

Puritans and Profits: The Puritan Economic Ethic and Ethos, A Compilation of Primary Sources

JOHN B. CARPENTER

We resolve to approve ourselves to the Lord in our particular callings; shunning idleness as the bane of any state; nor will we deal hardly or oppressingly with any, wherein we are the Lord's stewards.

—Covenant of Salem Church (1629)¹

The Puritan economic ethic was famously described by Max Weber in his seminal work, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.² However, Weber's thesis has been decried by some Christian scholars as poorly representing the primary sources of Puritanism.³ What exactly those sources taught, in their own words, about economic ethics was, until now, difficult for most people to evaluate as the sources are largely out of print and, until recently, few were available online. Some still are not. Here I seek to catalog those sources.

We are now in the decade between the 400th anniversaries of the founding of the Plymouth colony in 1620 and the Massachusetts Bay colony in 1630, which merged in 1691. They were both founded by varieties of

1. Cited in Cotton Mather, *The Great Works of Christ in America* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1979), 71.

2. *Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus*, 1905. The English translation is Talcott Parsons, trans., *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958).

3. For example, Felix Rachfahl argued that Weber fundamentally misunderstood Calvin (David Chalcrafft and Austin Harrington, *The Protestant Ethic Debate* [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2001]). In a course at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School on Calvin, my presentation on Max Weber was prefaced by the professor stating that Weber's thesis was "junk" (I believe) and that he totally misrepresented Calvin. I do not believe Weber was trying to represent Calvin but rather the impact of Calvinism. There is a difference.

Puritans. So, understanding Puritanism is key to understanding the nation that would, in part, grow out of these “Bible commonwealths.”⁴

Puritanism is defined as an inner-worldly ascetic⁵ evangelical movement, with its roots in the post-Reformation Calvinistic Anglican reform, aimed at holistic social transformation according to the ideational pattern of Scripture, beginning with the personally experienced regeneration of sinners.⁶ Since it was seeking holistic social transformation, it was inner-worldly; that is, seeing the believer’s life as lived out in this world and the church corporately engaged with the surrounding society. Key to that Puritan engagement was their ethics of wealth and vocation.

The giant of Elizabethan Puritanism was William Perkins (1558–1602), regarded by some as the greatest Puritan theologian.⁷ He influenced William Ames, John Cotton, John Robinson, Richard Mather, and John Winthrop.⁸ Perkins was “the chief formulator” of the new Puritan economic ethic.⁹ His *A Treatise on the Callings or Vocations of Men* (c. 1600) is the quintessential Puritan expression of the doctrine of vocation. Perkins defined “a vocation or calling [as] a certain kind of life ordained and imposed on man by God for the common good.”¹⁰

4. On the quartercentenary of the “City Upon a Hill,” see John Carpenter, “The 1620 Project: Puritanism and the Ideological Founding of America,” *Touchstone Magazine*, May/June 2021, <https://www.touchstonemag.com/archives/article.php?id=34-03-030-f>.

5. “Inner-worldly asceticism” is a term used by Max Weber to describe a spirituality of self-denial that aims to operate within ordinary life so as to transform it, as opposed to “other-worldly asceticism” such as monasticism. Richard Swedberg and Ola Agevall, *The Max Weber Dictionary: Key Words and Concepts*, 2nd ed. (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 2016), 11–12.

6. John B. Carpenter, “A New Definition of Puritanism, A Cross-Disciplinary Approach,” *The Evangelical Journal* 36, no. 1 (2018): 1–17. Available at <https://covenantcaswell.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/A-New-Definition-of-Puritanism.pdf>.

7. J. I. Packer writes, “No Puritan author save Richard Baxter ever sold better than Perkins, and no Puritan thinker ever did more to shape and solidify historic Puritanism itself.” Cited by Tim Challies, “The Puritans: William Perkins,” August 18, 2013, <https://www.challies.com/articles/the-puritans-william-perkins/>, accessed 9-6-2021.

8. Victor L. Priebe, “The Covenant Theology of William Perkins” (PhD dissertation: Drew University, 1967), 4.

9. M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1963), 412.

10. Perkins, *A Treatise on the Callings or Vocations of Men* (c. 1600), in *The Work of William Perkins*, ed. Ian Breward (Berkshire, England: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1970), 446. Henceforth: Perkins, *Vocations*. Available at <https://www.monergism.com/treatise-vocations-ebook>.

In Perkins's hands, the doctrine of vocation became a way of seeing the sacred in what had formerly been seen as profane. If every lawful job is a calling, then God will hold everyone responsible for how they perform their job. This means failure to do one's calling or to do it to the best of one's ability is not just a foolish way to end up impoverished but is sinful. "Two damnable sins that are contrary to this diligence," Perkins wrote. "The first is idleness, whereby the duties of our callings and the occasions of glorifying God are neglected or omitted. The second is slothfulness, whereby they are performed slackly or carelessly (Matt. 20:6; 25:26; 1 Thess. 3:10, 14)."¹¹

The doctrine of vocation is practical. Perkins wrote, "Whom God calls, to them he gives competent and convenient gifts, or knowledge, understanding, dexterity to this or that, and such like; and thereby makes them able for the performance of the duties of their callings."¹² The Puritan assumption behind their doctrine of vocation was that since God efficiently and omnipotently ruled nature, the talents a person exhibited indicated the calling God had chosen for that person.¹³ Perkins continues, "Contrariwise, they that enter into any calling being utterly unable to perform the duties thereof, were never called of God." That is, lacking a skill demonstrates an absence of calling. Applied to preaching, for example, someone who lacks effective public speaking abilities can be discouraged from ministries which require frequent preaching, on the basis that their lack of skill suggests a lack of a call.¹⁴ Hence a calling is not merely a mystical experience subjectively in one's soul. It is demonstrable and verifiable.

