

FORGING UNITY, FOSTERING DIVISION:

**THE PARADOX
OF
WORK
IN
EARLY AMERICAN TEXTS**

NATE BANFIELD

DEFENDED: APRIL 10, 2013

*For the University of Colorado Honors
Program*

Advisor:

Nan Goodman | Department of English

Defense Committee:

Nan Goodman | English

Virginia Anderson | History

Cathy Preston | English

Abstract

Work has always been a defining characteristic of American identity. This thesis explores the way that ideas about work in America were first expressed in literary form. Attention is paid to the work of William Bradford, John Winthrop, Robert Keayne and Cotton Mather. These Puritans all wrote as the Massachusetts Bay Colony was first being discovered and developed by English settlers. Their perspective thus reflects the first impressions and ideas of what constitutes work and work ethic in America. In delving more deeply into the text of these men, this thesis postulates that the common element in all of their writing is that work is presented both as a force that unites as well as a force that divides. The notion of class is described in various degrees of specificity, the historical conditions change the specific focus of each text, and each author has a particular perspective. What remains constant is the tension between unity and division vis-à-vis work that accompanies all of these texts. Contemporary American culture is, in part, inherited from the culture of the New England Puritans. The findings of this paper suggest that a part of that cultural inheritance is a view of work that provides both elements that bring society together as well elements as create rifts between people.

Introduction

Americans have always been defined by labor. Today, many are often identified so closely with their professions that the first question one person asks about another upon introduction is, “so what do you do?” Certainly, these notions have been changing throughout the centuries, but something has remained constant. From the recent focus on technology and informational jobs, to the early days of railroads and industry, from factory jobs in wartime to the ever-present entertainment industry, Americans are known by what we do for work. What is it the cultural DNA of America that promotes this notion so strongly? If it is to be found anywhere, perhaps it is the descriptions of the early European Americans, the Puritans who first brought the traditions of Western culture to the “New World”; traditions that survive today. The men of early America who recorded ideas of what labor and work mean left a powerful record that presents contradictory notions. For William Bradford, John Winthrop, Robert Keayne and Cotton Mather, work provides a pull both toward unity as well as division. Their ideas on work’s opposing

properties all manifest themselves in different ways, but the tension remains a constant one throughout all of their writing.

The note of unity rings clearly in each piece by these 17th Century Americans, through ideas of utopia, love, collective labor and the possibility of a new form of economic arrangement. For the first Pilgrims to land in Massachusetts, the very act of building necessary structures, ships, and raising corn, provides a possibility of creating a united society through the joint effort of physical labor. Bradford portrays the way that differences between individual and group are broken down in the action of work, and a new community is forged. For Winthrop, who arrived only in the New World ten years after Bradford, work provides the possibility of a unity so strong that the members of the community are like parts of body, joined in a brotherly, familial love. Winthrop's vision is that this tightly knit society will work to provide an example to the rest of the world; it will be "as a city on a hill," as he famously declares, because of the fantastic unity through collective effort. The excitement and hope for unity through work carries through into the writings of Robert Keayne, whose perspective as a merchant is reflected in his praise of the work done through the emergent market system. For Keayne, it is the Market that is able to provide for all, to build towards the sort of utopia that Winthrop envisions, and to perhaps provide for the utopic vision Winthrop hopes for. Mather, too, sees the unity of utopia in the possibility of work, and expands the idea of work to include the very act of creating greater cohesion and tighter community bonds with relatives and neighbors. In Mather's conception, it is the future that holds possibility, and the outer bounds of the community, for work is to spread the unity outwards to others outside of the colony. The possibility of unity is presented by all these men as a key feature of labor.

Amid all of the promise and possibility seen within early American texts, there is also a darker element present in labor, as it causes, or masks divisions. Despite the praise of collectivity that is contained in these texts, labor is continually a crucial part of a class divide. Work, or the lack of work, is used to justify how much payment one receives in Bradford's Of Plymouth Plantation, showing that class divisions spring up immediately within the nascent colony, and that they are justified with labor. Some people are even made scapegoats because they do not work hard enough and take what they have not earned, suggesting that they enact a class divide that is hidden. The fact that some people take food that they have not earned through work actually results in whippings, physical violence, showing how seriously force of labor is for dividing the early settlers. Winthrop actually asks that work be done in order to ensure that class divisions are maintained. He is quite clear about class, unlike the other writers, and states boldly that it exists while more subtly suggesting that the work of the wealthy is to maintain the destitute state of the poor by pacifying them with charity. The rich, Winthrop contends, must lend to the poor because of the danger that the poor may rise up in rebellion. For Winthrop, work is to be done to maintain the uneasy unity that is the result of a society divided by class. Mather and Keayne also hold work in a regard that promotes class division, by praising the work of the elite extensively to the ignorance or detriment of the poor. Keayne, whose focus on division is least pronounced, writes of the excellence of scholarship and the possibility of trading on the market, ignoring that these forms of work are undertaken only by the wealthy in a society that is increasingly divided by class. Keayne refuses to recognize the way that the market system is not one that provides for all equally, and thus uses the language of work to mask division. Mather uses similarly biased ideas, promoting the work that the educated do as a greater force to "do good." He makes explicit more criticism of those who do not work than Keayne, however, in

