate for an intelligent and sensitive man who believed that companionship was the prime reason for marriage. "It was a nice and subtle happiness", Haller remarks, "these men conceived [of] for themselves when they abandoned celibacy and embraced matrimony." Of course, it was easy for women themselves to fall into the error that they were equal to their husbands, because, as William Gouge explained, there is but

> "that small inequality which is betwixt the husband and wife: for all degrees where there is any difference between person and person, there is the least disparity betwixt man and wife." [14]

Woman is so little less than man that it is easy to imagine that she is not less at all. All human beings, moreover, had an equal chance for Salvation and the husband's natural superiority did not ensure him any greater favour in the eyes of God. In this respect, differences of sex and class meant as little to the Puritans as they did to the primitive Church. On the whole, however, in worldly affairs a woman would do better to submit to her husband even if he were "crooked, perverse, prophane and wicked," [15] with but one reservation. Like all those subject to a higher power, women

[14] Gouge, William, <u>Of Domesticall Duties, Eight Treatises</u> (London, Printed by John Haviland for William Bladen, 1622), p. 273.

[15] Ibid., p. 333.

were commanded to obey God first.

They were admonished to examine themselves carefully before they decided that their husbands' commands conflicted with their duty to God. A wife must plead with her husband before she disobeyed and should obey the voice of higher authority only as a last resort.

The Puritans defined woman's rôle in the world very narrowly, but this did not mean that they were indifferent to the charms of her nature or the pleasures of her company. They lived in an age when poets and playwrights were deeply interested in the topic of love between the sexes and many Puritan writers, like Milton, must have been conversant not only with the classical authors, but also with the works of their contemporaries. As Haller says, "When he [the Puritan] took a wife to his bosom, he looked for satisfactions which, though he still tried to square them with the word of God, were not unequivocally anticipated in the epistles of Paul."[16]

Paul had commanded women to obey their husbands, but he had also commanded husbands to love their wives. Consequently, Love, the husband's peculiar duty in marriage, called for a more thorough and painstaking discussion in books of instruction than did Obedience, the wife's duty. Love in these books is not only love between man and women, but is also between father and

[16] Haller, "The Puritan Art of Love", p. 253.

child and master and servant. Some of the descriptions of love in the books of domestic instruction are so glowing as to have almost the ring of personal experience.

The prerequisite for loving one's wife, the preachers decided, was to choose a wife one could love. They did not propose to run counter to current mores and advise the faithful to form alliances unequal in rank or wealth or disapproved of by parents. More interesting than the mechanics of marriage were the qualities to be sought in a wife. The most important, of course, was godliness. A woman who truly loved God would be sure to be a lovable woman. The next most important point in a woman was to have a temper agreeable to her spouse. No one could advise the lover in this, for the traits which made a woman endearing to one man might not make her lovable to another. The Puritans looked for soul mates in wives, and even after endless pages listing suitable conjugal virtues, the one important quality remained indescribable. Daniel Rogers sums up the Puritan idea of love by describing "a secret sympathie of heartes" that exists in some (not all) marriages, "whereof no reason can bee given, save the finger of God." Love came not from a particular quality in woman, but was a gift of God. As Gataker remarks,

> "As Faith, so Love cannot be constrained. As there is no affection more forcible, so there is none freer from force compulsion. The very

> offer of enforcement fumeth it oft into hatred. There are secret lincks of affection, that no reason can be rendered of: as there are inbred dislikes that can neither be resolved, nor reconciled..."[17]

and in spite of the most minute and detailed instructions, there could be no way of ensuring that two suitable people would love one another, although this love was the only really vital prerequisite for a truly happy marriage.

The Puritan preachers, in teaching men to use every aspect of their everyday lives as an occasion for godliness, formulated an entirely new vision of the ideal marriage relationship. They invested marriage and family life with a new dignity.[18] Both the cloistered life of the nun and the courtly love of the sophisticated upper classes were anathema to them. Marriage was not a political alliance, but a practical partnership with shared duties and rights which helped both partners carry out their appointed vocation in the world.

In a period when the female sex were making significant advances on both the economic[19] and social fronts, the Puritan emphasis on the importance of love between the sexes made an important contribution to the increased respect for women. Because this love was far more a spiritual companionship between men and women than a carnal attraction, women were valued for qualities other than their physical charms and a significant step was taken towards regarding them as persons equal to men.

[17] Gataker, Thomas, A Good Wife God's Gift; a marriage sermon on Prov. 19:14. (London, Printed by Edward Griffin for Fulke Clifton, 1620), p. 94.

[18] Siegel, Paul N., "Spenser and the Calvinist View of Life", North Carolina Studies in Philology, XLI (1944), p. 217.

[19] "... at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries, attempts were being made to improve the proprietary capacity of a married woman." Holdsworth, W. S., A History of English Law, Volume VII (London, Methuen, 1927), p. 379.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

Ideas and Practices of the Reformers and the Puritans

CHAPTER II

The Puritan idea of marriage was a Biblical one, diametrically opposed to the medieval Catholic view.[1] The Roman Church had early attempted to gain control of matrimonial affairs, but it was not until the twelfth century that its uncertain beliefs and jurisdiction hardened into a settled doctrine.[2] From then until the Reformation the law of marriage was embodied in the Canon Law administered by the Church in its own courts. The Civil Law in England had no jurisdiction over marriage and divorce. The medieval Church considered that the celibate was better able to serve God and that marriage was definitely a state inferior to virginity. The law of the Church therefore imposed celibacy on the clergy, extolled the virtues of virginity and depreciated family life. Sexual intercourse outside the sacramental protection of marriage became the deadly sins of fornication and adultery. The solemnization of matrimony in Medieval Europe was the most formless of contracts. It could be celebrated openly in Church after the publication of banns, but a clandestine marriage was equally valid. Such marriages could

[1] Knappen, Marshall Mason, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 451.

[2] McGregor, O. R., Divorce in England, A Centenary Study (Toronto, Heinemann, 1957), p. 1.

be effected in two ways: per verba de futuro, if the couple stated their intention to become man and wife and then consummated the marriage; or per verba de praesenti, if the couple simply said "We are now man and wife" in front of a witness, not necessarily a priest. It was not until 1563 that the Roman Church declared that a marriage not contracted in the presence of a priest and witnesses was invalid and illegal. Unfortunately, alongside this extremely lax approach to the contracting of marriage, the Church declared that any validly contracted Christian marriage was indissoluble. "A marriage law that asserted both the validity and indissolubility of clandestine marriages," O. R. McGregor states, "was a practical absurdity which could be sustained only by exercising the full range of canonical casuistry."[3]

The Church had abolished divortium a vinculo matrimonii (a divorce which dissolved the bond of marriage and gave one or both of the parties the right to marry again). Only divortium a mensa et thoro (a legal separation with no possibility of remarriage) was allowed by Canon Law. It could be granted for adultery, cruelty or heresy. In theory, either husband or wife could obtain this, but as the wife was afterwards still subject to all the legal disabilities of a married woman, having no control over her property, her own earnings or her children, this right can have been of little advantage to women.[4] In practice, the Church courts found a way around the

[3] Ibid., p. 3

[4] Thomas, Keith, "The Double Standard", Journal of the History of Ideas, XX (1959), p. 201.

problem of indissolubility by questioning the validity of the original marriage. If an impediment could be shown to have existed at the time the marriage was contracted, it could usually be declared null and void, leaving both partners free to marry again.

The impediments to the formation of valid marriage were extensive and sophisticated. In 1528, an English writer named William Harrington published a book listing twenty-two impediments, ten of which would automatically render the marriage null and void if discovered after the solemnization. Marriages between persons within the fourth degree of consanguinity were forbidden after the beginning of the thirteenth century. Blood relationship with one's spouse was not the only impediment. As copulation made man and woman one flesh, the blood kinswomen of a man's mistress were related to him by way of affinity to the fourth degree. In addition, as baptism was a new birth, so godparents were related to their godchildren and their blood relations. It can be seen how most couples living in a small, restricted community could almost certainly find that they had some relationship of this kind when they began to investigate their pedigrees. The Roman Church reformed its law of marriage by the provisions of the Council of Trent (1545 - 1563), but still claimed that celibacy was a higher state than marriage.

The first denial of the sacramental character of marriage was made by Luther in his De captivate Babylonica of 1520.[5] In the same

[5] Wace, Henry (ed.), Luther's Primary Works, together with his shorter and longer catechisms. Translated into English and edited with theological and historical essays by Henry Wace and C. A. Bucheim (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1896).

work he also attacked the absurd and unscriptural character of many of the impediments to marriage and the consequent practice of annulment, which he held to be contrary to the Divine command "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." He interprets the words of Christ in St. Matthew (V. 31, 32) as permitting divorce for fornication and allowing remarriage after such a divorce. In his Sermon on Conjugal Life, Luther recommends that the Mosaic law prescribing death as the punishment for adultery should be put into force by the civil authorities, and even if this is not the law, the adulterer (or adulteress) ought to be regarded as virtually dead, and the innocent partner free to remarry. Luther also advised that a wife's refusal to fulfill her conjugal duty should be grounds for divorce. This reflects his early, rather crude views of marriage, as existing purely as a legal outlet for man's sexual nature. Probably inspired by the prevailing Catholic exaltation of celibacy at the expense of marriage, Luther maintained that sexual intercourse was as natural and necessary as food and drink, and from this and from his equally simple view of woman's nature came his low esteem of matrimony. Luther did not have too high a regard for women. He is recorded as saying:

> "Marrying cannot be without women, nor can the world subsist without them. To marry is physic against incontinence... for thereunto are they [women] chiefly

> created, to bear children and be the pleasure, joy and solace of their husbands." [6]

After his own marriage in 1523, which proved to be quite happy, Roland Bainton feels that Luther developed a somewhat higher view of the purpose of marriage. [7] The significance of his views, however, lies in his denial of the sacramental nature of marriage, his affirmation of its necessity and importance in human life.

Jean Calvin's ideas of marriage, expressed in his _Institutes of the Christian Religion_, _Commentary on Genesis_, _Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists_ and his _Commentary on I Corinthians_ is far fuller and loftier than Luther's. In the _Institutes_, Calvin states that marriage is not a sacrament but a good and holy ordinance arranged by God for the benefit of mankind like architecture and agriculture. [8] It is a state to be honoured and not to be despised by those who choose celibacy.

> "Then will it follow that the children of God may embrace a conjugal life with a good and tranquil conscience, and husbands and wives may live together in chastity and honour. The artifice of Satan in attempting the defamation of marriage was twofold: first that by means of the odium attached to it he might introduce the pestilential law of celibacy; and secondly, That married persons might indulge themselves in whatsoever license they pleased. Therefore, by sharing the dignity of marriage, we must remove superstition, lest it should in the slightest degree hinder the faithful from chastely using the lawful and pure ordinance of God; and further, we must oppose the lasciviousness of the flesh, in

[6] Hazlitt, William (ed.) The Table Talk of Martin Luther. Translated and edited by William Hazlitt. (London, George Bell and Sons, 1895), p. 30 0.

[7] Bainton, Roland H., Here I Stand; a Life of Martin Luther (New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950), p. 300.

[8] Calvin, Jean, Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), 2 Vols., I, p. 269.

> order that men may live modestly with their wives."[9]

Calvin stated that although marriage is not a sacrament, it is more important than any other human institution.

> "The sum of the whole is, that among the offices pertaining to human society, this is the principal, and as it were the most sacred, that a man should cleave unto his wife."[10]

Man and wife together constitute the complete human being. Bieler says that in Calvin's theology,

> "Le mariage est par conséquent la condition naturelle de l'homme et de la femme, l'aboutissement normal de la nature humaine, sa réalisation parfaite."[11]

Any sexual relationship outside marriage is a sin, but the love of married persons for each other is a "second kind of virginity".[12] Calvin did, however, feel that marriage should not be used as an excuse for "intemperate and unrestrained indulgence".[13] He did not think that intercourse within marriage was blameless, but that the honourable state of matrimony drew a veil over its sinfulness. He admitted that virginity was an equally honourable state, but felt that those who were not specially called to embrace it must admit the fact and use the remedy appointed by God for their lust, namely marriage.

> "Those who are assailed by incontinence, and unable successfully to war against it, should betake themselves to the remedy of marriage, and thus cultivate chastity in the

[9] Calvin, Jean, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis (Edinburgh, the Calvin Translation Society, 1847-50), p. 134.

[10] Ibid., p. 135.

[11] Bieler, André, L'homme et la Femme dans la Morale Calviniste (Geneva, Labor et Fides, 1963), p. 38.

[12] Calvin, Jean, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists (Edinburgh, Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, 1845), p. 384.

[13] Calvin, Jean, Institutes, I, p. 350.

> way of their calling. Those incapable of self-restraint, if they apply not the remedy allowed and provided for intemperance, war with God and resist his ordinance." [14]

Marriage was originally instituted for the procreation of mankind; it was only after the Fall that it became a remedy for fornication. Calvin also recognized, probably because he himself was married, the hardships attendant upon the married state, which might persuade men to make vows of chastity which they could not sustain. To these Calvin gave this advice:

> "Let us remember that, since our nature was corrupted, marriage began to be a medicine, and therefore we need not wonder if it have a bitter taste mixed with its sweetness." [15]

Married people lived in an honourable state and could serve God as well as those who chose celibacy.

Marriage had, however, another purpose; and in thinking this Calvin was breaking new ground. The primary reason for the institution of matrimony by God was social. Man was created to be a social animal and woman was given to him as his companion. Her rôle as a helpmate was far more important than her rôle as a mother or as a remedy for concupiscence. From this theory sprang Calvin's novel estimation of women:

> "Now, the human race could not exist without the woman and, therefore, in the conjunction of human beings, that sacred bond is especially conspicuous by which the husband and the wife are combined in one body and one soul." [16]

[14] Ibid., p. 348.

[15] Calvin, Jean, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, p. 386

[16] Calvin, Jean, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis, p. 128.

From this primal bond sprang the family; the basis of all human society and the cornerstone of the state. Calvin's views of women were deeply influential in raising the status of women and increasing respect for them among his followers.

Although Calvin thought sex within marriage was relatively without sin, and rebuked those who would consider it sinful, he also felt that married people should act with restraint and modesty towards each other, avoiding the possibility of fornication within marriage.[17] Certain of his writings reveal a profound anti-sexual bias. He heartily approved, for example, of the penalties laid down in Leviticus for married couples indulging in intercourse during menstruation:

> "The enormity of the crime is seen by the severity of the punishment; and surely, when a man and woman abandon themselves to so disgraceful an act, it is plain that there are no remains of modesty in them."[18]

He also approved of the Mosaic penalty of stoning of girls found not to be virgin on marriage.[19] Above all, Calvin abhorred adultery, which he felt should be punished by death for the woman.[20]

Puritan thinking on marriage follows Calvin's main points, but develops several of his ideas. The first important Protestant book on marriage in English was published in 1541. It was a translation of a work by the Continental reformer Henry Bullinger, by Myles Coverdale. It had gone through nine editions by 1575 and is

[17] Calvin, Jean, Institutes, I, p. 348.