In the Puritans' doctrine of vocation, callings are professions in which we can be productive for the common good. Perkins emphasized that one receives a vocation that is good for society. "He abuses his calling whosoever he be that, against the end thereof, employs it for himself, seeking only his own and not the common good."¹⁵ Another prominent Puritan,

11. Perkins, *Vocations*, 450. "The idle body and the idle brain is the shop of the devil" (451). "Sloth and negligence in the duties of our callings are a disorder against that comely order which God hath set in the societies of mankind, both in church and commonwealth" (451).

12. Perkins, *Vocations*, 461.

13. Stephen Foster, "The Puritan Social Ethic: Class and Calling in the First Hundred Years of Settlement in New England" (PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1966), 190.

14. For a popular level application of this idea, see John Carpenter, "Brothers, We Are Not Amateurs," *Servants of Grace*, May 25, 2021, <https://servantsofgrace.org/brothers-we-are-not-amateurs/>, accessed October 4, 2021.

15. Perkins, *Vocations*, 449.

William Ames (1576–1633), shows that Perkins’s portrayal of vocation reflects the Puritan consensus. Ames wrote, “Everyone is bound to procure the common good, and advance it as much as he can.”¹⁶ Thus, aristocracy and wealth were no reasons, in the Puritan scheme, to be excused from diligently applying oneself to one’s vocation. John Downname (1571–1652), Perkins’s longer-lived contemporary, emphasized that even rich men must be engaged profitably for the commonwealth. Gentlemen who are blessed by God with riches should not be idle but “exercise themselves in employment of a more excellent nature.”¹⁷ John Preston (1587–1628), Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and a Puritan leader highly respected by the New England settlers, explicitly takes aim at the idle nobility: “Everyone is a servant to Christ and must do God’s work; no man is free, everyone is Christ’s servant and must be diligent to serve Christ and to do good to men. He that has an office must be diligent and attend it; every man must attend his calling and be diligent in it.”¹⁸

Despite the emphasis on the common good, Margo Todd is mistaken to claim, “The ultimate goal of the work ethic, for Protestants as for their Catholic humanist mentors, was the common weal.”¹⁹ For Puritans the ultimate goal is the glory of God, not the welfare of society. Perkins insisted that “the end of a man’s calling is not to gather riches for himself, for his family, for the poor; but to serve God in serving of man, and in seeking the good of all men and to this end, men must apply their lives and labors.”²⁰ Puritans believed that God’s order was, *ipso facto*, the best for the common weal, but that does not mean that social welfare was the ultimate goal.²¹ The glory of God, not capitalist profit or social improvement, was the incentive for the Puritan. Perkins concluded, “We must use and possess the goods we

16. William Ames, *Substance of Christian Religion* (London: T. Mabb, 1659), 147.

17. John Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse* (London: I. D. for Nicolas Bourne, 1629), 258.

18. John Preston, *Sinnes Overthrow: or, A Godly and Learned Treatise of Mortification* (London: Richard Badger for Andrew Crooke, 1641), 255.

19. Margo Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 148.

20. Perkins, *Vocations*, 308.

21. “The moral incentives propounded by later liberalism, the Ben Franklins and Samuel Smileses of secularized middle class culture, the ‘Protestant’ liberalism brilliantly set out for us in the novels of Richardson, Fielding, Dickens, and Thomas Mann—all of this flood of social morality based upon the priority of the individual’s ego over the need of the group, was absolutely the antithesis of Reformation Protestantism.” Charles H. and Katherine George, “English Protestantism and the Capitalist Spirit,” in *Capitalism and the Reformation*, ed. M. J. Kitch (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967), 12.

have that the use and possession of them may tend to God's glory and the salvation of our souls. Rich men must be rich in good works and together with their riches lay up a good foundation in conscience against the evil day (1 Tim. 6:18)."²²

Downname wrote that the Sabbath commandment requires "diligence and painfulness in our callings and labors, not giving way to idleness and sloth, vigilance and abstinence from immoderate sleep."²³ Preston emphasized the same theme: "So again, the Lord has commanded [you] to be diligent in your callings, to improve the time to the best advantage, for you shall give an account of it, it is one of the most precious talents you have."²⁴ He elaborated in *Sinnes Overthrow*,

The end of men's callings are not to gather riches; if men make this their end, it is a wrong end; but the end of our calling is to serve God and men, the ground hereof is this: Every man is a member of the commonwealth; every man has some gifts or other, which may not lie idle; every man has some talents, and must use them to his master's advantage.... Every man must attend his calling, and be diligent in it.²⁵

Thomas Adams (1583–1652) added,

Every one thinks himself God's son: then hear his voice, "Go my son." You have all your vineyards to go to. Magistrates, go to the bench to execute judgment and justice; ministers go to the temple, to preach, to pray, to do the work of evangelists; people go to your callings, that you may eat the labours of your own hands.... Every man to his profession, according to that station wherein God hath disposed us.... The incitation gives way to the injunction: work.²⁶

Abdias Ashton (1563–1633), a fellow at St. John's, Cambridge, who represents the center of Cambridge Puritanism, wrote, "We must not be ashamed of our calling or condition of life, how base soever it be (Gen. 16:34) but stay therein, lowly without all pride (Prov. 11:2) and not seek to intrude themselves into another."²⁷

22. Perkins, *Vocations*, 314.

23. Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 156.

24. Preston, *The Breast-plate of Faith and Love* (London: R. Y. for Nicholas Bourne, 1634), 164.

25. Preston, *Sinnes Overthrow*, 254–55.

26. Thomas Adams, "The Two Sons," *The Works of Thomas Adams* (Edinburgh: James Nichol; London: James Nisbet & Co.; Dublin: W. Robertson, 1861–1862), 2:87.