equating not working to allowing evil to enter the world. Thus, those who are not working as hard, or doing as much, are causing the world to suffer, and therefore deserve a state of lowered status. In fact, Mather's suggestion that status be based on work is quite similar to Bradford's, though there is a more religious doctrine behind Mather's assertion. As much as unity is held as an ideal that work can help achieve, there is a contrary thrust in all of these texts towards division.

The "Spirit of Capitalism" that sociologist Max Weber tied to Protestantism is an important part of the tensions between unity and division that are present in these texts. While all of these writings predate capitalism, the individuality that contrasts with group identity and the drive towards work in an increasingly market oriented world all indicate a logic that would become more pronounced in later years. In Weber's The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism, he argues that the Protestant (and therefore Puritan) drive towards constantly doing good works to glorify God was a belief that enabled capitalism to succeed so strongly among Protestant groups. Capitalism, an ideology of individualized success and failure, and of competition, can be seen in its most infantile stages in these early American writings.

While all of the writing examined in this paper maintains a focus on unity and division in work, it is worth noting that historic changes account for some of the variations in the text. Bradford and Winthrop were both writing at times when the Massachusetts Bay Colony was hardly populated by Europeans at all, and thus their perspectives reflect a focus on the building of foundations in the New World as well as idealism about what the possibilities are. Keayne, of course, is writing by the time that the city of Boston has been established, and thus his perspective reflects a far more developed Massachusetts. That he wishes to build a market house reflects the rising importance of Massachusetts as a trading hub for England, and the rise of

mercantilism and the market. Mather, writing at the end of the Puritans' height of power, wishes to expand community outward because he sees that the Puritan empire is declining.

William Bradford

William Bradford's Of Plymouth Plantation shows that work is both the source of unification within the fledgling colony in the New World even as it provides justification for an unequal distribution of resources. The tasks that the Puritans must undertake in order to build their society are communal. Building a meetinghouse and constructing ships are tasks that the group undertakes, and the products serve the collective as the labor unites the community. Despite this pull towards collectivity, which in many ways defined the Puritans, the text also presents the ideas that an inadequately laboring individual does not deserve a share of the collective crops, and that labor can be used to justify how much a hard worker will be paid. These ideas suggest that even as it unites people labor is also a divisive force, creating class rifts and providing a justification for whippings. In this text about the inception of Puritan America, labor causes division in the very community it helps to create.

One of the primary differences between Bradford and the other authors is that the work he describes is primarily physical. While Mather and Keayne are more interested in the tangible work that the elite will undertake, such as academic learning or trading on the market, and Winthrop speaks of the general work of building community, Bradford is most interested in the way that building and harvesting, manual labor, creates a drive towards unification and division, towards community and individuality. Within historical context, it makes sense that Of Plymouth Plantation focuses more on these issues. As an account of the first Pilgrims landing in

Massachusetts and settling, the book documents the creation of basic infrastructure closely because it was so important to survival. Within this account, the reader sees the foundational ethics of work, among the New England Puritans played out for the first time. Even as work creates this new community, it causes division within it.

Bradford's description of the construction of a meetinghouse soon after the Pilgrims arrive shows how the community is made safer and is better provided for as the result of collective labor. The settlers come together to create a dwelling that will serve them all:

This sommer they builte a fort with good timber, both strong and comly, which was of good defence, made with a flate rofe and batelments, on which their ordnance were mounted, and wher they kepte constante watch, espetially in time of danger. It served them allso for a meeting house, and was fitted accordingly for that use. It was a great worke for them in this weaknes and time of wants; but the deanger of the time required it, and both the continuall rumors of the fears from the Indeans hear, espetially the Narigansets, and also the hearing of that great massacre in Virginia, made all hands willing to despatch the same.