[18] Calvin, Jean, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses arranged in the Form of a Harmony (Edinburgh, Calvin Translation Society, 1842), p. 95.

[19] Ibid., p. 92.

[20] Calvin, Jean, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, II, p. 384.

considered to be the pattern on which many later marriage books were written.[21] In this work, a typically high opinion of marriage is expressed:

> "Whereof cometh it that wedlock is a greate worke and holy ordinance of God, which defileth or unhalloweth no man save him with an uncleane hart. Whom (to say truth) not the marriage but his own wickedness defileth."[22]

Puritan writers on marriage echo Coverdale again and again. Daniel Rogers, for instance, states:

> "Marriage is the Preservative of Chastity, the Seminary of the Common-wealth, seed-plot of the church, pillar (under God) of the world, right hand of providence, supporter of lawes, states, orders, offices, gifts of warre, the maintenance of policy, the life of the dead, the solace of the living, the ambition of virginity, the foundation of countries, cities, Universities ... yea (besides the being of these) it is the welbeing of them being made, and whatsoever is excellent in them, or any other thing, the very furniture of heaven (in a kinde) depending thereupon."[23]

Puritan writers continue the attacks on the Roman Church for its low estimation of marriage and continued advocacy of the superiority of virginity.

> "The Church of Rome, who labour so by all means to vilifie, depresse and debase this Divine Ordinance, ... Nothing is more odious and contumelious among them than the Name of a wife, or a Wived Person in some. The Name of a Concubine ... is more acceptable with them and more gratious in their eyes,"[24]

says Thomas Gataker.

[21] Fry, Roland Mushat, "The Teachings of Classical Puritanism on Conjugal Love", Studies in the Renaissance, II (1955), p. 149.

[22] Coverdale, Myles, The Christian State of Matrimonye, Wherein Husbands and Wyves may Learne to Keepe House together wyth Love. (Imprinted at London by John Awdeley, 1575), Fol. 33.

[23] Rogers, Daniel, Matrimoniall Honour (London, Printed by M. Harper for Philip Nevil, 1642), p. 7.

[24] Gataker, Thomas, A Wife In Deed (London, Printed by Iohn Haviland for Fulke Clifton, 1623), p. 40.

The gift of continence was given to very few men and women. Those who strove to live a celibate life chastely under the impression that this was what God desired were actually disobeying Him by ignoring the remedy He had appointed for human desire.

> "There is in most Men and Women naturally an inclination and propension to the nuptiall coniunction . . . Nor is this affection and disposition at all evil simply of itselfe. But since that Sinne came in by the fall of our first parents, mankind having lost that power and command of it selfe that before it had this affection is not only tainted and mixed generally with so much filth but is growne so violent, impetuous and head-strong with the most, that it is readie to break forth into grievous inconveniences, if some course be not taken for the repression and restraint of it. Now for remedie hereof in part God appointed this his Ordinance, which cannot but be esteemed as a singular Benefit and Blessing of all those that finde such infirmitie and defect in them selves." [25]

No one need wonder if he were meant to marry or not. God would make it clear to any believer who asked Him what he was meant to do. As William Whately says,

> "But hee that is so tyed in other respects, that he cannot marry without wronging another, or wants all fit means to maintaine a wife, or in regard of any other let, cannot attaine a wife, shall without fail attaine the gift of continency if hee be careful to use the forenamed meanes, and the like, that God hath appointed to subdue lust." [26]

Coverdale uses Calvin's argument to explain why marriage may seem to be a more difficult and unpleasant state than celibacy,

[25] Ibid., p. 37.

[26] Whately, William, A Care Cloth: or A Treatise of the Cumbers and Troubles of Marriage (London, Imprinted by Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man, 1624), Introduction.

although it is equally honourable.

> "After the fall of Adam and Eve there was nothing added further unto wedlock, neither altred in those things that were ordeined, saving that by reason of the fall and sinne, there was some sorrow and paine laied upon them and uppon us all."[27]

William Gouge explains that

> "So farre forth as men and women see just occasion of abstaining from mariage (being at least able to do so) they are by the Apostle persuaded to use their liberty and keepe themselves free. But all the occasions which move them to remain single arise from the weaknesse and wickednesse of men. Their wickednesse who raise troubles against others, their weaknesse who suffer themselves to be disquieted and too much distracted with affairs of the family ... If therefore man had stood in his intire and innocent estate no such wickednesse or weaknesse had seized upon him: and then in no respect could the single estate have been preferred before the maried."[28]

Although in the arguments defending marriage Puritan writers laid emphasis on its value as a lawful means of avoiding fornication and of providing a Christian environment for the raising of children, they followed Calvin in considering that the provision of companionship was the most important reason for the institution of matrimony.[29] Coverdale, after pointing out that there are three reasons for marrying, adds,

> "that they may live honestly and friendly the one with the other [and] that the one may help and comfort the other."[30]

[27] Coverdale, op. cit., Fol. 5.

[28] Gouge, William, Of Domesticall Duties, Eight Treatises (London, Printed by Iohn Haviland for William Bladen, 1622), p. 212.

[29] Gataker, op. cit., p. 37.

[30] Coverdale, op. cit., Fol. 6.

Other writers follow him in emphasizing that this was the most important reason why marriage was instituted. Robert Cleaver writes,

> "That the benefite of marriage, consisteth not only in the procreation of children, but also in the natural societie of the two divers sexes. Otherwise it could not be said, that there were any marriage between two old folks."[31]

This companionship was designed to provide not only help and comfort in worldly matters but also to bear what Richard Rogers, in his Diary, calls "spiritual fruit." Both partners were supposed to help in the spiritual development of the other. Puritan writers attempt to understand how every human relationship can be used to bring man closer to God, and as love between man and woman is the most satisfying and inspiring of human emotions, they attempt to show how it can be of greater use than any other in achieving this end.

From this emphasis on the importance of companionship comes the Puritan respect for women. Cleaver, for instance, combats the popular view of women in this way:

> "So that a wife is called by God himselfe, an Helper, and not an impediment, or a necessarie evill as some unadvisedly doe say, as other some say: It is better to burie a wife, then to marrie one. Againe, if Wee could be without women, wee could be without great troubles.
>
> These and such like sayings, tending to the dispraise of women, some maliciously and indiscreetly doe vomit out, contrary to the mind

[31] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 453.

> of the Holy Ghost, who saith, that she was ordeined as a Helper, and not as a hindrance. And if they bee otherwise, it is for the most parte, through the fault and want of discretion, and lacke of good government in the husband."[32]

Gataker waxes eloquent in describing woman fulfilling her primary rôle in marriage -- that of the helpmeet.

> "A fit Helpe, I say, for Man; For who fitter to helpe Man, than she, whom God himselfe hath fitted for man, and made for this very end to be a fit helpe for him? ... one that being in all parts and abilities in a manner as himselfe, shall furnish him with a second selfe, that may better and more fitly steed him, than any other help in some kinde can that being glewed as it were to him, and so becomming one with him, may make him as two, who before was but one."[33]

The Christian State of Matrimonye and the books that follow give explicit instructions for choosing a wife, and these, too, show a sympathetic if not a romantic attitude[34] towards women. Puritan thought on marriage also emphasized that family life was as much a vocation as any calling followed in the world. A wife or a servant, if she fulfilled her duties carefully, was rendering as great a service to God as any Minister. Gataker says:

> "And this is a great fault, with much griefe to bee spoken of, among many professors, that they seeme verie carefull of the observance of the generall duties of Christianitie; but are too too carelesse of performance of the speciall duties of their particular states and places: Forward Christians (to see to) in the generall: but failing fouly and fearefully, when it commeth to the particular; carelesse

[32] Ibid., p. 159.

[33] Gataker, op. cit., p. 30.

[34] "A beautiful body is such a one as is of right forme and shape to bear children and to keepe an house, even such a person as thou canst find to love, and to be content withall."

Coverdale, op. cit., Fol. 50.

> householders ... fond Parents; negligent and undutifull children."[35]

The persecution of the Puritans as far as public worship was concerned, from the appointment of Whitgift as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583 to the fall of Laud in 1644 meant that there was little public expression of opinion on the form of the solemnization of matrimony in England during this period.

Although marriage was a sacrament in the pre-Reformation Church, the ceremony itself -- the "solemnization" -- as noted earlier, was really a blessing by the Church of a marriage that already existed; contracted through the mutual vows of the couple. It was not, therefore, too difficult from a ceremonial point of view for the Reformers to advocate civil marriage, which simply meant the recognition of the existing contract by civil, rather than ecclesiastical, authority. As a result of Calvin's teachings, two of the Netherlands provinces established civil marriage in 1580. In England the presence of the civil authority was not required at marriages, and popular tradition placed great emphasis on the church ceremony. The Thirty-Nine Articles deny the sacramental character of matrimony, but the Prayer Book provides a form for the solemnization of marriage. The typical Puritan opinion on the marriage ceremony is probably best expressed in Cartwright's Directory which omits any mention of the civil jurisdiction but lays

[35] Gataker, op. cit., p. 20.

emphasis on the betrothal (spousals) and insisted that it should be held before witnesses. Cartwright also emphasized that marriage should be blessed in church. On the whole, Puritan thought inclined to the view that while a purely civil contract was not unlawful, it was preferable for marriages to receive public recognition through a ceremony in church.

The Brownists and Independents went much further in advocating emancipation from ecclesiastical jurisdiction in marital affairs. Robert Browne, probably influenced by the practice in Holland, advocated, although rather indefinitely, a completely civil marriage, in his book The Life and Manners of True Christians, published at Middelburo in 1582. In 1587 this view was more clearly expressed by John Greenwood, a member of the Brownist sect, at his trial. Other writers, like Robert Barrow, insisted upon the secular nature of marriage. Puritan writers on marriage never took so revolutionary a stand. William Perkins outlines a typical set of reasons to justify the ecclesiastical blessing of marriage. Firstly, that marriage, in so far as it is a public contract is "after a sort" a spiritual and divine ordinance; secondly, that marriage is "the seminaire of the Church and Commonwealth"; thirdly, he claims that such was the practice of the primitive church.

The tradition of civil marriage existed in New England from the first settlement and was given legal authority in Massachusetts in 1646, when a statute was passed providing that only a Magistrate, or a person authorized by the General Court could perform marriages.

The Marriage Act of 1645 finally established the legality of civil marriage in England, but "judged expedient that marriage be solemnized by a lawful minister." The ceremony, published in the Directory of Public Worship, was adapted from that of the Scottish Presbyterian Church, which service was in turn a verbatim translation from that of the English Church at Geneva. It consisted of a short exhortation and introduction; an exchange of vows, pronunciation of "man and wife" by the Minister, and concluding prayers. Cromwell's Marriage Act of 1653 enacted that marriage could only be performed by the local justices, and put all marital affairs in the hands of the state.

The preceding paragraphs have shewn that the Puritans thought marriage should be the cornerstone of the secular and spiritual life of most individuals and the foundation of the ordered human society. Only a full appreciation of the vital importance of marriage to the Puritans can explain their toleration of divorce,[36] which they advocated only as a remedy for marriages which could not supply the participants with the benefits for which marriage was instituted. As the Puritans did not consider marriage to be a

[36] "Divorce is permitted of God for the wealth and medicine of man for amendment in wedlocke. But like as all maner of medicines ... are very terrible: So is divorce indede a pitifull medicine."

Coverdale, op. cit., Fol. 94.

sacrament, there was no reason not to end it when it ceased to exist in reality. Calvin discusses divorce in his Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists and his Commentary on I Corinthians. He strongly urged that marriage should be indissoluble but allowed divorce for adultery.[37] As the Biblical punishment for adultery was death, the marriage would actually no longer exist and the innocent party would be free to remarry. Calvin expresses great horror at the sin of adultery and wished to institute the Biblical penalty in Geneva, but he was never able to persuade the civil authorities in Geneva to accept his views.[38] He did, however, feel that the wife had an equal right to divorce and remarriage if her husband were unfaithful, or if he deserted her. In Geneva, women had equal rights in this matter. As marriage was a contract, Calvin thought that failure to fulfil the terms of the contract, for example, by committing adultery, made the marriage non-existent. Marriage and divorce, therefore, could not be made or unmade by either civil or ecclesiastical authorities. The idea that women had a right to expect fidelity from their husbands, although a traditional part of Christian doctrine, had not been so forcibly taught before. Among the other Reformers, Beza also allowed divorce for adultery and malicious desertion; while Zwingli and Bucer reverted to the Roman civil law doctrine by allowing it in cases of cruelty, madness and incurable disease. In the marriage

[37] "The woman by her fornication, cuts herself off, as a rotten member from her husband and sets him at liberty." Calvin, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, II, p. 384.

[38] Cole, William Graham, Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis (New York, Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 127.

laws of Zurich, drafted in 1525 under the direction of Zwingli, adultery and desertion are punishable by the magistrates and divorce and subsequent remarriage are allowed in cases of impotence, disease and incompatibility. Hooper, who had studied this civil law doctrine while in exile in Zurich, expounded his views on divorce in A Declaration of the Ten Commandments in 1550. However, he discusses only one valid cause for divorce -- adultery.

> "True divorcement is a separation and departing of man and wife from the bonds and law of matrimony, for the breaking of the faith and promise of matrimony, which made the man and wife two in one flesh. I will not entreat of other causes of divorcements than fornication, because my book maketh no mention of any other." [39]

Hooper also introduced to England the idea that adultery automatically dissolved marriage,[40] and strongly advocated equal rights to divorce for women. Coverdale, in his influential translation of the Christian State of Matrimonye suggests that other causes for divorce might be allowed.

> "Faithful and virtuous Emperors, as holy Constantine, Theodosius, Valentinus, Anastasius and Justinian decreed other things also to be lawful occasions of divorce, as murther, poisoning and such like ... every reasonable man then consider that God dyde ordayne wedlocke for the honesty and wealth of man, and not for his shame and destruction. They therefore that in no case wyll helpe the oppressed person, nor in any wise permit divorce to bee made, doo even as the Pharisees which by reason of the comaundement of the Saboth after

[39] Hooper, John, *Declaration of the Ten Commandments in Early Writings* (Cambridge, The Parker Society, MDCCCXLIII), p. 382.