27. Commonplace book, Chetham Library, Manchester, Mss. Mun. A/2/78, cited

John Robinson (1575–1625), leader of the Separatists in Holland, similarly wrote,

When a man knows himself to be orderly called to a condition of life, he both sets himself more cheerfully and roundly to the works thereof, wherein he is assured he served God's providence by his order, and appointments; and with faith expects a blessing from God upon his endeavors in that course of life in which his hand has set him; and, withal, bears with comfort the crosses befalling him therein.... It is a good and godly course for a person diligently to read and seriously meditate upon such places of Holy Scripture as concern his or her special calling.²⁸

Joseph Hall (1574–1656), a Calvinist Anglican bishop, concurred:

The homeliest service that we do in an honest calling, though it be but to plow, to dig, if done in obedience, and conscience of God's commandment, is crowned with an ample reward; whereas that best works for their kind (preaching, praying, offering evangelical sacrifices) if without respect of God's injunction and glory, are loaded with curses. God loveth adverbs; and cares not how good, but how well.²⁹

Perkins did not believe that the Puritan should be all work and no play. He listed three reasons for "vacation": (1) Sabbath, which the Puritans, of all Calvinists, applied most rigorously to the church; (2) recreation, which is to be "means that make us fit for labor" as well as being moderate, lawful, and not on the Sabbath;³⁰ and (3) necessity, for those disabled through sickness, age, and the like.³¹ While Perkins couched this as though it were a softening of the imperative to work, actually it intensifies the mandate to work by sweeping away all the traditional excuses not to. Downname

in Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 139. Lake says, "Ashton was at St. John's throughout the 1580s and became a fellow in 1590, a biographer of William Whitaker and a Cambridge Puritan in the mainstream" (117).

28. John Robinson, *The Works of John Robinson* (Boston: Doctrinal Tract and Book Society, 1851), 1:117, 119.

29. Joseph Hall, "Holy Observations," in *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God, Joseph Hall* (London: C. Wittingham, 1808), 6:85.

30. John Downname defined "due" recreation: "walking in pleasant places, conferences which are delightful without offense, poetry, music, shooting, and such allowable sports as best fit with men's several dispositions for their comfort and refreshing." John Downname, *The Christian Warfare* (London: William Starsby, 1634), 989–90.

31. Perkins, *Vocations*, 471.

described the value of recreation as enabling “us to hold in our labors and to perform all good duties with more vigor and in much greater perfection.”³² Preston made this clear: “If pleasures and sports and recreations shall come in and allure you [away from your calling] and call you to draw you away to spend time amiss...if they do this ordinarily, you are lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.”³³

Hence, we should gear “recreation” to help us to be, in modern parlance, more productive. There is no play for play’s sake.³⁴ When Puritans put this into practice in New England, the result was a working year that grew by over 25%. Working days rose from around the traditional 240 to over 300 days per year.³⁵ With more time in the day dedicated to work, the work-to-rest ratio nearly doubled from around 2:1 to 4:1.³⁶ For millennia, societies had told workers to do only the minimum work necessary to earn enough to keep alive and pay for one’s pleasures.³⁷ Puritanism changed all that—intentionally.

Was the Puritan conception of vocation conservative or intended to be radical? H. M. Robertson (1905–1984) believed that “to...sixteenth-century [Puritan] divines, at least, the ‘calling’ was a conception to be employed on the side of conservatism in a period of economic change.”³⁸ Certainly, the emphasis was for people to be content in their status quo and do their duty, even those at the bottom of the social scale. Perkins implies as much. At the beginning of *Vocations*, he points out that the Scripture text which he is using as a jumping off point (1 Cor. 7:20) was originally addressed to servants. Later in *Vocations* he takes a critical view of what we would warmly call “a career change.” One may change a calling but only for

32. Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 264.

33. Preston, *The Breast-plate of Faith and Love*, 164.

34. Recreation “should serve only as refreshment to make men once more fit for their callings and more efficient in them than if they had taken no rest at all.” Foster, “The Puritan Social Ethic,” 203.

35. Suzanne Lucas reports that the “average [medieval] peasant worked about 150 days per year.” Suzanne Lucas, “Even Medieval Peasants Got More Vacation Time Than You,” Inc., Nov. 7, 2016, <https://www.inc.com/suzanne-lucas/even-medieval-peasants-got-more-vacation-time-than-you-do.html>, accessed September 20, 2021.

36. Stephen Innes, *Creating the Commonwealth: The Economic Culture of Puritan New England* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1995), 145.

37. Kitch, ed., *Capitalism and the Reformation*, 149.

38. Hector Menteith Robertson, *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism: A Criticism of Max Weber and His School* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1933), 10.

weighty reasons: “private necessity and the common good.”³⁹ To drift from job to job, as one’s whims or the “market” thought best, is to act as if the first occupation was not a calling. When a person has a vocation, he or she should not give it up lightly, like only to earn more money.⁴⁰ John Downame made an exception for the very poor. The poor “must labor painfully in their callings, notwithstanding the badness of their trade” and its “small earnings.” But in this case, they may “change their calling for a better which will afford them more sufficient means and maintenance.”⁴¹

Puritans and Property

In the posthumously published *Cases of Conscience* (1604), Perkins’s goal was to provide the pastor, on solid Reformation principles, with theological guidelines applied to the workaday world. Like Calvin, Perkins retained much of the old Christian tradition such as the Aristotelian ideal of the golden mean—moderation in all things—transmitted via Thomas Aquinas.⁴² Christians were to avoid profane pleasure, not just go to church once a week; they were to have extreme simplicity in matters of comfort and dress. More positively, they were to show “practical capacity, reliability, and honesty in every walk in life.”⁴³ This is, in modern terms, inner-worldly asceticism, a spirituality lived out by a disciplined life in the hurly-burly of social life.

Perkins wrote that the believer is to be content with merely necessary things, not seeking luxuries. He described the “moderation of appetite in the use of riches.”⁴⁴ “Man may with good conscience desire and seek for goods necessary, whether for nature, or for his person, according to the former rules; but he may not desire and seek for goods more than necessary; for if he does, he sins.”⁴⁵ How do we know what is “necessary”? “Things and goods are to be judged necessary and sufficient, not by the affection of the covetous man, which is insatiable, but by two other things; the judg-

39. Perkins, *Vocations*, 472.

40. Robert Middlekauff, *The Mathers: Three Generations of Puritan Intellectuals, 1596–1728* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 268.

41. Downame, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 260.

42. Kitch, ed., *Capitalism and the Reformation*, 93.

43. Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Wyon (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 2:679.