The communal nature of this task is emphasized by the phrase "made all hands willing to dispatch the same." Hands both signify a person's ability to do work and the physicality of his form. That "all hands" would come together for this task indicates that the finished meetinghouse is the product of the collective community of Plymouth joining in work together. The equality found within this work is emphasized in the phrase "willing to despatch the same," meaning that each person was equally disposed towards this new endeavor, willing to give something up in their efforts to serve the nascent community. Bradford's phrasing also indicates that the Pilgrims worked so each gave an equal portion, or that all worked on the same task. Either reading reinforces the idea that this effort was a unified one. As the community gathers together to work, the community is also strengthened by the work because of the new structure.

Bradford's praise of the meetinghouse's quality shows both that the community will be served and that the labor was admirable. In noting that "It was a great worke," (Bradford) the text shows the reader that this undertaking was both impressive and immense. The praiseworthy

properties also include that the fort is “builte [...] with good timber, both strong and comly [and] of good defence.” (Bradford) This catalogue of praises serves to highlight the myriad ways in which the physical building will serve the Pilgrims in the future. The description of a collective benefit is complemented by the image of different community members keeping “constant watch, espetially in time of danger,” demonstrating that this edifice was something worth guarding to extend its communal benefits. (Bradford) Even in the process of guarding the building, the community continues to reify itself. That the building serves as a meetinghouse is another strong indicator of how the collective has been strengthened through this product of labor. Because of the work that has been completed, the community of Pilgrims is now able to come together in a physical space and further benefit their fledgling society.

Even as Bradford narrows his focus to the laudable efforts of a single worker, he reveals that what is of primary importance about this man is how he helps the collective and is part of the group. This man’s hard work sets an example that others follow, allowing them to do work for group benefit:

The ship-carpenter that was sent them, was an honest and very industrious man, and followed his labour very dilligently, and made all that were imployed with him doe the like; he quickly builte them 2 very good and strong shalops (which after did them greate service), and a great and strong lighter, and had hewne timber for 2. catches; but that was lost, for he fell into a feaver in the hote season of the year, and though he had the best means the place could aforde, yet he dyed; of whom they had a very great loss, and were very sorie for his death. (Bradford)

The ship-carpenter is praised for being “honest,” “industrious” and diligent in his laboring. This man is, in fact, such a good worker that he is able to “imploy” others to work with him. Certainly it might be possible for any man with means to hire others to work for him, but this ship-carpenter is a leader in the work as well as an “imployer.” Those who work under him, the text explains, “doe the like”—that is, they labor with industry, honesty and diligence as well, all under his influence.

Ostensibly, this section seeks to praise one particular individual's efforts and mourn his loss. We may, however, plausibly read this passage as evidence of an individual who was sown into the greater fabric of the community and contributed to the whole. His services were provided to benefit others: "he quickly builte them 2 very good and strong shalops". Of course, no man can build two large boats alone—the text uses "he" here to indicate that a company of men built these boats under his command. By interchanging the word "they" and "he," the text breaks down the distinction between the individual and the collective. More broadly, it implies that in the process of laboring, this separation becomes less rigid. While the ship-carpenter may have been at the helm of the task, ultimately he was only one member of a larger organized body laboring to complete this ship. Describing the ship-carpenter in this way demonstrates that at times, the laudable actions of an individual contribute to the strength of the group overall.

While it is debatable to what extent the building of towns in New England was an effort to create exact replicas of English communities, it is clear that there was a profound focus on unity in this works. Scholar Bernard Bailyn contends that Puritanism provided a means to reconstruct existing patterns in a new land, writing, "Shaken out of their familiar ways by economic and political disturbances, most of the 20,000 Englishmen who migrated to America in the 1630s sought to recreate the village and farm life they had known. They accepted and probably welcomed the medieval social teaching of orthodox Puritanism if only for its inspiring support of the idea of the close knit community that existed for the good of all its members and in which each man was his brother's keeper." (Bailyn, 59) However, historian Virginia Anderson suggests that what made these villages different from England was their more cohesive character. She writes, "When they constructed new communities, for instance, they did not simply replicate familiar patterns: even if their towns often bore a physical resemblance to English villages, New

Englanders' extraordinary emphasis on voluntarism and cooperation as conditions of membership gave them a profoundly different character.” (Anderson, 236) It makes sense, then, that work provides such a strong sense of unity in Bradford’s text, as unity is a common feature in both of these perspectives. Bradford’s piece textually lays the groundwork for the creation of other New England communities.