[40] Ibid., p. 384.

> the letter, sufred men to be destroyed and perish." [41]

Some Puritan writers after this advocate divorce consistently for adultery, while others allow it also for desertion. Robert Cleaver, for instance, states flatly:

> "Nothing but Adulterie may separate those that are united by marriage," [42]

whereas William Whately, in The Bride Bush allows remarriage after desertion.[43] I have not found any advocate of the man's right to divorce, who denied women the same relief, in spite of the fact that the Old Testament definitely gives the husband this privilege.

John Milton's views on divorce are probably the most extensive exposition and development of Puritan thought on the subject. Haller feels that Milton's ideas on marriage and divorce

> "spring directly from the doctrine and code set forth by such men as Perkins, Smith, Whately and Gouge." [44]

Milton devoted four pamphlets and a considerable portion of Book II, Chapter 10 of his De Doctrina Christiana to the topic of divorce. The first pamphlet, entitled The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, Restored to the Good of Both Sexes appeared in August 1643. This work substantially gives Milton's theory; the succeeding works amplify and develop it. The Judgement of Martin Bucer concerning Divorce appeared in July 1644, and is mainly chapters translated

[41] Coverdale, op. cit., Fol. 95.

[42] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 195.

[43] "Now if it shall fall out, that either of the married persons shall frowardly and perversely withdraw themselves from the matrimonial societie (which fault is termed desertion) the person thus offending hath so farre violated the covenant of marriage, that ... the bond of matrimony is dissolved, and the other party so truly and totally loosed from it, that after an orderly proceeding with the Church and Magistrate in that behalf, it shall be no sinne for him or her to make a new contract with another person."

Whately, William, A Bride Bush, or a Wedding Sermon (London, Printed by William Iaggard for Nicholas Bourne, 1617), p. 39.

[44] Haller, William, Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution (New York, Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 92.

from the second book of Bucer's De Regno Christi. Milton states in the preface that he found himself in complete agreement with Bucer, and published the translation to support what he had previously written. In March 1645 Tetrachordon: Expositions upon the Four Chief Places in Scripture which Treat of Marriage or Nullities in Marriage appeared. It was produced by Milton's zeal to make his theories acceptable. to the public by giving them a fuller explanation of the passages of Scripture dealing with divorce and by citing more authorities that he had referred to in the first pamphlet. In the same month he published Colasterion: a Reply to a Nameless Answer against the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce.

Milton considered these treatises on divorce as significant as most of his prose writings, because he felt that domestic liberty was as vital to man as the ecclesiastical and civil liberty. In the first tract he covers many points found in Puritan writings on marriage, such as the necessity for mutual love in marriage. His first original point is expressed in a long exposition on companionship; a companionship he sees more as a meeting of twin souls than the working partnership envisaged by Puritan writers. Milton's great assertion is that marriage is concerned primarily with the mind and only secondarily with the body, and therefore that to grant divorce for failure to fulfill the physical, and hence less important, end of marriage, and refuse it for failure to fulfill the higher ends is absurd. The burning referred to in the Bible is, he feels, not a physical but a spiritual longing.

> "As for that other burning, which is but as it were the venom of a strict life and over-abounding concoction, abatement of a full diet may keep that low and obedient enough: but this pure and inbred desire of joyning to it selfe in conjugall fellowship a fit conversing soul (which desire is properly call'd love) is stronger than death as the spouse of Christ thought, many waters cannot quench it, neither can the floods drown it. This is that rationall burning that marriage is to remedy, not to be allay'd." [45]

Milton believed that a marriage of those whose minds were not naturally harmonious was not a true marriage, and that to force such a couple to stay together was to oppose God, Nature and Reason. Since such in compatibility might occur without any overt act on the part of either partner, Milton also did not feel that any public, legal process should be necessary to obtain divorce. The law should only indicate how the children and joint property should be disposed of and leave the participants to separate without enquiring into their emotional lives. Milton, in fact, asked for divorce by mutual consent.

Milton advocated equality in divorce rights for women, although he felt (basing his argument on Deuteronomy xxiv; 1) that the husband could decide upon divorce without his wife's consent. [46] This is partly due to the fact that Milton deals with the Old Testament

[45] Milton, John, _The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce_ (New York, Columbia University Press, 1931-1938), Vol. 3, Part II, p. 397.

[46] Gilbert, Allan H., "Milton on the Position of Women," _Modern Language Review, XV_ (1920), p. 18.

passages on divorce, which give the privilege only to the husband. As he is attempting to show that his argument has Biblical justification, Milton naturally follows what he considers to be Biblical teaching, but it is noteworthy that he often goes beyond the text in allowing rights to the wife. For instance, in his comment on Deuteronomy xxii, which forbids a man to divorce a wife he has falsely accused of marrying him when not a virgin, Milton says the wife may leave him if she wishes. In his exegesis of 1 Corinthians, VII; 12 ff. which allows liberty of divorce to Christians married to unbelievers, Milton describes an unbeliever as one who is unwilling to provide the help or solace for which marriage was instituted. Milton goes beyond his predecessors in his plea for divorce for mental incompatibility, but his ideas on marriage and divorce are logical developments of those common to Puritan writers.

These ideas had little effect upon either civil or canon law in England before the Civil War. In the century preceding the conflict, great perplexity existed as to the principles which ought to be enforced and the laws which were actually in existence The Statute 32, Henry VIII, c. 38, of 1540 abolished pre-contract and closely circumscribed the cases where marriage could be annulled by substituting the Levitical degrees within which marriage was forbidden for the canon lawyers' tables of consanguinity and affinity. Unfortunately, the Act was repealed in 1548. For another two hundred years, the English ecclesiastical courts continued to enforce the medieval law of marriage and the restricted survivals of the law of nullity. Some other attempts were made to introduce new principles of divorce. Statutes were passed in the reigns of Henry VII and of Edward VI delegating to Commissioners the duty of reforming all the laws of England relating to ecclesiastical matters. The resulting _Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum_ of 1552,prepared largely by Peter Martyr, then Professor of Divinity at Oxford, contained a section entitled _De Adulteriis et Divortiis_. This suggested that divorce be granted for adultery, desertion, cruelty and deadly hostility. Separations (Divortium a mensa et thoro) were to be abolished as contrary to Scripture. The _Reformatio Legum_ became a victim of the Marian reaction and was never incorporated into English law. Although the view that adultery was a valid reason for the dissolution of marriage was widely held by Puritan ministers in the second half of the sixteenth century, the Church of England publicly affirmed its belief in the absolute indissolubility of marriage, relieved only by separation _a mensa et thoro_ granted for adultery and cruelty. The only effect of the Reformation on marriage in England was the abolition of the actual loopholes which made the medieval system tolerable in practice. In view of the tremendous social and economic pressures directed at holding the family unit together and the complex legal problems facing any couple seeking an annulment or separation, it is remarkable how many marriages publicly and completely broke up. In his article on marriage among the Tudor and Stuart nobility, Lawrence Stone notes that forty-eight separations were granted between 1570 and 1695 to members of the older peerage.[47]

Puritan ideas on marriage and divorce may have made little impression on the laws controlling marriage and divorce in England, but they had a profound effect upon actual conduct in marriage. For the first time in Christian history this important area of human experience was discussed and considered as a vital part of Christian life. The Reformers' denial of the sacramental character of marriage meant that marriage and divorce could be discussed as normal facts in everyday life, and consideration could be made of the ways in which they could best serve man. At the same time, the Puritans insisted that marriage did not make its practitioners unsuited to be servants of God, and that actually being married could help a man serve Him better. Marriage was designed by God to provide man with a lawful outlet for his natural sexual desires, to provide for the procreation and rearing of children, and above all to fulfill the human need for companionship. Although some Puritan preachers became quite lyrical when describing love between the sexes, the attachment they contemplated

[47] Stone, Lawrence, "Marriage Among the English Nobility in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." Comparative Studies in Society and History III (1961), p. 202.

was a sensible, workaday one based on shared interests and complementary duties. The Puritan advocacy of divorce was the natural concomitant of their high estimation of marriage. Puritan writers helped sixteenth and seventeenth century English society develop a higher estimation of women through not only their concern with marriage but also because of their belief in male chastity. Although the Roman Church had attempted to enforce reciprocal marital fidelity and pre-marital chastity on all Christians, it had never succeeded, partly because of its greater interest in virginity. The arranged marriages of feudal life gave neither partner a chance to choose a mate with any personally pleasing qualities. As a result, most noblemen kept mistresses and concubines as a matter of course.[48] The Reformers, and especially Calvin, attacked premarital unchastity and, as we have seen, expressed a horror of adultery. Coverdale, for instance, writes:

> "For Gods sake man keepe thy selfe honest, sober, pure and cleane untyll the time that it be meete and expedient for thee to marry."[49]

The Puritan writers on marriage continued the attack on the double standard and completely changed the normally tolerant attitude towards adultery by the husband. One important result, as Stone remarks, is that arranged marriages became intolerable, and many plays and pamphlets were written against it in the early years of the seventeenth century. Puritan writers lay great

48 Painter, Sidney, French Chivalry; Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Medieval France (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1940), p. 100.

49 Coverdale, op. cit., Fol. 37.

emphasis upon marrying a woman whom one could love because of the importance of fidelity.

Stone writes:

> "But impressed by Calvinist criticism of the double standard in the late sixteenth century, wives began to object to their husbands openly maintaining a mistress, which would explain the increasing number of breakdowns of marriages and the reluctance to mention bastards in wills. The arranged marriage was unable to stand the strain of the shutting down of this safety valve and the scale of separations became so alarming that parents began relaxing the pressures and giving their children some limited right of veto over the choice of marriage partners." [50]

In every way Puritan ideas on marriage and sexual morality tended to raise woman's status and make her more valued and respected in English society.

[50] Stone, op. cit., pp. 202-203.

THE FAMILY

CHAPTER III

> "The family is a seminary of God and a Commonwealth. It is a Bee-hive, in which is the flocke, and out of which are sent many swarmes of Bees, for out of families are all sorts of people bred and brought up and out of families are they sent in to the Church and Commonwealth. The first beginning of mankinde, and of his increase, was out of a familie. For first did God ioyne in marriage Adam and Eve, made them husband and wife, and then gave them children: so as husband and wife, parent and childe, (which are parts of a family) were before magistrate and subiect, minister and people, which are the parts of a Commonwealth, and a Church," [1]

says William Gouge. The family was the basic unit of the social order in Puritan thought. In fact, if man had never sinned there would be no need for any other ecclesiastical or civil government; the family alone was necessary to maintain the fabric of human society in the Garden of Eden. Church and State were created by God after the Fall to cope with the evils of human nature that could not be controlled within the natural primary group. The Church was established on earth to restore the harmony between man and nature lost by the Fall. The first Church, Puritan writers maintained, was the family of Abraham.

[1] Gouge, William, _Of Domesticall Duties; Eight Treatises_ (London, Iohn Haviland for William Bladen, 1622), p. 17.

As the family was the basic unit of the Church, domestic religious instruction was considered indispensable to the success of the weekly services in church. Civil government was created because the post-Fall nature of man made the natural government of the family inadequate. All individuals were supposed to be part of a family unit and under its control.[2]

The structure of authority and subordination within the family was patriarchal.[3] The state supported the power of the family governor, but his was the primary authority. There was no conflict between the state and the well-ordered family for both had been instituted by God to enforce His law. The Puritan equation of household and state was part of the contemporary hierarchical theory of degree.[4] It was, in fact, a commonplace of political thought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Jean Bodin is the outstanding exponent of the view of the family as the basic unit of political society. He defined the state as a government of households, and his work is full of cross-analogies between the two bodies.

Bodin thought that the authority of the husband was decreed by both divine and natural law, and assigned to him because of his higher nature. His authority was analogous to the authority of the soul over the body, and the reason over concupiscence which, Bodin says, "the Scriptures always identify with the woman."[5]

[2] Calhoun, Arthur W., *A Social History of the American Family* (New York, Barnes and Noble, 1917), 3 vols; I, p. 67.

[3] George, Charles H. and Katherin George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570 - 1640* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 276.

[4] Laslett, Peter (ed.), *Patriarcha and Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1949), p. 27.

[5] Bodin, Jean, *The Six Books of the Commonwealth,* Abridged and translated by M. J. Tooley. (Oxford, Blackwell, n. d.), Bk. I, p. 6.

Other thinkers, even including the liberal Grotius, maintained that political subjection was analogous to the subjection of a woman to her husband. Spokesmen of the hierarchy of the Church of England also frequently likened the government of the family to that of the state. John Donne writes:

> "So that, both of civil and spiritual societies the first root is a family." [6]

There was a sense, however, in which the Reformers placed even greater emphasis on the importance of the family than did other thinkers. Peter Laslett, in his introduction to Sir Robert Filmer's Patriarcha feels that there may have been a profound change in the ethical pattern of family life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, reflecting the profound religious and economic changes of the time. He writes:

> "The little that is known points to an increase in the power of the parents, and especially of the father, rather than a decrease. In England, at any rate, the theological changes did nothing to soften the rigidity of the marriage and divorce laws and probably ended by strengthening them still further. It is true that extreme Puritanism, especially in the Low Countries and the New World, was ameliorating the position of women and breaking down the bonds which bound the adult son or daughter to the father. Nevertheless the Puritan theology deepened the emotional authoritarianism within the family group. Puritan family worship, Puritan fundamentalism ... powerfully reinforced the patriarchal tradition of Christianity." [7]

The family that the Puritans knew was a far larger unit than the contemporary nuclear family. Besides the husband, wife and

[6] Donne, John, The Works of John Donne (London, John W. Parker, 1839), 6 vols; 4, p. 18.

[7] Laslett, op. cit., p. 24.

children, it included single relatives, apprentices and servants, all of whom were subject to the patriarchal power of the head of the household. When Puritan writers referred to "the people" they meant the heads of such households.[8] The father not only exercised the delegated power of Church and Commonwealth over these assorted souls; he was also <u>their</u> representative in the larger bodies.

The wife's place in this nuclear organism was an important one and her powers and privileges were carefully defined by Puritan writers. Her authority within the family was second only to that of her husband. William Gouge typically asserts:

> "In generall the government of the family, and of the severall members thereof, belongeth to the husband and wife and both."

Robert Cleaver observes that

> "The gouvernours of families, if (as it is in marriage) there be more than one, upon whom the charge of government lyeth, though unequally, are first the Cheefe gouvernour, which is the Husband, secondly a fellow helper, which is the wife."[9]

The Puritan emphasis upon companionship between husband and wife as a principal function of marriage naturally contributed to the view of the wife as a co-ruler of the family and an effective deputy in the management of family affairs. Gataker describes her work as follows:

> "For it is the woman's trade to be (a housewife), it is the end of her creation, it is that that she was made for. She was made for man and given to man, not to be a play-fellow, or a bed-fellow,

[8] Hill, Christopher, Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England (London, Secker and Warburg, 1964), pp. 474-475.