44. William Perkins, *Whole Treatise on the Cases of Conscience* (London: John Leggat, 1632), 305. Henceforth: Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*.

45. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 307.

ment of wise and godly men, and the examples of sober and frugal persons.” However, we cannot impose one standard of material sufficiency for all persons. Sufficiency “varies, according to the divers conditions of persons, and according to time and place. More things are necessary to a public man than to a private and more to him that has a charge than to a single man.”⁴⁶ A generation later, William Ames, one of the Puritan theologians most read by the New England colonists, emphasized the call to “weaned affections.”⁴⁷ Even when the capitalist lawfully obtains wealth, in Ames’s ethic he or she is not free to squander it on luxury. We are to “employ our money in those things, which have a real use.”⁴⁸ Ames asks, “What kind of sin is luxury?” and answers, “Luxury does generally note any excess in the use of things, belonging to the decking of the body.” Its impact? “It destroys the soul.”⁴⁹

Perkins taught that the unrestrained appetite could lead people to eternal destruction. “Seeking of abundance is a hazard to the salvation of the soul, by reason of man’s corruption.” This is because to seek abundance is to doubt that God will provide tomorrow’s daily bread and, in the words quoted on the title page of *Cases of Conscience*, “whatsoever is not of faith is sin” (Rom. 14:23). “Seeking of abundance is a fruit of diffidence in the providence of God. Now all fruits of unbelief must be cut off; we must therefore desire no more than necessary.”⁵⁰ John Preston similarly tied the seeking of luxuries to a lack of contentment in God. The theological context of the ethic of weaned affections is “God’s all sufficiency.” Preston said, “No man is ever fit to serve [God] without this: except a man be content to have God alone for his portion; if he will join anything with him, if he will join God and credit together, God and riches together, God and pleasures together, he will never keep close to him.”⁵¹

The Puritans aimed their criticisms at “covetousness” per se, not wealth creation generally. Perkins wrote, “Covetousness is a notorious vice whereby

46. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 306.

47. “To the New England Puritans Ames was ‘that profound, that sublime, that subtil [*sic*], and irrefragable—yea, that angelical doctor.” Keith L. Sprunger, “William Ames and the Settlement of Massachusetts Bay,” *The New England Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (March 1966): 66, quoting Cotton Mather.

48. William Ames, *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof* (1639) (1639; repr., Norwood, N.J.: Walter J. Johnson, 1975), 254–55.

49. Ames, *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof*, 211.

50. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 307.

51. John Preston, *The New Covenant or Saints Portion* (London: I. D. for Nicolas Bourne, 1629), 22. In his *Sinnes Overthrow*, Preston dedicates a whole chapter to the subject, entitled “How to Mortify Covetousness” (220–60).

all men, almost, apply their callings and the works whereof to the gathering of wealth and riches." It was not a "respectable sin" to them. "This is one of the head and master sins of the world and from it a sea of evils flow both into church and commonwealth."⁵²

Although Perkins explained that wealth is good, it is good "only in part." It is good "only in part," not because of a deficiency in it but because of sin within us. His convictions about human depravity are at the root of his warnings about wealth—not some kind of Platonic disdain for the material. He wrote that wealth is good in itself, but it is "not always good to us." "Riches in abundance, are as the knife in the hand of a child, likely to hurt, if it be not taken away; because they are (in some men) occasions of sin, unless God in mercy prevent and hinder them."⁵³

Puritans generally believed that under normal circumstances the diligent would prosper. But they were not simplistic about this, like Job's friends. Perkins wrote, "The obedience of the gospel it is that makes every man in his trade, office and calling, whatsoever it be, to prosper."⁵⁴ Preston concurred: "God makes us rich by being diligent in our callings."⁵⁵ Paul Baynes (1560–1617), William Perkins's disciple and successor at Great St. Andrews, Cambridge, assured his congregation that "lawful prospering" and "Christian gaining" are promoted by true faith, "since the religious man works with a mind at peace with God and trusts him for a blessing."⁵⁶ So, godly business—working for the glory of God—was not only doing good but doing well. Thus, Perkins encouraged honest entrepreneurship on both pragmatic and theological grounds.⁵⁷ Weber concluded from this, probably the central thesis of his "Protestant ethic," "The earning of money within the modern economic order is, so long as it is done legally, the result and the expression of virtue and proficiency in a calling."⁵⁸ Puritan leaders, however, knew Providence could inflict poverty or bestow wealth on the undeserving. John Downname preached,

52. Perkins, *Vocations*, 446.

53. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 308.

54. William Perkins, *Commentary on Galatians*, in *The Works of William Perkins*, Volume 2, ed. Paul M. Smalley (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2015), 290.

55. Preston, *Sinnes Overthrow*, 255.

56. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 414.

57. Todd, *Christian Humanism and the Puritan Social Order*, 157.

58. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 54.

Worldly prosperity is but one of God's ordinary gifts, which is of no great excellency and worth, being compared with his rich jewels, his spiritual graces, and eternal joys; as it may hereby plainly appear, in that he scatters them as common and trivial trifles, amongst his enemies as well as his friends and bestows them as well on those who condemn and rebel against him as upon those that love and serve him; yea, most commonly he gives to his children these earthly blessings with a straight and sparing hand and affords them to strangers and enemies in great plenty and abundance.⁵⁹

Despite more traditional warnings against "worldly prosperity," the cat was out of the bag; wealth was not all bad. Thus, by the time the Westminster Puritans met to hammer out a confession (1647), they could include this amazing statement in their catechism:

Westminster Shorter Catechism 74. What is required in the eighth commandment?

A. The eighth commandment requireth the lawful procuring and furthering the wealth and outward estate of ourselves and others.

Stealing was not merely taking from others but failing to use one's time, energy, and resources to add to the commonwealth. Nearly twenty years earlier, Downname had taught that the eighth commandment "enjoins us to pursue and increase by all good means as much as in us lies our own and neighbor's good."⁶⁰ Two years before the Westminster divines wrote that catechism question, John Cotton (1584–1652) described a violation of the eighth commandment as "to take another man's goods without leave or to spend our own without benefit to ourselves or others."⁶¹ He would take that ethic with him to the City Upon a Hill.