Labor is used not just for construction, but for agriculture as well, and it is in this view that Bradford’s text reveals the more divisive power of labor. Bradford’s text shows labor to be a divisive element when work is used to justify the unequal distribution of resources. While the act of laboring may bring people together, there is a hidden ideology that justifies inequality hiding behind the actions that unite. Amid all of the praise of work’s unifying properties, Of Plymouth Plantation demonstrates this darker side of labor as amicable relations break down during a poor harvest. The reader sees that under conditions of scarcity, taking something that one inadequately labored to produce is enough to justify being whipped. Conversely, those who have labored harder than everyone expects that their pay will be greater, commensurate with their efforts.

The crop of corn that has been raised is described in disparaging terms, rather than with the praise that attends the description of the meetinghouse and the ships. Just as the praise of these two projects also provides praise for the unity that labor creates, the following description is a vilification of the disunity that lack of collective effort can create:

Now ye wellcome time of harvest approached, in which all had their hungrie bellies filled. But it arose but to a litle, in comparison of a full years supplie; partly by reason they were not yet well acquainted with the manner of Indean corne, (and they had no other,) allso their many other employments, but cheefly their weaknes for wante of food, to tend it as they should have done. Also much was stolne both by night and day, before it became scarce eatable, and much more after ward. And though many were well whipt (when they were taken) for a few ears of corne, yet hunger made others (whom conscience did not restraine) to venture. So as it well appeared that famine must still insue the next year allso, if not some way prevented, or supplie should faile, to which they durst not trust. (Bradford)

The corn is “but a litle, in comparison to a full years supplie”—a description that indicates how pitiful this product is compared to what is expected and needed. Likewise, the text denigrates the labor expended on the corn. The crop is not what it should have been because there was a lack of unified effort in the work good. The people who raised this crop had “many other employments,” meaning that their efforts were not fully focused on this particular task. The broader implication in this statement is that there is a level of personal responsibility one has in determining what work he will do, and if one chooses not to focus on a particular task, there are consequences for this action. Additionally, there was “weaknes for wante of food,” again indicating that the effort of tending to this corn was also weak and inadequate. Unlike the effort devoted to constructing the ships and the meetinghouse, there was a lack of collective effort in the fields.

The result of the scattered and inadequate effort is disunity, seen in an inability to share the product collectively as well as the designation of some corn as “stolne.” That the “corne” is described as “stolne” is notable because it indicates that those who took it did not deserve it in some way. Were this corn truly communal property, there could not really be stealing. If it were a fairly shared product of everyone’s labor, how could one take too much? The word “stolne” therefore indicates that there is a correlation between the effort given to the crop and how much a person deserves to reap from it. Disturbingly, the taking of corn that has not been “earned” causes such disunity that it leads to violence within the community. The text notes that “many were well whipt” for this indiscretion. The violence is not random, but is justified in Bradford’s text: these whippings were “for a few ears of corn”. It is disheartening to see people whipped over such a petty matter, but the text supplies a logic for this punishment. There is, therefore, an unequal power dynamic at play within this infant colony. This idea is suggested more explicitly in Winthrop and Mather’s works, but here Bradford shows that labor provides a nexus for

divisions of class and therefore power. When the product of labor can be equally distributed, there are no issues. An earlier section of the text describes a harvest which was much more fruitful as being a happy occasion without any such division:

They begane now to gather in the small harvest they had, and to fitte up their houses and dwellings against winter, being all well recovered in health and strenght, and had all things in good plenty; for as some were thus imployed in affairs abroad, others were excersised in fishing, aboute codd, and bass, and other fish, of which they tooke good store, of which every family had their portion. All the sommer ther was no wante. (Bradford)

In this earlier harvest, there is no quarrel about how much person should get, there are no accusations of stealing, and there is no whipping. Indeed, “every family had their portion,” meaning that harvest was distributed fairly; “ther was no wante,” because the people took what they needed and there was enough for them. But when, in a future harvest, the supply of corn is inadequate to provide for everyone, a hidden hierarchy emerges. Some are whipped merely for taking food, while others actually carry out the whipping. Certain people are made into scapegoats merely for taking food to feed themselves, rather than the group suffering collectively. The labor that was put into the field was inadequate, and thus people who take too much from this supply are guilty of taking something that was not earned by work. These are the same people who had had “no wante” previously, so clearly the problem is not some overly greedy people sprinkled throughout Plymouth. The underlying justification behind blaming these people is that they have taken something they did not earn through labor.