[9] Cleaver, Robert, A Godly Form of Householde Government (London, Printed by T. Crede for T. Man, 1598), p. 19.

> or a table-mate, only with him (and yet to be all these too) but to bee a Yoake-fellow, a work-fellow, a fellow labourer with him, in the managing of such domesticall and household affaires."[10]

The idea of the "calling" or vocation is here applied to women's work in a way that it had never been before. Women could not exercise a calling in the world as men did, but that did not mean that their work was any less necessary or not of equal importance in the eyes of God.[11] The idea of wifehood as a calling equal to that of any masculine vocation was an entirely new one. With the elimination of the monastic pattern of life, Protestantism cut off the only alternative to marriage open to women. In fact, the assumption was that all females would marry;[12] advice to single people in the family books is always advice to single men, or to widows.

Although women were co-rulers in the family hierarchy, they had constantly to bear in mind that they were subject to their husbands. All writers on the family emphasize this subjection and give cogent reasons for it. It arose first of all from the nature of woman. Even before the Fall she was subject to man because she was made of and for him. But, at that time, her subjection was pleasant because it was natural.[13] Because she tempted Adam she was considered more responsible for the Fall of Mankind than he was, and consequently was given a more severe punishment by God. Part of this punishment was to have her natural subjection become servitude

[10] Gataker, Thomas, A Mariage Praier (London, Printed by J. Haviland for Fulke Clifton, 1624), p. 128.

[11] "Thou mariest to be a Wife; and that is not a naked Name, or a bare title; it is the Name of an Office, that hath many duties annexed to it."

Gataker, Thomas, A Wife in Deed (London, Printed by Iohn Haviland for Fulke Clifton, 1623), p. 18.

[12] Morgan, Edmund S., The Puritan Family (Boston, Published by the Trustees of the Public Library, 1944), p. 9.

[13] Before the Fall, the woman "avait bien été sujette à son mari: Mais c'était sujétion franche et non durie, mais maintenant elle est mise comme en servage."

Bieler, André, L'homme et la femme dans la morale calviniste (Geneva, Labor et Fides, 1963), p. 37.

because Adam's original authority became tyranny. One writer suggests that the personality of the male sex was changed after the Fall and that man has become "more humorsome and hard to please."[14] Sin made woman resent the condition of subordination and find its attendant duties irksome. The most important virtue in a wife was her own recognition that she was subject.[15] It did not matter how virtuous, talented or dutiful she was, if she did not truly accept her husband's authority in her heart she was rebelling both against her own nature and against God.

> "Every good woman must suffer herselfe to be convinced in judgement that she is not her husband's equall, out of place, out of peace; and woe to those miserable aspiring shoulders that will not content themselves to take their place below the head."[16]

However gifted she was, a wife should not aspire to rival or even equal her husband intellectually.[17] Even if she were equally gifted, she must remember "what [her] sex and [her] state admit." Wives should not love or fear their husbands more than they loved or feared God; but if they had the misfortune to be married to a man who was an enemy of Christ, they should still remember that they are subject to him,

> "because in his office he is in Christ's stead, though in his heart an enemie."[18]

As a wife was made by God to help man, she would be contravening the reason for her own existence if she upset the family hierarchy

[14] Sprint, John, The Bride-Womans Counsellor; Being a Sermon Preach'd at a Wedding, May 11th, 1699, at Sherbourn, in Dorsetshire (London, Printed by H. Hill, in Blackfryars, near the water-side), p. 6.

"for though by their abusing the end of their creation by hurting and destroying him whose helpers they were created to be; the Lord abased them to a low degree of inferiority to the man, and that justly."

Rogers, Daniel, Matrimoniall Honour (London, Printed by Th. Harper for Philip Nevil, 1642), p. 257.

[15] Ibid., p. 281.

[16] Whately, William, A Bride Bush, or a Wedding Sermon: compendiously describing the duties of married persons; by performing whereof, Marriage shall be to them a great helpe, which now finde it a little hell (London, Printed by William Iaggard for Nicholas Bourne, 1617), pp. 189-190.

[17] Rogers, op. cit., p. 286.

[18] Gouge, op. cit., p. 330.

by being his equal or competitor.[19]

The female ruler presented the Puritans with a difficult problem because of their view of female nature. Obviously a woman was totally unsuited to being the head of a state as she was by nature a subject. Calvin, in fact, sees in the female sovereign a punishment for Adam's weakness. A controversy was waged over this point in the sixteenth century, caused in large part by the reigns of the Catholic queens, Mary Tudor and Mary Stuart. Some writers inclined to the view that no woman ruler could be a rightful sovereign; others inclined to the view that the laws of nature might be abrogated in the case of a specific female.[20] The husband was always advised to remember his superiority and to maintain it. Cleaver warns men not to love their wives so much that they forget

> "that he is a man, the ruler and governor of the house and of his wife."[21]

As this order within the family was so vitally important for the wellbeing of society, Puritan writers make every effort to convince both partners that their own natures demanded that things be this way. Rogers advises women not to ask why they are subject, but to tell themselves that it is God's will that they should be so.[22]

All books on the family carefully outline the duties of husband and wife, children and servants, to each other. Robert Cleaver describes the wife's duty as follows:

> "The wyf also, which is a fellowe helper, hath

[19] "a fit helpe, I say, for Man; for who fitter to helpe Man, than she whom God himselfe made for this very end to be a fit helpe for him."
Gataker, A Wife in Deed, p. 30.

[20] Phillips, "The Background of Spenser's Attitude towards Women Rulers", The Huntington Library Quarterly, Vol. V., no. 1, (October, 1941), passim.

"For Nature [that is "That Primary Law imprinted on our hearts by God Himself] from the beginning hath not only distinguished Men from Women by the strength of Mind and Body, but hath also appropriated distinct Offices and Virtues to each Sex the same indeed for kind, but far different in Degree."
Buchanan, George, A History of Scotland, seventh edition. Revised and corrected from the original by Mr. Bond. (Glasgow, Chapman and Lang, 1799), p. 56.

John Knox, however, eventually came to admit that God sometimes saw fit to endow certain exceptional women with the qualities necessary to a ruler.

[21] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 174.

[22] "The first point to be handled in the treatise of wives particular duties is the generall manner of all (subiection) under which all other particulars are comprised, for it hath as large an extent as that Honour which is required in the first commandment, being applied to wives. When first the Lord declared unto woman her dutie, he set it downe under this phrase, 'Thy desire shall be subiect to thine husband', Genesis III:16.
Rogers, op. cit., p. 254.

> some things belonging to her, to further godlinesse in her familie: as, for example: In her selfe to give example to her Household, of all readie submission to all good and christian orders, that no exercise of religion be hindred, or put out of place, at such time as they should be done. And in her husbands absence, to see good orders observed, as he hath appointed: to watch over the manners and behaviour of such as bee in her house, and to helpe her husband in spying out evils that are breeding . . . and St. Paul requireth, that wives, specially the elder, bee teachers of good things, and to instruct the younger." [23]

Managing a household of any size in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a complicated business. All of the food, many household necessities such as soap, and much of the clothing and linen had to be made at home. The wife had to be familiar with all these operations so she could either do them herself or supervise others.[24] The wives and daughters of craftsmen were also expected to help in the family workshop. Many became so skilled that when their husbands died they carried on the business and even, as guild records show, completed the training of his apprentices.

Widows not only engaged in small crafts, but even in large scale mercantile operations. In addition, women were responsible for the material well being of servants and children.[25] Although she was advised to manage money and goods very carefully, the wife's control over family property was sharply limited. Most writers devote a great deal of attention to the vexed question of a wife's right to give alms or otherwise dispose of common property

[23] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 60.

[24] Power, Eileen, "The Position of Women" in C. G. Crump and E. F. Jacob (eds.), The Legacy of the Middle Ages (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1943), p. 420.

[25] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 60.

without the consent of her husband. Perkins, for instance, says that:

> "The wife may give alms of some things but with these cautions, as first she may give of these goods that she hath excepted from marriage. Secondly she may give of these things which are common to them both, provided it be with her husband's consent, at least general and implicit. Thirdly, she may not give without or against the consent of her husband. And the reason is, because both the Law of Nature and the Word of God commands her obedience to her husband in all things." [26]

Other writers are a little more liberal. In his Preface to Of Domesticall Duties, Gouge explains that

> "much exception was taken against the application of a wives subiection to the restraining of her from dispensing the common goods of the family without or against her husband's consent." [27]

In the original sermons on which the book was based, he attempts to soften this by explaining that wives may dispose of property if the husband is not responsible, or if he is absent, and he suggests that the female reader "interpret all, according to the rule of love." The changes in women's property rights in the New England colonies suggest that, on the whole, Puritan writers had a more liberal view of women as responsible individuals. In England a married woman had no control over her own property, even the property she inherited from her own family or that which she brought to the marriage as her dowry. Her husband retained his rights over any money she might earn, even after a separation, and she could not conduct a

[26] Perkins, William, *The Whole Treatise of Cases of Conscience* (London, Legatt, 1636), p. 332.

[27] Gouge, op. cit., Epistle Dedicatory.

legal action by herself as she was not a person in the eyes of the law.[28] The only support she was entitled to as a widow was that of her jointure, or amount agreed upon by her father-in-law at the time of her marriage. It usually took the form of a physical ownership of land, although occasionally families preferred to retain the estates under unified management and to pay the widow a fixed annuity instead.

Daughters in New England, however, inherited their parents' estates on a plane of comparative equality with the sons, instead of being disinherited by primogeniture as they were in contemporary England. Single women enjoyed the same property rights as single men, and married women might reserve their right to separate ownership of personal property by premarital agreements which received the approval of the courts more readily than in England.[29] In England, probably due to Puritan influence, a significant change took place in the nature of testamentary bequests to girls between 1540 and 1640. It was customary for fathers to provide for their unmarried daughters dowries in their wills, making the bequest conditional upon the girl marrying the father's choice. But by the third decade of the seventeenth century, many fathers were leaving their daughters portions free from any strings at all, and even specifying that the amount was to be paid when the girl reached a certain age, whether she were married or not.[30] At the end of the

[28] Thomas, Keith, "The Double Standard", Journal of the History of Ideas, XX (1959), p. 200.

[29] Cobbledick, M. Robert, "The Property Rights of Women in Puritan New England" in Peter Murdock (ed.), Studies in the Science of Society (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1937), pp. 107-115.

[30] Stone, Lawrence, "Marriage among the English Nobility in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." Comparative Studies in Society and History III (1961), p. 184

seventeenth century it had become customary for the portions of all future children to be assigned in the parents' marriage settlement. A girl was at last in a position to defy her father without depriving herself of her marriage portion. Puritan respect for woman as a responsible individual slowly came to influence society to give her more real responsibility.

Wives also had a part to play in the religious function of the family. Women were specifically forbidden to preach or teach publicly, but they were allowed to share the supervision of domestic devotions to much the same extent as they were allowed to administer the family's material resources.

Daniel Rogers, for example, is horrified by the prospect of a woman speaking publicly:

> "God indeed promised by Joel to the Church of the Gospell, that he would poure out his spirit without difference to all ages, sexes, states of people. But not in such a disorder, that a woman should dare in publique, or in a private place after a publique manner to declare truthes of Religion, usurping over men and encroaching upon the laws of Christ. Such immodesties and insolencies of women, not being able to containe themselves within the bounds of silence and subjection, I am so farre from warranting, that I here openly defie them as ungrounded and ungodly." [31]

Wives, however, were allowed to share with their husbands the supervision of domestic prayers and teaching, and, if her husband were absent, a wife could teach her children by herself;[32] provided

[31] Rogers, op. cit., p. 285.

[32] Perkins, William, Christian Oeconomie: or, a short survey of the right manner of ordering a familie acc. to the Scriptures. (London, E. Weaver, 1609), p. 289.

she did not forget her "owne infirmity." Some writers, even the strict Daniel Rogers, would allow a woman to expound the Scriptures to the whole household, if her husband were too ignorant or too uncaring to fulfill his responsibilities, although, of course, she must "ballance her spirit to sobernesse and subjection" while she did it. Many women took these duties seriously. Lady Falkland, for example, is described as spending an hour every morning with her maids, praying with them and catechizing them.[33]

The wife's relationships with other members of the family, children and servants, demand some consideration. One of the reasons for marrying was to produce children who were regarded as a blessing;[34] partly because man, since the Fall, was mortal, and his children provided him with a kind of immortality; partly because children were economically useful. In a society where children could contribute to the family income from an early age, as in the Old and New World in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, they were certainly welcome. For women the bearing of children was one of the most important ways of serving God, quite equivalent to any other Christian duty, such as almsgiving or worship. Some Puritan writers also agree with St. Paul in saying that a woman was expiating her original responsibility for the Fall through her sufferings in childbirth.[35] The child was seen by the Puritans as naturally rebellious and self-willed. The chief duty of both parents

[33] Clark, Alice, Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century (London, Routledge, 1919), p. 241.

[34] Gataker, A Wife in Deed, pp. 34-35.

[35] Coverdale, Myles, The Christian State of Matri-Monye, Wherein Husbandes and Wyves May Learne to Keepe House Together Wyth Love (London, John Awdeley, 1575), Fol. 37.

was the checking of these unfortunate traits and the instilling of Christian virtues. As we have seen, the power of the father over the family was, theoretically, almost despotic. Gouge even suggests that the wicked child who proves incorrigible should be put to death; although he insists that the Magistrate, and not the parents, execute the sentence. The power of parents might be great, but their responsibilities were correspondingly very heavy. In the specific instructions for the carrying out of these duties, the theoretically absolute power of the parents is seen to be actually relative. The responsibilities of the parents cover three areas: education, choice of calling and choice of marriage partner.