These warnings of the dangers of riches led to an emphasis on stewardship. Stewardship meant that possessions are entrusted to people by God, to be used in ways pleasing to God. Stewardship, by definition, confers certain rights on the steward to dispose of property as he or she may see fit, but with heavy responsibilities to do so with the ultimate owner, God, in mind. So, the Puritans had a qualified belief in the right of private property. Possession usually demonstrated God's decree, thus the basis for a "right." But if

59. Downname, *The Christian Warfare*, 376.

60. Downname, *Guide to Godlynesse*, 156.

61. John Cotton, *Milk for Babes* (London: Coe for Henry Overton, 1646), 3.

it becomes obvious that people are using their possessions in ways that are displeasing to God, then the property can be removed.

There are shades of Thomistic natural law in Puritan concepts of stewardship and private property. Perkins wrote, “The law of nature sets down and prescribes distinction of possessions and property of lands and goods, and the gospel does not abolish the law of nature.”⁶² Puritans such as Perkins held to the doctrine of “just price” just as fervently as had the medieval scholastics, and thus abhorred profiteering. Early in Elizabethan Puritanism, the Gainsborough Separatist congregation excommunicated a tailor for charging seven shillings for a doublet and hose when another tailor testified that five was the just price.⁶³ John Knewstub (1544–1624) taught that two rules should guide the setting of prices “in the fear of God”: (1) our covetous affection must not set the price of that we offer for sale and, (2) we must sell our commodities as near as possible to the price we bought them for.⁶⁴ Ames taught, “That rule is chiefest which is delivered by the Holy Ghost, Prov. 20:14, that the buyer, to abate the price, should not deceitfully take away from the wares, which are to be bought, or the seller, to augment the price, should not amplify against his conscience the worth of his wares.”⁶⁵

What was new with the Puritans was a more affirming disposition toward the tasks of the market, not the worldly motives of the market—that is, greed. Greed might motivate diligence as well as a sense of vocation, but it was not good.

Although Puritans eventually made peace with “usury,” as long as Puritanism was really Puritanism it retained a critical distance from the unrestrained market.⁶⁶ This is not to say that the Puritans had the view of Francis of Assisi, that money was so evil in itself that the sanctified should not even touch it.⁶⁷ Perkins wrote, “Mammon is called mammon of iniquity

62. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 313.

63. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 411.

64. John Knewstub, “Lectures upon the Twentieth Chapter of Exodus and Certain Other Places of Scripture,” quoted in *Elizabethan Puritanism*, ed. Leonard J. Trinterud (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 349–50.

65. Ames, *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof*, 236.

66. Perkins lists “usury” along with “carding and dicing” as “miserable course[s] of living.” Perkins, *Vocations*, 447. Although it was permitted, charging interest was still looked on with some suspicion.

67. Thomas of Celano, *St. Francis of Assisi* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1963), 192.

not because it is so in itself but because it is so in the common use—or rather abuse—of wicked men.”⁶⁸ Richard Sibbes (1577–1635) explained:

We must know it is not the world simply that draws our heart from God and goodness, but the love of the world; worldly things are good in themselves and given to sweeten our passage to heaven; they sweeten the profession of religion; therefore bring not a false report upon the world, it is thy falseness that makes it hurtful, in loving it so much. Use it as a servant all thy days, and not as a master, and thou may have comfort therein. It is not the world properly that hurts us, but our setting our hearts upon it.⁶⁹

John Downname preached that prosperity could be either a blessing or a temptation depending on the heart of individuals:

It appears that prosperity in itself is good, but being considered in our use, it is not absolutely good, but indifferent, both in respect of the subject and the use; for it is good to the good, evil to the evil; good to those who well use it, and evil in those who abuse it unto sin. Prosperity is good when it is enjoyed by a faithful man, who being in Christ, hath recovered that right in all God’s blessings which we lost in Adam.... It is good when as it is used...for the advancement of God’s glory...and the furthering of our own salvation. And if any such enjoy prosperity and thus use it...it is to be accounted unto them God’s singular blessings, and as a temporal pledge of eternal happiness.⁷⁰

Therefore, it is possible for the righteous to be wealthy. For being so, Perkins explained four main guidelines under the heading “How a Man May with Good Conscience Possess and Use Riches.” First, owners of property are to understand that they are “but the stewards of God, to employ and dispense them [riches], according to his will.”⁷¹ In the Puritan ethic this meant that the individual accumulated wealth to add to the commonwealth; instead of fleeing from money, on the one hand, or building luxurious mansions for one’s exclusive indulgence, on the other, the talented entrepreneur should “make the overflow of their cup serviceable to the maintenance of God’s worship and the relief of his poor saints.”⁷² Second, “We must use

68. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 309.

69. Richard Sibbes, *The Saints Cordials* (London: Henry Overton, 1637), 188.

70. Downname, *The Christian Warfare*, 369.

71. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 310.

72. Jeremy Dyke, *A Counterpoison Against Covetousness* (London: Robert Mylbourne, 1619), 42.

special moderation of mind, in the possessing and using of riches, and be content with our estate, so as we set not the affection of our heart upon our riches."⁷³ Ashton echoed the same principle: "The godly mind is contented with sufficiency of all things necessary."⁷⁴ Third, we must be willing to give up all our wealth.⁷⁵ To ward off any suspicion that he is getting near to the papist doctrine of "holy poverty," Perkins specifically calls the practice of giving all one's money to the poor and then living off alms to be "Popish conceit."⁷⁶ Since Puritanism rejected all religious "works" as means for obtaining God's grace, poverty was no longer necessarily sanctifying. "We, on the contrary, do answer that this practice is in no sort lawful, unless a man have special calling and warrant from God to do so."⁷⁷ These would be rare exceptions, indeed. "Men must not therefore voluntarily forsake their riches and so bring sorrow to themselves."⁷⁸ Downname emphasized that Christians should shun both the indulgence of the profligate and the severity of Roman Catholic monasticism. We should, he wrote, have

a moderate desire of such things as are necessary and convenient, both for our own maintenance according to the necessity of nature, person and state and also for the relief and benefit of others and that both for private persons and public service of Church and Commonwealth. The which desire ought to be free from friar-like affection of poverty and on the other side from covetousness and ambition.⁷⁹

A key obligation of stewardship is charity. Puritans were to be philanthropists. Queen Elizabeth accused Puritan landlord Francis Russell, the Earl of Bedford, of making all the beggars in England with his charity—encouraging idleness by removing the need to work.⁸⁰ Richard Sibbes wrote that "the life of faith orders our prosperity" by relieving others with it.⁸¹ On

73. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 310.