While other factors, such as scarcity of food and theft serve to divide the settlers at Plymouth, labor is still a key source of division. Scarcity of food has been a very serious issue throughout human history, and has resulted in violence from the French Revolution to more recent riots in Haiti, so it is not entirely surprising that it presented violence among the Pilgrims. Additionally, existence at Plymouth was not entirely utopic even in times of abundance. At one

point, Bradford responds to a complaint about the problem of theft within the colony by saying,

Would London had been free from that crime, then we should not have been trobled with these here; it is well knowne sundrie have smarted well for it, and so are the rest like to doe, if they be taken. (Bradford)

In other words, theft is a fact of life at Plymouth Plantation, just as it is a fact of life in even the most civilized locale in the home country of England. Despite these mitigating factors, labor is the ultimate underlying cause of division even as it serves to unify people through common purpose. Labor divides people because some work harder than others and lack proper compensation for their efforts. Although people understand the communal benefit that work creates, they also expect to have compensation bestowed on them that reflects their own individual efforts.

Bradford more explicitly shows labor as a justification for wealth when it describes the way that different sections of the population feel about their work:

For the yong-men that were most able and fitte for labour and servise did repine that they should spend their time and streingth to worke for other mens wives and children, with out any recompence. The strong, or man of parts, had no more in devission of victails and cloaths, then he that was weake and not able to doe a quarter the other could; this was thought injuestice. The aged and graver men to be ranked and equalised in labours, and victails, cloaths, etc., with the meaner and yonger sorte, thought it some indignite and disrespect unto them. (Bradford)

This account of grievances makes it clear that people accept labor as an individual justification of wealth and status. The “yong-men,” who are clearly stronger and more physically productive, are frustrated that they are unable to determine what work they do or how they are compensated. They serve the collective, but they do not do so entirely willingly or happily. Similarly, the “man of parts,” who had numerous talents or services to offer through labor, is upset that he is of the same social rank as a much less productive person. That this titan of travails “had no more in division of victails and cloaths” than “he that was weake and not able to doe a quarter” of the first man’s work indicates again that labor is a justification for social division. This multitalented

Pilgrim expects that he will be given a share of wealth greater than his less-productive compatriots. The older men, who expect that their wisdom and contributions will be honored by the conference of higher status, are appalled by the way that their status is seen as equal to the young men. They see it as “indignitie and disrespect unto them” that they are “equalized in labours” because their age and experience should place them in a higher stratum of society.

There is an individualism that is present to a surprising degree, even given Weber’s assertion that individualism is a feature of Puritanism, considering the way that these people have been induced to rely on one another in this harsh new land. A person’s work is for the community, but the benefits are expected not only to be communal but to be personal as well, commensurate with how much effort has been expended. Curiously, the complaints revolve around one’s efforts, but they do not reference how much benefit has been given to the community through one’s work. The attitude is decidedly self-serving.

A historical read of the text supports the notion that there is a strong strain of individuality within Bradford, the sort of self-made individualism that is still so strong in American ideology today. As a breakaway sect of Protestants, the Puritans’ were emigrants from a land with different political and social patterns of behavior from their own ideals. In the New World, they were able to fully express the individualistic aspect of their character. As Ellwood Johnson writes,

As their religion was the religion of the heart, so their politics were the politics of individualism. This was not an individualism, however, that lent itself easily to democratic process. Instead, it was a sense of personal autonomy resulting from a moral rebirth and whose value could be measured by personal productivity, responsibility to others, and its intimacy with God. Underneath the demands that the English Puritans made of their government and church we can detect a growing elitism of belief in themselves as an aristocracy of worth opposed to the aristocracy by birth, a belief that took rigid political shape in New England and was much exercised there in keeping other classes of people leveled economically as well as politically. (Johnson, 62)

Johnson’s historical interpretation matches closely with what Bradford presents in his texts

through men looking for compensation based on the effort that they have expended. The tension between individuality and community play out as tension in labor between division and unification, respectively.

The proposed solution to these complaints again showcases a tension between individuality and collectivity. It allows for greater effort to produce greater wealth, while also enacting a sense of responsibility to the group. Societal labor is reorganized in a way that has people working together in a general fashion, but it also allows for compensation that is based on an individual's labor and allows for individualized success and failure.

So they begane to thinke how they might raise as much corne as they could, and obtaine a beter crope then they had done, that they might not still thus languish in miserie. At length, after much debate of things, the Govr (with the advise of the cheefest amongst them) gave way that they should set corne every man for his owne perticuler, and in that regard trust to them selves; in all other things to goe on in the generall way as before. And so assigned to every family a parcell of land, according to the proportion of their number for that end, only for present use (but made no devission for inheritance), and ranged all boys and youth under some familie. This had very good success; for it made all hands very industrious, so as much more corne was planted then other waise would have bene by any means the Govr or any other could use, and saved him a great deall of trouble, and gave farr better contente. (Bradford)

The new system is far more individualistic. Rather than raising a communal plot, people are made responsible for their own parcels of farmland. It is clear that by giving individuals a greater say in how their work is distributed, a greater level of productivity is achieved. This new system "made all hands very industrious, so as much more corne was planted than other ways would have bene". This method is seen as superior not only because it is more productive. It "provides better contente", or satisfies people more because it allows rewards to be bestowed upon individuals due to their harder work. The people "trust to them selves" above the group, and therefore this mode of raising crops makes more sense. People also feel a greater level of pride in their work because they have a greater level of ownership in it and its product. People had complained earlier that they were forced to work for others, such as young men being forced to

work for other families. With this division of labor, the work has a much more immediate and personal result.