Education was designed above all to secure salvation for the child. Even the children of the godly were not automatically saved, but any child who had been properly instructed stood a better chance than others. The nature of the child was such that he was born without knowledge but with the capacity for attaining it. On the other hand, he was also innately evil, and therefore capable of committing terrible sins, which would incur the wrath of God in spite of his ignorance. The duty of parents was to instill in the child the knowledge of his own depravity as soon as possible. In 1642 the State of Massachusetts, followed shortly by the other orthodox New England colonies, decreed that no one should

"Suffer so much barbarism in any of their

> families as not to indeavour to teach by themselves or others, their children and apprentices so much learning as may inable them perfectly to read the english tongue, and knowledge of the Capital lawes; upon penaltie of twentie shillings for each neglect therin. Also that all masters of families doe once a week (at the least) catechize their children and servants in the grounds and principles of Religion." [36]

Apart from spiritual education, the parents also had to feed and clothe the child and bring him up so that he could exercise a calling. Girls started housework at the age of six or seven, boys began general tasks at the same time and continued until they were twelve or so, when they were apprenticed. If a boy was intended for the University, he would begin his academic education at the age of seven and enter college at fifteen or sixteen. In choosing a calling for a child a parent had to remember that no occupation is "lawful but what is useful to humane society", and to pay attention to the child's wishes. Most writers emphasize that if the parent made a choice which the child really disliked, the latter should be allowed to start again in another calling. The same reciprocal pattern can be observed in parental control of the choice of spouse.

Although the Continental reformers suggest that provision be made for magisterial interference if the parental attitude was unreasonable, no trace of this is found in English writers, and the fundamental obligation to heed the parents' wishes is heavily stressed among the children's duties. Perkins says that contracts made

36 Farrand, Max, ed., The Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts, Reprinted from the copy of the 1648 Edition in the Henry E. Huntington Library, (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), p. 11. Quoted in Morgan, op. cit., p. 45.

without parental consent are actually void.

Yet Puritan writers also caution parents to pay attention to the natural inclination of their children in these matters. Gataker makes a particular point of this:

> "A Father may finde out a fit wife, and thinke such a one a meet match for his sonne: and her Parents may bee also of the same minde with him ... and yet it may be, when they have done all they can, they cannot fasten their affections... There are secret lincks of affection, that no reason can be rendred of: as there are inbred dislikes, that can neither be resolved, or reconciled."[37]

Because Puritans placed as high a value on domestic happiness and family life as on respect for and obedience to the father, there was a constant conflict between the parental desire to see their children properly settled in life according to their judgement, and the knowledge that marriages between unwilling partners led to unhappy homes and consequent social disorder. Stone feels that the influence of the Puritan writers was largely responsible for the widespread criticism of forced marriages in the early seventeenth century and that women at this time generally won the right,not to choose their own mates, but to veto their parents' choice if they truly found their prospective mate intolerable.[38] Parents had, above all, to remember that their power was for their children's ultimate good and not for their own advantage. The general assumption seems to be that both parents participate in making the important decisions

[37] Gataker, Thomas, A Good Wife God's Gift; a Marriage Sermon on Prov. 19:14 (London, Printed by Edward Griffin for Fulke Clifton, 1620), p. 138.

[38] "The doctrine of the absolute right of parents over the disposal of their children was slowly weakening in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries ... when one looks for the cause of this change of attitude it seems likely that a preponderant part was played by the Puritan ethic ... there was the strong working of moral and religious enthusiasm for a Christian society based on secure family relationships ... and an examination of puritan pamphlet and sermon literature shows criticism of the two basic presuppositions underlying the arranged marriage."

Stone, op. cit., p. 186.

in their children's lives, although the father has the greater responsibility, especially in the choice of calling. Wives should not, however, make any decisions on their own. Gouge writes:

> "A wife may not simply without, or directly against her husband's consent, order and dispose of the children in giving them names, apparelling their bodies, appointing their callings, places of bringing up, marriages or portions."[39]

In relation to her children, the wife occupied the same position as she did in the general family hierarchy, a trusted lieutenant of her husband without any independent power.

In relation to servants and apprentices, the wife's power was definitely less than that of her husband. The term 'servants' covers several different kinds, including Negro and Indian slaves in the colonies. Servants might be voluntary ones, or "indentured" ones in New England, the latter being those who, lacking the price of the passage across the Atlantic, sold his services for seven years to an individual who would pay it. Involuntary servants worked for a master as punishment for wrongdoing. One kind of wrongdoing was participation in warfare -- on the wrong side. Prisoners taken in a just war, it was thought, had forfeited their lives by attempting to take the lives of others; their punishment was either death or slavery. On this ground the Puritans enslaved the Indians they captured in the Pequot War and in King Philip's War.[40] Irishmen captured by Cromwell's armies were also shipped

[39] Gouge, op. cit., p. 309.

[40] Morgan, op. cit., p. 63.

to New England. When a man stole from, or otherwise damaged another and could not make restitution in cash, he might be sold for a number of years until the bill was paid. Obviously these different types of servants worked for their masters on different terms, yet in Puritan thought, all owed the same duties to their masters and were to be treated in the same way. The duties of the servant were obedience, faithfulness and reverence. Legislative and judicial action supported the master's power both in England and in the colonies.

The reverence of a servant for his master was supposed to surpass that of the wife and children for the head of the household. The servant's respect should contain a greater element of fear.[41] Within the family group there was no inferiority to match that of the servant; he was always ranked last in the family hierarchy and there was great emphasis in the guides to godliness on the lawfulness of servitude and the importance of passive obedience on the part of servants. A king might be called to account by his subjects, but not a master by his servants. It is only Anabaptists, Gouge assures the reader, who try to destroy the order of society and teach that there is no real difference between master and servant.

In spite of the lowness of the servant's status in the family and his indubitably difficult life, both he and his master were supposed to work for the good of each other and for their common Master.

[41] Ibid., p. 64.

Consider how Dod and Cleaver state the great truth that in Christ there is neither bond nor free.

> "Even bondmen are commanded notwithstanding their low estate and the baseness of their condition, yet to bring some glory to God, and to win some reverence to their glorious profession, by their good behaviour ... Even a servant, if he be not audacious and arrogant, not given to picking and falsehood, but trusty, diligent and serviceable, patient, meek and humble ... shall have reward of this service, as well as if he were in a higher and more honourable calling, that the world made account of." [42]

God gave authority to the master so that he might help his servants live a Christian life. A master could not rightfully command his servant to any evil action. If he did, the servant could humbly refuse, and the courts would support him. Spiritual health was, of course, much more important than bodily health, and the master was as responsible for his servants' souls as he was for his children's. To many servants in Puritan households who did not necessarily share their masters' views, daily catechizing and religious instruction must have become profoundly annoying.[43] Gataker complains that it is only too frequently easier to get good work from servants who were openly not believers than from those who claimed to be fervent Christians.[44] The relationship between master and servant was made by God for their mutual good. Between the two there is the same basic equality that exists between all Christians, whatever their station

[42] quoted in Hill, op. cit., p. 475.

[43] Morgan, op. cit., p. 73.

[44] Gataker, A Wife in Deed, p. 21.

in life.[45] Naturally, if the servant was himself an ardent Christian he would appreciate and understand the patriarchal relationship. Puritan ideas about the place of the servant in the family were as ethically inspired as their thoughts on any other topic. Very definitely, the master of a household did not cover an exploitative approach to his servants with a concern for their well being. The fact that servants and apprentices were often the children of friends and neighbours made the educational aspect of the household more marked.[46]

There was one class of people who really had no place outside the family. These were single people who were not children or apprentices; although a careful distinction has to be drawn between the status of bachelors, spinsters, and the widowed of either sex. Single women were really in the most disadvantageous position. The Reformers' insistence on the fact that the married state was an honourable one and that celibacy was not in any way a more godly state meant that those who were voluntarily single lost a great deal of status in the world. Although there are some references to the actual superiority or greater godliness of marriage in the literature, on the whole, Puritan thought on this matter was that the only real advantage in remaining single was that it was less troublesome. Fuller, for instance, in his chapter on "The Constant Virgin" in The Holy and Profane States, emphasizes the

[46] "It [the Puritan family] was also a school, where vocational training was combined with discipline in good manners and guidance in religion, a school of which all servants were the pupils and to which many respectable and godly men sent their children."

Morgan, op. cit., p. 77

privilege and comfort of the single life rather than its self-sacrifice and arduousness.[47] Whately, in a treatise devoted to an all too detailed outline of the miseries of marriage,advised that those who could should remain single, not because this was a more godly state but because they might find the hardships of marriage and child-rearing too much for them.[48] Anglican writers, in contrast, still clung to a clear preference for virginity, seeing in the capacity to remain single a token of superior moral endowment. Hooker, for example, speaks of the single life as "a thing more angelical and divine" than married life.[49] Of course, as Whately is careful to point out, anyone lacking the means to support a wife, or the freedom to contract a marriage (because he is an apprentice or servant) has a clear sign from God that he is not intended to marry. He will, of course, be given the gift of continence "that God has appointed to subdue lust."[50] The single people Whately refers to are, however, all male, and although later in the same book he asks widows and widowers not to marry again if possible, he nowhere suggests that single women so remain, for they had no status except as daughters or dependents in some household not their own. A widow often continued to run her household or her husband's business and thus had an acceptable place in society, but a single woman would have to live under her father's control all her life

[47] George, op. cit., p. 267.

[48] Whately, William. A Care Cloth: or a Treatise of the Cumbers and Troubles of Marriage: Intended to Advise Them that May, to Shun Them; that May Not, Well and Patiently to Beare Them. (London, Imprinted by Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man, 1624), Introduction.

[49] George, op. cit., p. 268.

[50] Whately, A Care Cloth, Introduction.

with no hope of achieving adult status if she did not marry.[51] Fathers felt themselves morally obliged to marry off their daughters and severe parental pressure was inevitably put on girls. Before the dissolution of the monasteries, the Church had offered an honourable and interesting career to girls of the nobility, the gentry, and (in the later Middle Ages) the bourgeoisie.[52] To unmarried gentlewomen, monasticism offered a chance to exercise their powers of organization in the government of a community and the management of estates, and the opportunity of a good education. The loss of this career for spinsters was felt as late as the end of the seventeenth century when Mary Astell, writing of the education of women, suggested setting up lay sisterhoods or colleges for the unmarried.[53] For the working class woman to remain unmarried was not the tragedy that it was for the middle class girl. Working on the land or as a domestic servant, she was automatically assigned a lowly but secure place in some household. So important was this relationship with a household that persons living apart from their families in New England were ordered to rejoin them or to leave the colony.[54] The adult unmarried woman had no place in society as Puritan writers viewed it. As woman was created primarily to help man, she was in some ways incomplete in herself.[55] From this sprang the widespread contempt for "old maids" or

[51] Stone, op. cit., p. 183.

[52] Power, op. cit., p. 413.

[53] Astell, Mary, An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex (London, Printed for A. Roper and G. Wilkinson and R. Clavel, 1696).

[54] Calhoun, op. cit., I; p. 71.

[55] Thomas, op. cit., p. 213.

"withered virgins" — as Milton calls them — who had failed to achieve the main purpose of their existence.

Puritan thought on the family reflected the economic situation of the typical middle class Protestant who was the head of a small workshop or farm. He had a relationship with his family and work people which differed greatly from that of the head of a great noble family or of a monastery, who worked through a hierarchy of subordinates. The father who was also economic head of the household was in direct personal contact with those who worked side by side with him under his orders. He knew them well and could hardly help but feel some responsibility for both their physical and spiritual welfare. Similarly, the social basis for the Puritan view of marriage as a companionship based on mutual affection was the relationship between husband and wife in a small business where the woman was, in fact, a helpmeet to her husband. Almost all guild regulations, which forbid the employment of women, make exception for the craftsman's wife and daughter who are expected to help in the workshop although they need no formal apprenticeship or training.[56] This kind of practical co-operation was almost unknown in noble households where men and women spent their lives engaged in widely disparate occupations. So long as the family farm and small family business predominated in English family life, the patriarchal theory of the family corresponded to economic reality. The father's economic supremacy was reflected

[56] Power, op. cit., p. 426-427.

in the Puritan insistence on the secondary nature of woman's place in the family. She was vitally important to the proper functioning of the household, but she was useful only so long as she did not step out of her place. Woman had no function to fulfill and no rôle to play in society, outside the unit of the family.

And yet, the more important the family became as an institution in Puritan thought, the more important became the rôle assigned to woman in the life of man, and the more important the need to define and understand that rôle.[57]

57 Haller, William and Malleville Haller, "The Puritan Art of Love", The Huntington Library Quarterly, V, no. 2 (January, 1942), p. 247.

SEX AND THE NATURE OF WOMAN

CHAPTER IV

As woman's sphere in life was determined mainly by her sexual function in that the only rôle society offered her was that of a wife, it is necessary to outline the Puritan attitude to sex, both in marriage and outside it, before the nature of woman can be discussed. Calvin and the Puritan writers, as we have seen, were deeply influenced by St. Paul's harsh attitude to fornication, which the latter insisted on treating as a major crime which separates the soul from Christ.[1] In his Harmony of the Pentateuch, Calvin goes to great pains to prove that the condemnation of adultery by the Seventh Commandment covered fornication also.[2] The Puritans believed that sexual desire existed before the Fall and that it was therefore sinless. However, its nature, like the nature of all Creation, had been changed by the primal sin, and it had become so strong that it could not be controlled by man's conscious mind.[3] Therefore desire was indeed sinful if a man gave way to it in any but the right circumstances and the right manner. The torments of desire were one of the punishments inflicted by God on fallen

[1] Foster, Hazel Elora, Jewish and Graeco-Roman Influences upon Paul's Attitudes toward Women (Chicago, Ill., Private edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1936), p. 279.

[2] "Although one kind of impunity is alone referred to, it is sufficiently plain, from the principle laid down, that believers are generally exhorted to chastity, for if the Law be a perfect rule of holy living, it would be the more absurd to give a licence for fornication, adultery alone being excepted.

Furthermore, it is incontrovertible that God will by no means approve or excuse before his tribunal what the commonsense of mankind declares to be obscene."

Calvin, Jean, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses arranged in the Form of a Harmony (Edinburgh, Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, MDCCCLII), pp. 68-69.

[3] "But since that Sinne came in by the fall of our first parents, Mankind having lost that power and command of it selfe that before it had; this affection is not only tainted and mixed generally with much filth, but it is growne so violent, impetuous and head-strong ... that it is readie to break forth into grievous inconveniences, if some course be not taken for the repression and restraint of it."

Gataker, Thomas, A Wife in Deed (London, Printed by Iohn Haviland for Fulke Clifton, 1623), p. 37.

mankind.[4] Fornication damages man in a way no other sin does because it defiles the body dedicated to Christ and destined to be a partaker of heavenly glory. Gouge outlines the horror with which God regards those who indulge in sexual irregularities.

> "In his soule he hateth them: by his word he hath denounced many fearefull judgements against them, both in this world and in the world to come. Against no sinne more: this sin is reckoned to be one of the most principall causes of the greatest judgements that ever were inflicted in the world: as of the generall deluge of that fire and brimstone which destroied Sodome and Gomorrah . . . . By all which we see that fearefull doom verified 'Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge'."[5]

All intercourse outside of marriage was condemned as against divine and natural law.[6] Besides the everlasting torment in store for the unchaste, there were natural punishments in store for them in the world.