74. Ashton, *Commonplace book*, 113, cited in Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, 145.

75. "We must upon the calling of God, forsake our riches, and all that we have in this world, not only in disposition of mind, but in deed." Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 312.

76. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 313. "Yet inveigh against wealth and particularly against the pursuit of wealth though he may, the English Protestant divine never enshrines its opposite, poverty, in the Roman Catholic manner." George, "Protestantism and Capitalism in Pre-Revolutionary England," 163.

77. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 313.

78. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 313. "Our Savior Christ bids him that had two coats not to give both away, but one (Luke 3:11)."

79. Downname, *A Guide to Godlynesse*, 156.

80. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, 411.

81. Sibbes, *The Saints Cordials*, 304. Perhaps demonstrating something of the

the whole, though, the Puritans were definitely more discriminating in their charity than were the pious medieval papists. In the Puritan view, “children, the aged and the sick should be helped, but constructively by founding almshouses and providing work for them to do.”⁸² The Puritans did not see poverty as a condition to be tacitly accepted or even cherished because of the opportunities for charity it provided. Instead, they considered it, at best, the rotten fruit of a fallen world and, so, a problem to be solved.⁸³

Perkins wrote, “It is a foul disorder in any commonwealth that there should be suffered rogues, beggars, vagabonds; for such kinds of persons are of no civil society or corporation, nor of any particular church and are as rotten legs and arms that drop from the body.”⁸⁴ The apostle Paul bids everyone to labor and so support himself or herself, that he or she may not need the help of others (1Thess. 4:11–12).⁸⁵ Hence, Puritans called for punishment when they came across “sturdy beggars” choosing poverty rather than self-supporting labor. For the “truly poor,” such as widows, orphans, the handicapped, the sick, and the aged, they urged, even commanded, charity—albeit as the community’s duty rather than a means for achieving merit for the heaven-striving soul. Thus, in the Puritan pilgrim’s progress toward the celestial city, poverty, as much as wealth, was hazardous.⁸⁶

The Ethic in New England

So, the Puritans had a clearly developed economic ethic just as England was eyeing the Atlantic’s western shore. By the time Massachusetts’s visionary governor John Winthrop first set foot in the New World, Puritanism had developed, over a generation, a vigorous, prolific theological ethics. New England became the stage on which Calvinist doctrines of social ethics found their fullest application. According to Bernard Bailyn, “In Geneva, Scotland, and the Netherlands, theory had always to be qualified to some

significance of economic ethics for the Puritans, in a list of areas of life in which we can live “The Life of Faith,” Sibbes discusses “prosperity” eighth and “God’s Ordinances” (sacraments) ninth. First, he listed periods in which the elect feel deserted by God. Sibbes, *The Saints Cordials*, 299–311.

82. Kitch, ed., *Capitalism and the Reformation*, 149.

83. George, “Protestantism and Capitalism in Pre-Revolutionary England,” 163.

84. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 455–56.

85. Perkins, *Cases of Conscience*, 313.

86. George, “Protestantism and Capitalism in Pre-Revolutionary England,” 164.

extent by pre-Calvinist practices. In New England, doctrine literally preceded practice.”⁸⁷

Of immediate impact on the New England Puritans were the ministries of Ames and Cotton. Cotton described the all-encompassing vision of Puritanism on which New England was founded.

I am very apt to believe, what Mr. Perkins has, in one of his prefatory pages to his golden chain, that the Word and Scriptures of God do contain a short *upoluposis*, or platform, not only of theology, but also of other sacred sciences (as he called them) attendants and handmaids, thereunto, which he makes ethics, economics, politics, church government, prophecy, academy. It is very suitable to God’s all-sufficient wisdom and to the fullness and perfection of the Holy Scriptures, not only to prescribe perfect rules for the right ordering of a private man’s soul to everlasting blessedness with himself, but also for the right ordering of a man’s family, yea of the commonwealth too.⁸⁸

Cotton emphasized, “Labor to be weaned from the world: not that I call upon any man to neglect his calling, but,” he insisted, spiritual things are the priority. “A man must not be so careful for his daily bread, as that he wholly forget and neglect his duty to God.”⁸⁹ John Hull (1624–1683), a faithful Puritan merchant and mint-master, lived out this ethic. When he lost £120 in a shipwreck, he wrote in his diary, “The Lord wean my heart more from these outward things, and fix it more upon himself!”⁹⁰ By the time of Cotton Mather (1663–1728), the third generation in the City Upon a Hill, the cry for “weaned affections” was still alive and well—at least in the sermons. A generation later, Samuel Wigglesworth (1688–1768) echoed the same theme: “If therefore their riches increase they must not set their hearts upon them.”⁹¹

John Cotton wrote, as part of a larger work of theology and piety, a chapter on “Christian Calling.” This work shows the structure, integrity,

87. Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), 23.

88. John Cotton, Letter to Lord Say and Seal [Viscount Saye and Sele] (1636), in Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), 1:414.

89. John Cotton, *The Way of Life* (London: L. Fawne and S. Gellibrand, 1641), 252.

90. “Dairy of John Hull,” in *Puritan Personal Writings* (New York: AMS Press, 1982), 148.