Even under this far less communal system, however, there is still recognition of group identity. Broadly, the people of Plymouth must share the same spaces, interact, attend church, and do other work together. Even more specifically, a contemporary text mentions that these family farms must also "bring in a competent portion for the maintenance of public officers, fisherman, &c., which could not be freed from their calling without greater inconveniences" (Chronicles of the Pilgrims, referenced in History of Plymouth Plantation, 134). The new system is hardly an example unadulterated capitalism. People willingly cede a portion of their crops to provide for others, whose jobs likewise benefit them. There is still a sense that the work being done is for the greater good, as the corn raised by families will be used to provide for people whose jobs help society in other ways. The fishermen and public officers depend on corn from the families, just as the families depend on fish and governmental operations. The spirit of collectivity still prevails, alongside the very notable pull of individuality expressed through labor.

Bradford's piece shows the way that labor serves to build the community as well as building individual people within the community, a result that can create division. Work strengthens the community by providing physical structures such as ships a meetinghouse; it nourishes the community in that it provides the means for crops to be grown. It unites people together as they all work on these projects together, it unites them as they share in the fruits of their labor. And it can strengthen individuals as part of the larger group, just as the individual ship captain is noted for the way that he uses his efforts to provide for the larger collective. Yet the strain of individuality that labor creates can be so strong that it actually serves to divide. The

men who work harder in the fields expect better compensation for their greater efforts, and the farming system eventually shifts so that those individual families that expend more effort are better compensated. Most striking of all is the way that certain individuals are actually whipped for the way that they take food that they did not individually earn. Just as labor has the power to bring people together, it can also foster an individuality so strong that it erupts into violence.

Bradford's text suggests a meritocracy based on compensating people for the amount of effort they expend, contained in a society that has a recognition of collective identity. To a far greater extent than other Puritans writing on work, he examines manual labor as a nexus for this system. It is not unfair to speculate, however, that Bradford's ideas on labor may also be serving to mask an extant system of class inequalities. In this view, labor is only a justification to punish lower class scapegoats in conditions where food is scarce. The fact that some are whipped certainly indicates an existing set of unequal power relations that is enacted in the time of the poor harvest. Of Plymouth Plantation's many mentions of community give a bright view of the possibilities of future generations, but its descriptions of violence and division cast a shadow on these hopes.

John Winthrop

In John Winthrop's "A Modell of Christian Charity," class divisions are presented far more concretely than in Bradford, and Winthrop calls for work that unites society in love while suggesting hatred through justifying stratification. He thus portrays work as an even more powerful unifier than Bradford does. All of this rhetoric is expressed with the underlying idea of building a new, utopian society that will prove to be an example to the world. It is work that will

create the bonds that unify this new society. Yet in illustrating the precepts that will guide work in this expected civilization, Winthrop's rhetoric hardly champions an idealistic notion of full equality. Instead, "A Modell of Christian Charity" purports that the wealthy must work in lending to the poor, and thereby prevent a rebellion that might result from what he deems to be natural class divisions. Lending to retain social cohesion is, in essence, the work of the elite. For Winthrop, work is undertaken to create a society that is cohesive like a body, or family full of love, while it also ensures that divisions in society remain unchallenged.

Winthrop's conception to work is highly abstract in comparison with other early Americans', showcasing both the conditions in which the piece was written as well as Winthrop's aristocratic background. Written some ten years after Bradford's landing in Massachusetts, Winthrop's "Modell of Christian Charity" is a speech given to the men and women who joined Winthrop on the ship *Arabella* before they all arrived in the New World. It is therefore meant to inspire and motivate, and is understandably less concrete. Within early America, Winthrop is situated at a time in which there is still a great deal to be done to build the very necessities that will make life possible, but he does not dwell on specifics. Yet he is quite practical concerning the notions of class division. He acknowledges them frankly, shows them as immutable fact, and views part of the work in the New World as maintaining these class divisions through the action of charity.