> "Dost thou preserve thy body in holiness and honor? Thou shalt avoid hereby those infinite woes and miseries, which befall the unchaste, as poverty, barreness, a rotten body, a worse soule, a ruined estate, both in this world and in the world to come."[7]

Fortunately God had appointed a remedy for the curse of desire, and that was a marriage, "a singular Benefit and Blessing of all those that finde such infirmitie and defect in themselves."[8] Intercourse within marriage was as chaste as virginity.[9] We have seen that the Puritans firmly combatted what they conceived to be the Roman Church's exaggerated regard for chastity and lack of respect

[4] Gouge, William, Of Domesticall Duties; Eight Treatises (London, Printed by Iohn Haviland for William Bladen, 1622), p. 221.

[5] Calvin, Jean, Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians (Edinburgh, Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, MDCCCXLVII), p. 220.

[6] Calvin, Jean, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, p. 97-98.
cf. also
Coverdale, Myles, The Christian State of Matrimonye (London, John Awdeley, 1575), Fol. 13.

[7] Rogers, Daniel Matrimoniall Honour (London, Printed by Th. Harper for Philip Nevil, 1642), p. 19.

[8] Gataker, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

[9] "This is the end and purpose why this law was given; to avoid as dissolute, common and libidinous life, with other uncleanliness, to love and keep chastity and purity of wyfe, which consisteth either in sincere virginity, or faithful matrimony."

Hooper, John, "A Declaration of the Ten Commandments" in Early Works (Cambridge, Park Society, MDCCXLIII), p. 374.

for marriage, yet they themselves did not feel that intercourse between married people was necessarily sinless. Calvin refers to marriage as "a veil by which that fault (immoderate desire) is covered over."[10] Even within the remedy provided by God, sexual intercourse could be sinful and could, in fact, become fornication.[11] Sexual desire must be used for the ends God intended, just as any other appetite of the natural world, such as the need for food and drink. Sex in marriage should be used as a remedy against incontinence, for the procreation of children, and for the development of mutual affection in the married couple.[12] The last is an important point because it emphasizes the sexual aspect of the Puritan idea of companionship in marriage. Puritan writers emphasize that conception is not the sole purpose of marital intercourse; barren women and women already pregnant have an equal right to coition.[13]

Married couples are warned to be on their guard against sexual behaviour which could become lust. Calvin remarks in the Institutes:

> "For though honourable wedlock veils the turpitude of incontinence, it does not follow that it ought forthwith to become a stimulus to it. Wherefore, let spouses consider that all things are not lawful for them."[14]

Several kinds of sexual behaviour in marriage are dangerous. Gouge criticizes those married couples who are "ever colling, kissing, and dallying ..., they care not in what company."[15] Public displays of this nature are irresponsible in that they encourage lustful desires in others.

[10] Calvin, Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, p. 231.

[11] Cleaver, Robert, A Godly Form of Householde Government (London, Printed by T. Crede for T. Man, 1598) p. 184.

[12] Gouge, op. cit., p. 221-223.

[13] Ibid., p. 224.

[14] Calvin, Jean, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Translated by Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), 2 vols, I; p. 350.

[15] Quoted in Frye, Roland Mushat, "The Teachings of Classical Puritanism on Conjugal Love", Studies in the Renaissance, II (1955), p. 156.

Wantoness, or excessive enjoyment of intercourse, is also strongly criticized. Cleaver writes:

> "... marriage is not a mad and dissolute estate, neither are husbands to turne their wives into whores, or wives their husbands into whoremasters, by immoderate, intemporate, or excessive lust."[16]

Richard Baxter felt that if married people "pamper the flesh" in this way, the marriage would actually encourage the growth of the very desires it was instituted to satisfy.[17] Immodesty of various kinds was also as sinful in marriage as outside it. Following Biblical teaching, Puritan writers thought that married couples who indulged in intercourse during menstruation deserved divine censure.[18] Natural penalties also awaited those who enjoyed "this kind of intemperance"; the danger of infection from "the very foulness of the disease,"[20] and the danger of producing deformed offspring.[21] Couples who would not wait to arrange their marriage properly but insisted on marrying as soon as they saw someone they liked, "though they keepe themselves free from the penalty of the lawes under which they live, they procure meanes to be married, yet they declare a lustfull and adulterous minde."[22] Puritan thinkers seem to feel that married couples should be constantly on their guard against the possibility of lustful behaviour toward each other. Their fear of lust was based on its increased strength since the Fall and its consequent ability to pervert man's reason. Immoderate love was

[16] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 157.

[17] Baxter, Richard, Christian Oeconomics (London, James Duncan, 1830), p. 155.

[18] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 158.

[19] Gouge, op. cit., p. 223.

[20] Calvin, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, p. 95.

[21] Gouge, op. cit., p. 223.

[22] Ibid., p. 197.

a bad basis for marriage, because its very violence prevented it from maintaining the stability necessary for a lifelong relationship. Passionate love was a short-lived emotion soon succeeded by indifference.[23] Above all, passionate love or lust were a kind of idolatry in that they put a human being in the centre of the person's life, which is rightfully God's place. The Puritans did not despise or condemn any of the goods of this world, for they were created by God for man's use. Such good things must, however, be enjoyed in moderation and not become an end in themselves, for that would be to pervert the use for which such things were created. Sexual desire, being so much stronger than the desire for food, drink, or wealth, was particularly prone to this kind of perversion. The Puritans had a very realistic view of the profoundly disturbing nature of sexual desire, and consequently felt that it must be more severely controlled than any other human desire if it was to fulfill the purpose God intended. Even love for the spouse must not become immoderate. Henry Smith warns:

> "Man must take heed that his love toward his wife be not greater than his love toward God, as Adam's and Sampson's were."[24]

Because woman exercised a profound attraction over men, and consequently had the power to turn his mind against God, men were warned to beware of loving too deeply or passionately. Milton's **Samson**, Smith says, made this mistake and was punished by losing

[23] Cleaver, op. cit., p. 179.

[24] Smith, Henry, <u>Preparative to Marriage</u> (London, Printed by T. Orwin for T. Man, 1591), p. 56.

control over his own destiny.[25]

As marriage was the only legal outlet for this strong sexual desire, Puritan writers, following other Reformers, emphasize the necessity for both partners to render "due benevolence" to the other. Any abstinence from intercourse must be by mutual agreement. Gouge feels that modesty, either real or feigned, or fear of having too many children, are not valid excuses for refusing the other partner, but that

> "when one of the married couple being weake by sicknesse, pain, labour, travell or any other like meanes, and through that weaknesse not well able to performe this dutie, the other notwithstanding will have it performed, 'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice' saith the Lord. Shall God's sacrifice give place to mercy and shall not man's or woman's lust?"[26]

While Puritanism "consciously taught the purity, legality and even obligation of physical love in marriage",[27] it also expressed a profound suspicion of man's sexual nature and insisted that it be carefully controlled.

Woman was created by God of man and for him.[28] As this was the end for which she was created, she denies her own nature when she ceases to be of use to man.[29] As Adam existed quite contentedly without her, she is not as necessary to him as he is to her.

> "The woman was God's owne gift to Adam. And shee was God's gift bestowed on him to

[25] Gilbert, Allan H., "Milton on the Position of Women", Modern Language Review, XV, (1920), p. 243.

[26] Gouge, op. cit., pp. 222-223.

[27] Frye, op. cit., p. 155.

[28] Haller, William and Malleville Haller, "The Puritan Art of Love," The Huntington Library Quarterly, V, no. 2 (January, 1942), p. 248.

[29] "Shee ceaseth to be a Wife, yea to be a Woman when shee ceaseth to be a meanes of good to man."
Gataker, op. cit., p. 54.

> consummate and make up his happinesse. Though he were at the first of himselfe happy, yet not so happy as he might be, untill he had one to partake with him in his happiness." [30]

However, no other created being could take her place as his companion.[31]

As woman derives her origin from the man, she is therefore inferior in rank to him,[32] but still created in the image of God, though in the second degree.[33] Even before the Fall, as we saw in the previous chapter, she was man's inferior, as she was created as a secondary being. Her inferiority is part of the natural order[34] and she is therefore subject to man because he is her superior.

> "As an head is more eminent and excellent than the body, and placed above it, so is an husband to his wife."[35]

Richard Baxter speaks of the 'natural imbecility' of the female sex which makes it necessary for them to be ruled by men.

Woman also bears a greater responsibility for the Fall of Mankind than does man, because she was first deceived by the serpent and became Satan's agent.[36] As a result, her original subjection became onerous and unpleasant to her. Her subjection also changed its nature and became very severe, so that woman is not a servant to her husband. Partly this is for the protection of mankind, as Eve caused the downfall of the human race through her

[30] "The woman was God's owne gift to Adam. And shee was God's gift bestowed on him to consummate and make up his happinesse. Though he were at the first of him selfe happy, yet not so happy as he might be, untill he had one to partake with him in his happiness".

Gataker, Thomas, A Good Wife God's Gift; a marriage sermon on Prov. 19:14. (London, Printed by Edward Griffin for Fulke Clifton, 1620), p. 9.

[31] Rogers, op. cit., p. 255.

[32] Calvin, Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, p. 357.

[33] Calvin, Jean, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis, Translated from the original Latin and compared with the French edition, by the Rev. John King (Edinburgh, Calvin Translation Society, 1847-1850), p. 129.

[34] Gouge, op. cit., p. 268.

[35] Ibid., p. 30.

[36] Sprint, John, The Bride-Womans Counseller; Being a Sermon Preached at a Wedding, May 11th, 1699 (London, Printed by H. Hill, n. d.), p. 6.

natural credibility, her descendants have to be carefully controlled so that their weakness does not lead them into similar trouble.[37] The creation of woman implied "the erecting of a family"[38], and as a further punishment for her sin in injuring Adam, whose helper she was created to be, God made childbirth painful and dangerous to her.[39] Puritan writers wish women to be constantly aware of their own inferiority. Cleaver and Rogers, for example, insist that women nurse their own children, because this is one of the functions for which they were designed, and to refuse is to deny their own nature.[40] It is also a denial of subjection, because women refuse to nurse because they wish to be in control of their own bodies and use them for purposes not intended by God and their husbands. "The wife is further to remember, that God hath given her two breasts, not that she should occupy and use them for a shew, ... but in the service of God, and to be a helpe to her husband in suckling the child common to them both."[41]

Woman's nature made it unsuitable for her to do anything men did, such as dressing in masculine attire or engaging in masculine occupations. Not only did this upset the natural order; it might also lead to sexual license. It was disgraceful

> "for women to affect manliness in their dress and gestures, propriety and modesty are prescribed, not only for decency's sake, but lest one kind of liberty should at length lead to something worse." [42]

37 "Remember, thy sexe is crazy, ever since Eve sinned."

Rogers, op. cit., p. 281.

cf. also

"and good reason it is that she who first drew man unto sin, should be now subiect to him, lest by the like womanish weaknesse she fall again."

Gouge, op. cit., p. 269.

38 Ibid., p. 230.

39 Rogers, op. cit., p. 257.

40 Ibid., p. 279.

41 Cleaver, op. cit., p. 238.

42 Calvin, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, p. 110.

Modesty was woman's primary virtue, and although, as we have seen, the Puritans considered that chastity and fidelity should also be masculine virtues, thus running counter to the mores of their time, there was a widespread feeling that as the consequences of adultery or unchastity were more serious in women than in men,[43] women should be more greatly condemned for sexual sins. Calvin, commenting on Deuteronomy, writes:

> "If the punishment i.e., stoning for girls who were found not to be virgins on marriage seem to anybody to be somewhat too severe, let him reflect that no kind of fraud is more intolerable. A false sale of a field or a house shall be accounted a crime ... and therefore, she who abuses the sacred name of marriage for deception and offers an unchaste body instead of a chaste, much less deserves to be pardoned."[44]

Because woman's primary purpose in life should be to help man, any action she might commit to harm him was more blameworthy than a similar sin on his part. It was a commonplace of sixteenth century thought that woman was naturally inferior to man and existed primarily for his sexual gratification. The difference in the Puritan view is not that they denied she was made for man, but that they thought she was made to give him a different kind of satisfaction. St. Thomas Aquinas thought woman was necessary to man and created as a helpmate for him, but she was a helpmate only in procreation, since man could be more efficiently aided by his fellowmen in every other sphere of life. The Puritans said

[43] Thomas, Keith, "The Double Standard," Journal of the History of Ideas, XX, (1959), p. 204.

[44] Calvin, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses, p. 92.

she was made to be a helpmate in a social sense;[45] a companion to man and his assistant in domestic life. She was also a spiritual companion, capable of helping him become more godly. Woman was made by God for man, and her whole life should be dedicated to fulfilling his wishes. If she considered herself a person in her own right, or attempted to live for her own ends, she was defying the natural order and Divine law. Providing she kept her place in the natural hierarchy and attempted to fulfill the purpose for which she was created, she could be a greater blessing to man than any other created thing.

[45] Cole, William Graham, Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis (New York, Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 120.