91. Samuel Wigglesworth, *An Essay for Reviving Religion: A Sermon Delivered at Boston* (Boston: S. Kneeland, May 30, 1733), 16.

and comprehensiveness of Puritan theology. Cotton begins with a lengthy, typically Reformed description of justification by faith. Only after establishing that foundation and then carefully going through the whole of the Christian life does he deal with the doctrine of vocation. He echoes Perkins. Seeking one's particular vocation is one of the first priorities of those who have responded to the general vocation of glorifying God. "As soon as ever a man begins to look toward God, and the ways of his grace, he will not rest till he find out some warrantable calling and employment."⁹² As with Perkins, one of the criteria by which we judge God's vocation is whether we can serve others through it. "We live by faith in our own vocations, in that faith, in serving God, serves men, and in serving men, serves God."⁹³ This aspect of the doctrine of vocation should have the effect of mitigating tendencies toward individualism. Cotton described this new ascetic ideal as a "combination of virtues strangely mixed in every lively holy Christian... diligence in worldly business, and yet deadness to the world."⁹⁴

In New England, these moral laws flowed from the Bible, were taught by the ministers, and were enforced by the state. For example, the Puritans especially targeted laziness. In 1648, the General Court of Massachusetts decreed:

It is ordered by this Court and the authority thereof, that no person, householder or other, shall spend his time idly or unprofitably under pain of such punishment as the Court of Assistants or County Court shall think meet to inflict. And for this end it is ordered that the constable of every place shall use care and diligence to take knowledge of offenders in this kind, especially of the common coasters, unprofitable fowlers, and tobacco takers.⁹⁵

Often, they believed, the poor needed scolding for their laziness. Cotton Mather does not blush from doing just that about the Native Americans:

92. John Cotton, "Christian Calling," *The Puritans*, ed. Miller and Johnson (New York: American Book Company, 1938), 319.

93. Cotton, "Christian Calling," 322.

94. Cited in Alan Heimert and Andrew Delbanco, eds., *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985), 186.

95. *The Book of the General Lawes and Libertyes Concerning the Inhabitants of Massachusetts* (Cambridge, Mass.: By the Order of the General Court, 1648), 25–26. "Instances of enforcement of the laws against idleness are very numerous in both Essex and Suffolk Counties." Foster, "The Puritan Social Ethic," 203–204n27. For a brief summary of the legislation against idleness, see Innes's *Creating the Commonwealth*, 121.

“They are lazy drones and love idleness exceedingly!”⁹⁶ He was perfectly able to say the same thing about those in his own people. “Idle gentlemen and idle beggars are the pests of the commonwealth.”⁹⁷ Edward Holyoke (1689–1769) listed idleness as one of the sins hypocrites indulge in.⁹⁸

This ethical application alone in New England is vulnerable to the Marxist charge that religion was a tool to “legitimate the interests of the dominant capitalist class.”⁹⁹ That is, that the Puritan ethic for vocation and against idleness was wielded by the ruling class as a self-serving instrument for exploitation of the workers. If Puritanism only applied its values in the services of profit in the commodity economy, this charge might have some traction. However, the case of the merchant Robert Keayne illustrates that the Puritans were not using their religion simply to further the interests of capital.

Keayne, in 1639, was fined £200 for price gouging. His Boston church also rebuked him for covetousness. He admitted that he had charged excessively for some commodities to make up for losses in others. His pastor, John Cotton, instructed him in the doctrine of “just price.” Keayne offended Massachusetts primarily not by violating a scholastic doctrine of just price, though that may have been Cotton’s way of explaining the offense. Rather he violated Winthrop’s vision for the commonwealth: “We must be knit together in this work as one man...we must be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities for the supply of others’ necessities.”¹⁰⁰

However, Puritan just price theory, being inner-worldly, reflected economic realities. Cotton’s “just price” was measured by the prevailing price of a product according to the ordinary laws of supply and demand in a market

96. Cotton Mather, *The Way to Prosperity* (Richard Pierce: Boston, 1690), 27.

97. Cotton Mather, *Bonifacius: An Essay Upon the Good* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), 117.

98. Holyoke conjectures that some men go to church and practice Christian disciplines only to be better able to deceive their customers. They have “no regard to their word and promises; in their falsehood as to their merchandise.... It is evident, that notwithstanding their high profession, mammon is their God and they mind earthly things.” Holyoke, *The Duty of Ministers of the Gospel to Guard Against the Pharisaism and Sadducism of the Present Day* (Boston: T. Fleet, 1741), 24.

99. Megan Rogers and Mary Ellen Konieczny, “Does Religion Always Help the Poor? Variations In Religion and Social Class in The West and Societies in The Global South,” *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, June 26, 2018, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-018-0135-3>, accessed October 5, 2021.

100. John Winthrop, “A Model of Christian Charity” (1630), cited in Heimert and Delbanco, eds., *The Puritans in America*, 91.

free from monopoly, misrepresentation, or coercion.¹⁰¹ This is a fruit of the inner-worldliness of Puritan ethics, that its principles, though rooted in Scripture, are applicable to the real world of the market and home. Hence, Puritan economic ethics is exonerated from the Marxist charge of turning “the gaze of the oppressed away from the exploitation that shapes their everyday lives.”¹⁰² Keayne repented with tears and the church let him off with an admonition. Most of the court’s fine against him was remitted.

In the Robert Keayne case, John Cotton applied these rules for preserving the “Model of Christian Charity”:

1. A man may not sell above the current price, i.e., such a price as is usual in the time and place.
2. When a man loses...for want of skill, etc., he must look at it as his own fault or cross, and therefore must not lay it upon another.
3. Where a man loses by casualty of sea...it is a loss cast upon himself by providence.
4. A man may not ask any more for his commodity than his selling price, as Ephron to Abraham, the land is worth thus much.¹⁰³

The Puritans were too realistic about the selfishness inherent in depraved human nature to believe in *laissez faire*. Cotton Mather himself, as late as 1705, in such wartime sermons as “*Lex Mercatoria, Or, the Just Rules of Commerce Declared*” blasted the “detestable Hobbianism” [*sic*] and the “general scramble of unbridled economic exploitation, of men reverting as if in a state of nature to ‘sharks, that are all for themselves, and that would gladly make minims and morsels of all mankind beside themselves.’”¹⁰⁴

Further, Cotton Mather, in his famous *Bonifacius*, echoed the refusal of Puritanism to judge a person’s value or sanctification by their wealth: “You will be sure to visit the poor as well as the rich, and often mention the condition of the poor, in your conversation with the rich. Keep, sir, a list of ‘em!”¹⁰⁵ Mather devotes a whole chapter (chap. 7) imploring magistrates to use their power for good. Physicians should treat the poor “for

101. Foster, “The Puritan Social Ethic,” 225–26.

102. Rogers and Konieczny, “Does Religion Always Help the Poor?”

103. John Winthrop, *The Journal of John Winthrop*, eds. Richard S. Dunn and Laetitia Yeandle (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press, 1996), 165–66 (November 1639).