Winthrop's description of work as analogous to the functions of the body makes it clear how intricately paired work is with the social order. He his speech by admonishing those on the *Arbella*, "We must delight in each other; make others' conditions our own; [...] labor and suffer together, always having before our eyes our commission and community in the work, as members of the same body" (Winthrop). The labor they will undertake will be transformative in

nature and will provide the means for people to come together so strongly that their new society is like a body, with each individual member a part of the new whole. The vision already sounds utopic, and this thread is even more pronounced in the famous proclamation that the new society “shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are on us.” (Ibid) This new society will prove so advanced that it will be a model for the rest of the world; it will show others how harmoniously people may live together and prosper.

According to the “Modell,” it is through labor that individuals are able to serve society, and it is also through their labor that they allow society to serve them. Labor is the means by which functionality, and therefore unity, is achieved in society. This concept is illustrated by the text in an allegory concerning the mouth and the body:

The mouth is at all the pains to receive and mince the food which serves for the nourishment of all the other parts of the body; yet it hath no cause to complain; for first the other parts send back, by several passages, a due proportion of the same nourishment, in a better form for the strengthening and comforting the mouth. Secondly, the labor of the mouth is accompanied with such pleasure and content as far exceeds the pains it takes. So is it in all the labor of love among Christians. The party loving, reaps love again, as was showed before, which the soul covets more then [sic] all the wealth in the world. (Winthrop)

In this brief example, Winthrop compares any Christian in the new community to the mouth. She is to labor to provide for her Christians, just as the mouth labors by chewing to provide nourishment to the body. And it is by doing this labor that she will, likewise, be rewarded. By providing for the community, a Christian’s work also will sustain and provide for her, as the community will give back just as the body returns nourishment gained from the mouth. Labor is, therefore, a part of the essence of this new community. By laboring, individuals “nourish” the community, or allow it to prosper while also coming to depend on the community providing for them. This is the very definition of a functional, unified community.

Mutual dependence is at the core of what Winthrop’s text urges the Pilgrims to build through their work. His discussion of how the new society is to be built ties work to collective

reliance and love, while also underscoring the enormity of the undertaking ahead. Following a series of discussions on the task before them, the text reads,

Fourthly, for the means whereby this must be effected. They are twofold, a conformity with the work and end we aim at. These we see are extraordinary, therefore we must not content ourselves with usual ordinary means. Whatsoever we did, or ought to have done, when we lived in England, the same must we do, and more also, where we go. That which the most in their churches maintain as truth in profession only, we must bring into familiar and constant practice; as in this duty of love, we must love brotherly without dissimulation, we must love one another with a pure heart fervently. We must bear one another's burdens. We must not look only on our own things, but also on the things of our brethren. (Winthrop)

The work that is to be undertaken proves to be organized with very lofty goals in mind. Because work is a means to achieving these ends, the text presents it as having a great deal of importance. Winthrop charges, "the same must we do, and more also, where we go," to indicate that there will be more labor in this new land than listeners have yet undertaken good. The overarching goal is to achieve the aim of building a cohesive and exemplary new society. Therefore, this labor is undertaken to "love brotherly without dissimulation," to "love one another with a pure heart fervently," and to "bear one another's burdens." Each of these phrases indicates a great deal of interdependence within this new society. The passage's phrasing makes it slightly unclear whether this love is the labor itself or the goal of the labor. What is clear is that labor is intertwined with bringing this kind of mutual trust and reliance into being. The terms "duty," "means," "do," and "practice," all complement the word "work" and suggest that the action of loving is an action of labor, a necessary endeavor to provide the bonds that will create the utopia of society in the New World.

The ideas of dependence and unity are illustrated through the ideas of family, love and the body. These metaphors are employed to tie work to the cohesive society that is to be constructed. The text argues that love inherently causes people to labor in beneficial ways for each other; it is this impetus that causes men to do good deeds. Winthrop explains,

So the way to draw men to the works of mercy, is not by force of Argument from the goodness or necessity of the work; for though this cause may enforce, a rational mind to some present act of mercy, as is frequent in experience, yet it cannot work such a habit in a soul, as shall make it prompt upon all occasions to produce the same effect, but by framing these affections of love in the heart which will as naturally bring forth the other, as any cause doth produce the effect.
(Winthrop)

“Works of mercy” are understood to be acts of charity or compassion toward those who are facing hardship. This work is undertaken because of the singular internal impetus of love in the heart. That this will naturally bring forth “the other” implies a unity between the laborer and the recipient of the work, or mercy. Therefore this section is reinforcing the idea that love acts as a force that helps unify people through the acts of work. The passage also argues, in effect, that work driven by love are the result of people living together. Love is something that occurs “naturally.” By assembling people together, their love will naturally create the desire to do works to benefit each other. This will, again, create the unity necessary in a new society.