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER V

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were a period of vast social, political, and economic changes in England, of which the development of the middle classes was one of the most significant. Although lines between classes were never rigidly drawn and rich merchants constantly swelled the ranks of the landed gentry while economic failures sank to the artisan level, the middle class retained sufficiently distinctive habits and values to be distinguished from the nobility and gentry on the one hand and the poor on the other. Economic changes favoured the development of industry and commerce and the Tudors, having crushed the power of the feudal nobility, chose their chief counsellors from the newly enriched middle classes. The Puritans found their audience and adherents among this class.[1] Puritanism did not necessarily rationalize all middle-class ideals, but the family described by the Puritan preachers is obviously a middle-class household, and the duties women are assigned are clearly those a middle-class housewife would practice. On the accession of Elizabeth, Puritanism was a

[1] Knappen, Marshall Mason, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 353.

minority movement of a small group of scholars. The growth in the number of its adherents in following years testifies to the wide-spread appeal of Puritan ideas. In order to see whether Puritan ideas on women were really a reflection of the view of the sixteenth and seventeenth century middle classes, we should contrast them with the views of the separatists who broke off from the Church of England at various times during the sixteenth century, and with the views of the Anglicans. Many communities of religious extremists emigrated to Holland or to America. They were known by a variety of names; Brownists, Independents, Baptists and Quakers, among others, and they represented a wide variety of theological opinion. What they had in common was that they believed in a pure church of the regenerate and insisted upon separation from the ungodly in the national church and upon conversion as a condition of membership. Most groups also believed in the complete self-government of individual congregations. They laid great emphasis upon direct inspiration by the Holy Spirit and tended to have little respect for human learning. Their assertion of the spiritual equality of all believers led to the encouragement of lay preaching and culminated in the Quaker doctrine of the "inner light". In the political sphere this consciousness of the direct relationship with God which all believers held led to democratic protests against the established order. The hierarchical patriarchal family was also threatened by them. From the beginning the separatists allowed women an equal share in Church government and, not surprisingly, women were numerically extremely prominent among them. Popular Elizabethan satires on the "Family of Love" and other sects make a great point of the large number of their female adherents, and this was a favourite gibe against the sectaries during the Civil War period. In the Episcopal returns and Indulgence documents of the reign of Charles II, conventiclers are frequently described as being "chiefly women" and "most silly women".[2] Hooker claims in the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity that sectaries work on women because of the disabilities of their sex, their weaker judgment, and their more emotional natures.[3] Many of these women were of the lower classes and had probably never been active members of any church. A large number who left their husbands to go to the Netherlands with Brown and Harrison were largely illiterate. As the members did not believe in an educated or ordained ministry, it was possible for women to take part in Church government and to preach. There was some precedent for this among other Protestant movements. The Lollards, for example, encouraged women to read the Bible and recite the Scriptures at meetings, and in theory, all Protestants subscribed to the belief in the priesthood of all believers and allowed that, in spite of her subject state and natural unfitness, a woman might, in exceptional circumstances, preach. But this conclusion was reluctantly arrived at

[2] Thomas, Keith, "Women and the Civil War Sects." Past and Present, No. 13 (April, 1958), p. 45.

[3] Keble, John (ed.), The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, 7th ed. (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, MDCCCLXXXVIII, 3 vols., I; p. 47.

and largely theoretical in application, so women preachers are found only among the sects.

Preaching by women began in certain Baptist Churches in Holland and was found in Massachusetts by 1636.[4] It became common in London in the sixteen-forties and spread outside the city as far as Yorkshire and Somerset. It was among the Quakers that the spiritual rights of women received most attention. All the Friends were allowed to speak and prophesy on the basis of complete equality, for the Inner Light knew no barriers of sex. Fox declared that women's subjection had been eradicated by Redemption. The Gospel prohibition of women preachers was held to refer to local and temporary conditions, and so was not valid on the contemporary scene. Fox was concerned to liberate for the service of the Church the gifts of government and inspiration that lay dormant in women.[5] As a result, women were the first Quaker preachers in London, in the Universities, in Dublin, and in the American colonies, and it was rumoured at first that the sect was composed entirely of the female sex. The Quaker movement made an enormous contribution to the emancipation of women.

The horrified opposition aroused by the women preachers of the sects was certainly inspired by more than the female defiance of Biblical prohibitions. Such female preachers were felt to challenge the natural order by stepping out of the subordinate rôle to which

[4] Thomas, op. cit., p. 47.

[5] Ross, Isabel, Margaret Fell; Mother of Quakerism (London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1949), pp. 273-274.

God and man had assigned them. Anne Hutchinson, the leader of Antinomianism in Massachusetts, was accused of forgetting her place in society, being a husband rather than a wife, and a magistrate rather than the subject she rightfully was. Other women sectaries were accused of developing ambitions unsuitable to their state and harbouring desires to upset the natural order. This was not only usurping the rightful power of the male sex, but was also a breach of womanly modesty. Not all contemporaries saw these motives; some preferred to agree with Hooker that the natural imbecility of women attracted them to heretical organizations and that the sects chose to swell their ranks with easily recruited members. Such could not bring themselves to see how attractive it must have been to women denied any voice or office in the established church to be given responsibility and a chance to participate in public worship.

The sects were also popularly associated with revolutionary views on marriage and divorce, and, as in the case of their preponderantly female membership, this charge seems well founded. The Brownists, as mentioned before, considered marriage a civil contract and approved of divorce. The "Pauline privilege" of divorce by a believing spouse of the unbelieving mate was invoked by the Anabaptists and Brownists. In the sixteen-forties several sectary women cast off their old husbands and took new ones, pleading reasons of conscience. The enemies of the sects argued that this was evidence that the growth of schism was undermining the unit of the family, so important for social order. The separatists themselves maintained that they wished to leave the family undisturbed, apart from ensuring that every member had liberty of conscience. The official Confessions of the Congregational and Baptist Churches maintained that differences in religion did not dissolve any natural bond or abolish the obedience due from wives and children to their superiors. But as the family was the basic unit of the Church as well as of the State, liberty of conscience did threaten the natural order. "Once the religious sanction was taken away or weakened, then the whole of society was subject to challenge and re-sanctioning from a new point of view -- that of reason, natural right, popular consent and common interest."[6]

The religious sects had little or no long term effect upon the place of women. In company with much other contemporary thought, the more radical views on the family went underground at the Restoration, and as the sects became institutionalized and their members rose in the world, they became conservative regarding the organization of the family and the place of women. Spiritual equality no longer meant social equality. What is significant is the horror with which both Presbyterians and Anglicans regarded the conduct of the female adherents of the sects.[7] Although the social radicalism of the sects was much exaggerated by their alarmed

[6] Thomas, op. cit., p. 54

[7] Ibid., p. 52.

opponents, both wings of the Church perceived the same dangers inherent in the licence the sectaries allowed to women. This suggests that the non-Puritan adherents of the Church of England, while they espoused a more traditionally medieval view of marriage and celibacy, held views similar to the Puritan on woman's nature and place in society. Richard Hooker, for instance, describes the single life as "a thing more angelical and divine" than marriage,[8] and states that the main reason for marriage is procreation. He also insists on the inferiority of women and says that "the very imbecility of their nature and sex doth bind them, namely to be always directed, guided and ordered by others."[9] He also condemns women teachers as an "absurdity". John Donne firmly believes that women originally sinned more greatly than man in the Fall,[10] and writes a list of wifely virtues with which a Puritan could certainly agree:

> "Chastity, sobriety, taciturnity, verity and such: for, for (sic) such virtues as may be had, and yet the possessor not the better for them, as wit, learning, eloquence, music, memory, cunning and skill, that make her never the fitter."[11]

The Puritan and the traditionalist might hold profoundly different views of marriage, but both agreed what woman should be and do.

The ideal of the Puritan preachers was a middle-class woman, the wife, in fact, of a typical member of their congregation.

There were many devoutly Calvinist families among the

[8] Hooker, op. cit., III; p. 427.

[9] Ibid., p. 429.

[10] Donne, John, The Works of John Donne, with a Memoir of his Life by Henry Alford. (London, John W. Parker, MDCCCXXXIX), 6 vols., 4, p. 27.

[11] Ibid., p. 29.

Elizabethan and Stuart nobility and gentry, but their influence was not all-embracing. The Court and London life attracted more and more of the upper classes to spend part of the year in London.[12] In Chapter I, mention was made of the widespread hostility to the manners and mores of upper class young men who had returned from Europe deeply influenced by the freer Italian life. One of the most striking features of Stuart society was the growing cleavage between Court and Country. The Jacobean Court was notorious for its sexual licence, and the aristocracy came to be associated by the ever-growing body of Puritans with sexual licence and social irresponsibility. "Although," as Stone says, "the court of King Charles was a far more respectable place than that of his father, the situation could not be restored overnight, and the puritan gentry, brooding in their country manorhouses upon the evils of the day, continued to be regaled with news of aristocratic scandal, most of it associated with the court group."[13] Puritan writers express much hostility to the practice, common in aristocratic families, of living apart for the greater part of the year; the husband in London and the wife in the country seat. Gouge writes:

> "Contrarie also to the forenamed dutie of cohabitation, is the practise of many men, who living themselves in one place (suppose at London) send their wives unto some countrey house, and there even mew them up, as Hawkes, never caring to come at them, but then most merrie, when their wives are far off."[14]

[12] Stone, Lawrence, "Marriage among the English Nobility in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." Comparative Studies in Society and History, II (1961), p. 95.

[13] Ibid., p. 204.

[14] Gouge, William, Of Domesticall Duties; Eight Treatises, (London, Printed by Iohn Haviland for William Bladen, 1622), p. 234.

It is remarkable that, in a period when England was noted for its learned, aristocratic ladies, including its Queen, no mention is made of anything but a domestic education for girls, with the proviso, of course, that she learned to read so she could become a good church member. This again suggests that woman in Puritan thought was the typical middle-class housewife. It is noteworthy that Lady Brilliana Harley, and Lucy Hutchinson, both married to men prominent in the Parliamentary armies, did not live as women of their class typically did. Lady Harley was certainly her husband's helpmeet, running his estates and supervising his business while he was at war, and finally defending Brampton Castle from a six-week Royalist siege. The life that women led at Court would be considered by Puritan preachers as utterly immodest and useless. With the new value placed on a happy family life by the Puritans, there became apparent a strong tendency to deplore any aristocratic or libertine conduct which would jeopardize the domestic security so important to this happiness. It is "a middle class morality, which the rich despise and the poor cannot afford."[15] The sexual promiscuity common in aristocratic life was condemned because it was incompatible with the high emotional values expected from marriage, because it was wasteful, and because it took time and money better spent in other ways.

The Puritan view of woman was an idealization of the

[15] Thomas, Keith, "The Double Standard", Journal of the History of Ideas, XX (1959), p. 204.

middle-class housewife reigning over the typical family of a successful craftsman or merchant. Its main inspiration was the Biblical teaching on marriage, the family, and women, reinterpreted to reconcile it with contemporary conventions in morality. The wife, in the middle-class family, had the important responsibility of managing the household and helping her husband in his business. Her conduct and disposition were of interest because of her vital importance to man. But as she was made for man, it was in his interest that preachers concerned themselves with her. There was an improvement in her status if it is compared with the medieval situation. As we have seen, because of its over-valuation of virginity and strong ascetic bent, the medieval Church popularly considered woman the main source of temptation leading men from God. Secular life held out little promise of anything better, as the average feudal male was absorbed in war and the chase, and considered that woman existed only to provide him with sexual satisfaction.[16] The new and higher status ascribed to marriage by the Reformers and their followers in England certainly raised the status of the wife,[17] and the equally new advocacy of masculine chastity and fidelity put woman on a more equal footing with man as far as sexual behaviour was concerned. Puritan denunciations of the Churching of Women, with its origins in the medieval view of woman as something shameful and unclean, also helped to raise

[16] Painter, Sidney, _French Chivalry; Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Medieval France_ (Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1940), pp. 105-106.

[17] Powell, Chilton Latham, _English Domestic Relations, 1487-1653_ (New York, Columbia University Press, 1917), pp. 170-172.

women's status. On the other hand, the Puritans made no effort to restore the legal and economic rights women had enjoyed under Roman law and which the Church and feudalism had taken away.[18] To question the family hierarchy or the place of woman in it was to flaunt Nature, Reason and the Will of God. No provision was made for those who did not marry, and no calling except that of the wife was ever offered to women. The real changes in women's lives came from sources other than Puritan writers. Men and women, for example, both began to marry at a later age, partly because of the introduction of humanist ideas of individual freedom of choice, and partly because health manuals, which were widely read at this time, warned against the dangers of too early conception and child bearing.[19] To see how closely the Puritan woman resembles the middle-class ideal, we should consider two poems written by a man who was not a theologian or even a Puritan. Willobie His Avisa. Or, The True Picture of a Modest Maid, and of a Chast and Constant Wife by Henry Willoby was published in 1594 and is in praise of middle-class woman and bourgeois virtue as compared to aristocratic licence; while Sir Thomas Overbury's A Wife appeared in 1614 and is a description of the qualities requisite in a perfect wife. "Avisa is precisely the sort to appeal to the bourgeoisie, then and now. Resisting all improper advances of noble suitors, she exemplifies Puritan virtue."[20]

[18] Knappen, op. cit., p. 453.

[19] Stone, op. cit., p. 198.

[20] Wright, Louis B., Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England (Chapel Hill, N. C., University of North Carolina Press, 1935), p. 477.

Overbury's Wife is entirely suited to playing the secondary and supportive rôle of the Puritan helpmeet:

> "A passive understanding to conceave
> And judgement to discerne, wish to finde,
> Beyond that, all as hazardous I leave,
> Learning and pregnant wit in woman-kinde"[21]

The Puritan preachers in their guides to domestic happiness provided a blueprint for the ideal wife of the new middle classes, a creature created for man and devoted only to doing him good. Her rôle in the family was vitally important, but carefully circumscribed , and she had no place outside it. Although woman enjoyed increased respect and a higher status in Puritan thought, this advance resulted from the high regard the Puritans had for domestic life and married happiness, rather than from any new idea of the nature of woman herself.

[21] Overbury, Thomas, *The Overburian Characters; To which is Added A Wife.* Edited by W. J. Paylor (Oxford, Blackwell, 1936), p. 105.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Astell, Mary. An Essay in Defence of the Female Sex. London: Printed for A. Roper and E. Wilkinson at the Black Boy, and R. Clavel at the Peacock in Fleet Street, 1696.

Bainton, Roland H. Here I Stand; a life of Martin Luther. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

Barber, Elinor. The Bourgeoisie in Eighteenth Century France. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Barrow, Henry. The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590. Edited by Leland H. Carlson. London: Published for the Sir Halley Stewart trust, 1962.

Baxter, Richard. The Practical Works of the Reverend Richard Baxter with a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of his Writings by the Reverend William Orme. 23 vols. London: James Duncan, 1830.

Becon, Thomas. Worckes. Cambridge: Parker Society, 1843.

Bedford, Jessie. Home Life Under the Stuarts, 1603-1649. London: St. Paul, 1925.

Benson, Mary Sumner. Women in Eighteenth Century America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935.

Bieler, André. L'Homme et la Femme dans la Morale Calviniste. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1963.

____________. La Pensée Economique et Sociale de Calvin. Geneva: Georg, 1959.

Black, J. B. Elizabethan Society. Kingston: Jackson Press, 1920.

Bodin, Jean. Six Books of the Commonwealth. Abridged and Translated by M. J. Tooley. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, n. d.

Boston Public Library. Catalogue of the Galatea Collection of Books Relating to the History of Woman. Boston: 1898.

Bradley, Rose M. The English Housewife in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. London: Edward Arnold, 1912.

Braithwaite, Richard. The English Gentlewoman. London: Printed for Michaell Sparks and are to be sould at the Blew Bible in Greene Arbour, 1636.

Bruce, H. A. Woman in the Making of America. Boston: Little Brown, 1912.

Buchanan, George. A History of Scotland. Seventh edition. Revised and corrected from the original by Mr. Bond. Glasgow: Printed by Chapman and Lang, 1799.