104. Kenneth Silverman, *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 212.

105. Mather, *Bonifacius*, 78.

nothing.”¹⁰⁶ In the tradition of “to whom much is given, much is required” (Luke 12:48), Cotton Mather emphasized the need for activity, particularly that the wealthy and upper classes be constantly active in doing good.¹⁰⁷ A young Benjamin Franklin, raised in Cotton Mather’s Boston, would pick up *Bonifacius* and credit the little book with shaping his own ethic.¹⁰⁸

Poverty was not necessarily a sign of sin. Benjamin Wadsworth (1670–1737) warns his hearers, “Persons may sometimes come to pinching poverty yet not for any particular, remarkable sin or fault of their own.”¹⁰⁹ Urian Oakes (1631–1681) preached, “Men of shallow heads grow rich and get great estates, when men of understanding can thrive at no hand.... Success does not always wait upon the counsels and actions of persons of great sufficiency.”¹¹⁰ Even when wealth was earned through diligence at one’s calling, diligence and trade are merely the means for God’s gracious bestowal of the reward. Cotton Mather told his congregation in “The true cause of losing;” “Perhaps our losses may [seem to be] from the fraud or force of our enemies; but let us consider, it was our God that let loose those devourers upon us.”¹¹¹

John White (1575–1648) wrote, “Knowledge causing piety, piety breeding industry, and industry procuring plenty unto it. A beggar was not then to be seen in the town.”¹¹² John Cotton perhaps said it most explicitly: the good Christian “loseth no opportunity [to] bestir himself for

106. “Physicians are even overstocked with opportunities to help the poor and heal them for nothing.” Mather, *Bonifacius*, 101.

107. Mather, *Bonifacius*, 119. “Every day of our activity for the Kingdom of God will be some sort a day of Pentecost unto us, a day of the Holy Spirit’s coming upon us” (150).

108. In 1784, Franklin wrote, “If I have been, as you seem to think, a useful citizen, the public owes the advantage of it to [Cotton Mather’s *Bonifacius*, or *Essays to Do Good*].” “Benjamin Franklin recalls Boston, the place of his birth,” Massachusetts Historical Society, <https://www.masshist.org/object-of-the-month/objects/benjamin-franklin-recalls-boston-the-place-of-his-birth-2006-01-01>, accessed September 6, 2021.

109. Benjamin Wadsworth, *Vicious Courses, Procuring Poverty* (Boston, 1719), 4–5, cited in John E. Crowley, *This Sheba, Self: The Conceptualization of Economic Life in Eighteenth Century America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), 63.

110. Urian Oakes, “The Sovereign Efficacy of Divine Providence” (1677), in *The Puritans: A Sourcebook of Their Writings*, eds. Perry Miller and Thomas Herbert Johnson (Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications), 356.

111. Cotton Mather, *Durable Riches* (London: John Allen, 1695), 5.

112. Cited in Samuel E. Morison, *Builders of the Bay Colony* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958), 24. Also cited in W. B. Patterson, *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England’s Religious Past* (Oxford University Press, 2018), 320.

profit—this will he do most diligently in his calling.”¹¹³ The next step suggested by Weber, which most Puritans only half-heartedly took, at most, was to begin to see material success as a sign of faithfulness in a calling. John Cotton noted, “To see riches well got, and well employed is pleasing to God who will probably reward this kind of rich man with ‘spiritual gifts.’”¹¹⁴ Cotton’s prolific grandson Cotton Mather wrote, “All that we have is but a loan from the great God unto us.”¹¹⁵ Preston had earlier said it forthrightly: “The Lord does all in all, it is he that commands all, it is he that disposes all.”¹¹⁶

Conclusion

According to the Puritans, “all” is what God demanded. We have seen that Puritanism, by teaching its folk to have weaned affections, contributed to the creation of the “iron cage” that made capitalism possible. As inner-worldly ascetics, the Puritans were counter to the spirit of consumerism. But ironically, opposing the effects of indulgent consumerism—the “ethic” of immediate, individual gratification—Puritanism helped create the system that begat modern capitalism. It taught people to work hard but not indulge themselves in the fruit of their labor. It taught people to produce capital and use it for some good, even for the creation of more capital. Puritanism simultaneously provided an incentive for economic prosperity while casting suspicion on the selfish enjoyment of it. On the backs of that capital, capitalism produced modern economic growth. That modern economic growth made today’s consumerism possible.

Thus, Puritan economic ethics made the Puritans more than just flotsam carried along by the currents of the economic supersystem. It enabled New Englanders to succeed in a forbidding land and to contribute to the dawning of a new economic epoch. However, to conclude from that that Puritans simplistically saw wealth as a sign of divine blessing and poverty as a sure symptom of sinfulness is to woefully misunderstand them. The Puritan ethic promoted “the spirit of capitalism” by its thoroughgoing integration of faith with life, doctrine with the marketplace. But it opposed the consumeristic, individualistic pursuit of money and whatever it can buy.

113. John Cotton, *Christ the Fountain of Life*, cited in Heimert and Delbanco, eds., *The Puritans in America*, 31.

114. John Cotton, *The Way of Life, or God’s Way and Course* (London: L. Fawne and S. Gellibrand, 1641), 461.

115. Mather, *Durable Riches*, 13.

116. Preston, *Sinnes Overthrow* 44.