Butler, Samuel. Hudibras. The text edited by A. R. Waller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.

Calder, Isabel M. Activities of the Puritan Faction of the Church of England, 1625-1633. London: S. P. C. K., 1957.

Calhoun, Arthur W. A Social History of the American Family From Colonial Times to the Present. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1945. 3 vols.

Calvin, Jean. Commentaries. Newly translated and edited by Joseph Harontunian, Ph. D., D. D. in collaboration with Louise Pettibone Smith, A. M., Ph. D. London: S. C. M. Press Ltd., 1958.

__________. Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Edinburgh: Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, MDCCCXLVIII.

__________. Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians. Edinburgh: Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, MDCCCLIV.

Calvin, Jean. Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis. Translated from the original Latin and compared with the French edition, by the Rev. John King. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1847-1850.

__________. Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the Form of a Harmony. Edinburgh: Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, MDCCCLII.

__________. Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists. Edinburgh: Printed for the Calvin Translation Society, MDCCCXLV.

__________. Epistolae et Responsa. Hanoviae, apud Gulielmum Antonium, MDXCVII.

__________. Institutes of the Christian Religion. 2 vols. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

Camden, Carroll. The Elizabethan Woman; a Panorama of English Womanhood, 1540 - 1640. London: 1952.

Cartwright, Thomas. Cartwrightiana. Ed. by Albert Peel and L. H. Carlson. London: Published for the Sir Halley Stewart trust, 1951.

Clark, Alice. Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century. London: Routledge, 1919.

Cleaver, Robert. A Godly Form of Householde Government. London: Printed by T. Crede for T. Man, 1598.

Cole, William Graham. Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

The Confession of Faith Agreed Upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. Edinburgh: Johnstone, Hunter and Co., MDCCCLXXVI.

Conversations with Luther. Selections from Recently Published Sources of the Table Talk. Translated and edited by Preserved Smith and Herbert Percival Gallinger. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, [c. 1915.]

Coverdale, Myles. The Christian State of Matrimonye, Wherein Husbandes and Wyves may Learne to Keepe House Together wyth Love. London: John Awdeley, 1575.

Cragg, Gerald Robertson. Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660-1688. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Cremeans, Charles Davis. The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England. Urbana, Ill.; The University of Illinois, 1942.

Crump, C. G. and E. F. Jacob. The Legacy of the Middle Ages. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1943.

Donne, John. The Works of John Donne, with a Memoir of his Life by Henry Alford. 6 vols. London: John W. Parker, MDCCCXXXIX.

Douglas, James. The Status of Women in New England and New France. Kingston: Queens College and University, 1912.

Elyot, Thomas. The Defense of Good Women. Oxford, Ohio: Anchor Press, 1940.

Fanshawe, Lady Anne. Memoirs of Lady Fanshawe, Wife of Sir R. Fanshawe, Bart., Ambassador to the Court of Madrid in 1665, written by herself, [with] extracts from Correspondence of Sir R. Fanshawe. London: Henry Colburn, 1829.

Fleming, S. Children and Puritanism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933.

Foster, Hazel Elora. Jewish and Graeco-Roman Influences Upon Paul's Attitudes Toward Women. Chicago, Ill.: Private Edition, Distributed by The University of Chicago Libraries, 1936.

Gataker, Thomas. A Good Wife God's Gift; A Marriage Sermon on Prov. 19:14. London: Printed by Edward Griffin for Fulke Clifton, 1620.

__________. A Good Wife God's Gift and A Wife in Deed, Two Marriage Sermons. London: Printed by Iohn Haviland for Fulke Clifton, 1623.

Gataker, Thomas. A Mariage Praier. London: Printed by J. Haviland for F. Clifton, 1624.

George, Charles H. and Katherine George. The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570 - 1640. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Goodsell, Willystine. History of the Family. New York: Macmillan, 1941.

Gouge, William. Of Domesticall Duties, Eight Treatises. London: Printed by Iohn Haviland for William Bladen, 1622.

Hooper, John. Early Writings. Cambridge: Parker Society, MDCCCXLIII.

Great Britain. Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642-1660. Collected and Edited by C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait for the Statute Law Committee. London: H. M. S. O., 1911.

Halkett, Anne. The Autobiography of Anne, Lady Halkett. Edited by John Gough Nichols. Westminster: Printed for the Camden Society, 1875.

Haller, William. Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

__________. The Rise of Puritanism, or the Way to the New Jerusalem as set forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

__________. Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638-1647. New York: Columbia University Press, 1934.

Hazlitt, William (ed.). The Table Talk of Martin Luther. Translated and edited by William Hazlitt. London: George Bell and Sons, 1895.

Hill, Christopher. The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1961.

__________. Puritanism and Revolution; Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century. London: Secher & Warburg, 1958.

Hill, Christopher. Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England. London: Secher and Warburg, 1964.

Holdsworth, W. S. A History of English Law. Nine Vols. London: Methuen, 1923-1927.

Hooker, Richard. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. 2 vols. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1907.

Howard, G. E. A History of Matrimonial Institutions. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1904.

Hutchinson, Lucy. Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson, Written by his Widow Lucy; with an Essay by F. P. G. Guizot. London: J. M. Dent, n. d.

James, Margaret. Social Problems and Policy During the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660. London: Routledge, 1930.

Jarrett, Bede. Social Theories of the Middle Ages. Boston: Ernest Benn, 1926.

Joyce, G. H. Christian Marriage; an Historical and Doctrinal Study. London: Sheed & Ward, 1933.

Jonson, Ben. Selected Works. Edited, and with an Introduction by Harry Levin. New York: Random House, 1938.

Keble, John (ed.). The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker. 7th ed. 3 vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, MDCCCLXXXVIII.

Kelso, Ruth. Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1956.

Kephart, William M. The Family, Society and the Individual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, [c1961]

Knappen, Marshall Mason. Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries. Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1933.

__________. Tudor Puritanism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Knox, John. The First Blast of the Trumpet etc., incl. with History of the Reformation within the Realm of Scotland. Glasgow: Printed and sold by J. Galbraith and Company, MDCCLXI.

Knox, John. History of the Reformation in Scotland. Edited by William Croft Dickinson. 2 vols. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1949.

Laslett, Peter (ed.). Patriarcha and other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer. Edited from the original sources and with an Introduction by Peter Laslett. Oxford: Blackwell, 1949.

Lewis, C. S. The Allegory of Love; A Study in Medieval Tradition. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Mathew, David. The Social Structure in Caroline England. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Martin, Hugh. Puritanism and Richard Baxter. London: S. C. M. Press, 1954.

McGregor, O. R. Divorce in England, A Centenary Study. Toronto: Heinemann, 1957.

Miller, Perry. The New England Mind; the Seventeenth Century. New York: Macmillan, 1939.

Miller, Perry (ed.). The Puritans. New York: American Book Co., 1938.

Milton, John. Works. 18 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931-38.

Morgan, Edmund S. The Puritan Family. Boston: Printed by the Trustees of the Public Library, 1944.

Moryson, Fynes. An Itinerary. Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1907-8. 4 vols.

Murdock, George Peter (ed.). Studies in the Science of Society, Presented to Albert Galloway Keller in Celebration of His Completion of Thirty Years as Professor of the Science of Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

New, John F. H. Anglican and Puritan; the Basis of their Opposition, 1558-1640. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Niccholes, Alexander. A Discourse of Marriage. London: Printed by N. O. for Leonard Becket, 1615.

Overbury, Thomas. The Overburian Characters; to which is Added a Wife. Edited by W. J. Paylor. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936.

Painter, Sidney. French Chivalry; Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Medieval France. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1940.

Payne, William Lytton. Mr. Review. Morningside Heights, N. Y.: King's Cross Press, 1947.

Perry, R. B. Puritanism and Democracy. New York: Vanguard, 1944.

Perkins, William. Christian Oeconomie: or, a short survey of the right manner of ordering a familie acc. to the Scriptures. Written in Latin and now set forth in the vulgar tongue by T. Pickering. London: E. Weaver, 1609.

__________. The Whole Treatise of Cases of Conscience. London: Legatt, 1636.

Powell, Chilton Latham. English Domestic Relations, 1487-1653. New York: Columbia University Press, 1917.

Queen, Stuart A., et al. The Family in Various Cultures. Chicago: Lippincott, 1961.

Reynolds, Myra. The Learned Lady in England, 1650-1760. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.

Rogers, Daniel. Matrimoniall Honour. London: Printed by Th. Harper for Philip Nevil, 1642.

Rogers, Timothy. The Character of a Good Woman; both in a single and marry'd state, in a funeral discourse on Prov. 31.10. "Who can find a virtuous woman? for her price is far above rubies," occasion'd by the decease of Mrs. Elizabeth Dunton, who died May 28, 1697, with an account of her life and death, and part of the diary writ with her own hand, with a preface containing a brief history of several excellent women. London: Reprinted for J. Harris, 1697.

Ross, Isabel. Margaret Fell; Mother of Quakerism. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949.

Rutherford, Samuel. Lex, Rex, or The Law and the Prince. Edinburgh: Robert Ogle and Oliver Boyd, 1843.

Schente, W. The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1948.

Schlatter, Richard Bulger. The Social Ideas of Religious Leaders, 1660-1688. London: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Schneider, H. W. The Puritan Mind. New York: Holt, 1930.

Schucking, Levin L. Die Familie im Puritanismus. Leipzig und Berlin: Verlag und Druck von B. G. Teubner, 1929.

Shaff, Philip. The Creeds of Christendom. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1899.

Sibbes, Richard. Complete Works. 7 vols. Edited with a memoir by Rev. Alexander Balloch Grossart. Edinburgh; Nichol, 1862-64.

Simpson, Alan. Puritanism in Old and New England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Smith, Henry. Preparative to Marriage. London: Printed by T. Orwin, for T. Man, 1591.

__________. The Wedding Garment. London: Printed for W. Wright, 1590.

Smyth, C. H. Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1926.

Sprint, John. The Bride-Womans Counseller; Being a Sermon Preach'd at a Wedding, May 11th, 1699, at Sherbourn, in Dorsetshire. London: Printed by H. Hill in Blackfryars, near the water-side. For the Benefit of the Poor.

Stern, B. J. The Family, Past and Present. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. Familiar Studies of Men and Books. London: Chatto and Windus, 1882.

Stuart, D. M. The English Abigail. London: Macmillan, 1946.

Taylor, Jeremy. The Whole Works with a Life of the Author and a Critical Examination of Some of his Writings by the Right Reverend Reginald Heber, D. D., Late Lord Bishop of Calcutta. 3rd edition. 15 volumes. London: Longmans, MDCCCXXXIX.

Usher, Roland G. (ed.). The Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth as Illustrated by the Minute Book of the Dedham Classis, 1582-1589. London: Offices of the Historical Society, 1905.

Wace, Henry, (ed.). Luther's Primary Works, together with his Shorter and Longer Catechisms. Edited with theological and historical essays by Henry Wace and C. A. Bucheim. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.

Ward, A. W. and Waller, A. R. (eds.). The Cambridge History of English Literature. Volume III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Whately, William. A Bride Bush, or a Wedding Sermon, Compendiously describing the Duties of Married Persons: by Performing whereof, Marriage shall be to them a Great Helpe, which now finde it a little Hell. London: Printed by William Iaggard for Nicholas Bourne, 1617.

__________. A Care Cloth: or A Treatise of the Cumbers and Troubles of Marriage: intended to advise them that may, to shun them, that may not, well and patiently to beare them. London: Imprinted by Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man, 1624.

Willobie his Avisa. With an Essay on Willobie His Avisa by G. B. Harrison. London: John Lane at the Bodley Head, 1926.

Willson, D. Harris. King James VI and I. London: Johnathan Cape, 1956.

Wilson, Violet A. Society Women of Shakespeare's Time. London: John Lane, 1924.

Wing, John. The Crowne Conjugall or the Spouse Royall. Middleburgh: J. Hellenius, 1620.

Winnett, Arthur Robert. Divorce and Remarriage in Anglicanism. London: Macmillan, 1958.

Wright, Louis B. Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

Articles

Frye, Roland Mushat. "The Teachings of Classical Puritanism on Conjugal Love", Studies in the Renaissance, II, (1955), pp. 148-159.

Gilbert, Allan H. "Milton on the Position of Women," Modern Language Review, XV (1920), pp. 7-27; pp. 240-264.

Haller, William. "Hail Wedded Love." E. L. H. T., A Journal of English Literary History, XIII, (1945), pp. 79-97.

Haller, William and Malleville Haller. "The Puritan Art of Love." The Huntington Library Quarterly, V, no. 2, (January, 1942), pp. 235-272.

Phillips, James E. "The Background of Spenser's Attitude towards Women Rulers." The Huntington Library Quarterly, Vol. V, no. 1 (October, 1941), pp. 5-32.

Phillips, James E. "The Woman Ruler in Spenser's Faerie Queene." The Huntington Library Quarterly, V, no. 2 (January, 1942), pp. 211-234.

Powicke, F. J. "Puritan Idyll". John Rylands Library, Manchester Bulletin. IV. (1917-18), pp. 434-464.

Seton, Bruce. "The distaff side: a study in matrimonial adventure in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries." Scottish Historical Review, XVII (1919-1920), pp. 272-286.

Siegel, Paul N. "The Petrarchan Sonneteers and Neo-Platonic Love." North Carolina Studies in Philology, XLII (1945), pp. 164-182.

Siegel, Paul N. "Spenser and the Calvinist View of Life." North Carolina Studies in Philology, XLI (1944), pp. 201-222.

Stein, Harold. "Six Tracts About Women." The Library, 4th Series, Vol. XV, no. 1 (January, 1934), pp. 38-48.

Stone, Lawrence. "Marriage among the English Nobility in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries." Comparative Studies in Society and History, III (1961), pp. 182-206.

Thomas, Keith. "The Double Standard." Journal of the History of Ideas, XX (1959), pp. 195-216.

Thomas, Keith. "Women and the Civil War Sects." Past and Present, No. 13 (April, 1958), pp. 42-62.

Trinkhaus, Charles. "Renaissance Problems in Calvin's Theology." Studies in the Renaissance, I (1954), pp. 59-80.

Trinterud, Leonard J. "The Origins of Puritanism." Church History, XX, no. 1 (March, 1951), pp. 37-57.

Wright, Celeste Turner. "Something More About Eve." North Carolina University Studies in Philology, XLI (1944), pp. 156-168.

Unpublished Material

McKinnon, Alastair Thomson. "Masculinism in Ancient Israel; the Literature of the Old Testament in the Light of Recent Anthropological Theories respecting Matriarchy and Patriarchy." Unpublished B. D. thesis, Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, 1953.