While Weber argues in The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism that brotherly love is a way for more impersonal social organizations to form, the bulk of Winthrop’s text suggests otherwise. Weber writes that brotherly love is “for the Calvinists a characteristic element in their ethical system,” and argues that this feature allows “service in the interest of the rational organization of our social environment.” (Weber, 108-109) There is certainly something to this notion, that the idea of thinking of each other as brothers serves Winthrop’s larger goal of creating a more unified society. Yet Winthrop also speaks of other forces accomplishing the purpose of creating a new utopia: familial love and even the kind of unity that a body enjoys. These metaphors do not have the impersonal nature that Weber believes is key to making a more rational organization of a work environment. Winthrop instead provides a positive vision of a harmoniously entwined group of people, interspersed the idea of painful class divisions that must be maintained.

Brotherly love is, for Winthrop, a call to serve. Winthrop draws upon the history of the church to show love to be a force that calls people to serve and a force that creates unifying bonds among all:

So Phoebe and others are called the servants of the church. Now it is apparent that they served not for wages, or by constraint, but out of love. The like we shall find in the histories of the church, in all ages; the sweet sympathy of affections which was in the members of this body one towards another; their cheerfulness in serving and suffering together; how liberal they were without repining, harborers without grudging, and helpful without reproaching; and all from hence, because they had fervent love amongst them; which only makes the practice of mercy constant and easy. (Winthrop)

This passage again demonstrates the way love is an impetus for serving, for labor. The people mentioned are “servants of the church,” they labored, or served, out of love rather than a desire for material wealth or an external force. Love, by its association with labor, creates the drive for unity as well as being a part of the unity itself. Indeed these people have “fervent love” for each other. They are unified so strongly that they are referred to as “this body,” implying that they form a cohesive whole. Winthrop’s mention of love is familial as well as general, implying that within this new utopic society people will be part of a greater cohesive unit that functions like a large family. The document opens by assuring the reader that differences in wealth are present so “that every man might have need of others, and from hence they might be all knit more nearly together in the bonds of brotherly affection.” (Winthrop) These words have an egalitarian ring to them and again suggest that the envisioned utopia is one where people will care for each other better and more intimately than neighbors or co-workers. They will be brought together like siblings, and their unity will be forged in a symbiotic fashion, where they all rely on each other and help each other. Throughout these passages, the idea of unity is the constant. It is shown through the ideas of love, the body, and brotherly affection this is all repetitive. The first two passages explicitly tie love and the body to labor, showing how working communities are united like a body and driven by love. The view of brotherly affection again shapes the notion of how

strongly unified this new society will be.

A thread of rhetoric that justifies class division within society, and thereby promotes labor in hatred, counter poses Winthrop's notion of love that signifies unity, compassion and equality through labor. This opposing notion shows that for Winthrop, division exists already and must be maintained through labor. There is nothing subtle about the message; it is contained in the very first line of the text: "GOD ALMIGHTY in His most holy and wise providence, hath so disposed of the condition of mankind, as in all times some must be rich, some poor, some high and eminent in power and dignity; others mean and in submission." (Winthrop) By presenting status as something ordained by God, Winthrop asserts that they are entirely natural and therefore should exist, as they are a result of divine will. As the Puritans generally saw their work as in the service of glorifying God, it follows that Winthrop's assertion here on class is also an assertion that work must be done to maintain these class hierarchies. Further, Winthrop's descriptions of classes indicate that there truly is a sense of animosity that accompanies the work he implies. Some are "mean," signifying both a sense that these people are of low birth as well as suggesting a that these people may be "mean" in that they are unkind, or not nice. Those who are members of the upper class are completely opposite: they are high in power, but more notably high in dignity; they are proper and worthy of respect, unlike the members of the lower class.

Unlike Bradford, there is no real tie in Winthrop between the labor one does and one's ability to be seated in a position of wealth or power. Writes Stanley Gray, "These leaders were not unscrupulous men avid of power, but sincere zealots of aristocratic birth and training who honestly believed that it was for the good of the people to keep power in the hands of those best fitted to exercise it." (Gray, 689) Winthrop's perspective is aristocratic, and his writings express that class distinctions are natural, but not that they should be changed based on the quality of

one's labor. As Gray points out, birth is a stronger criteria for Winthrop's view on what a person's class status should be.

Winthrop's text is much like Bradford's in the language used to describe social classes. However, Bradford's text shows a desire for social status and compensation to be based on how much labor one does to benefit society. While Winthrop's text is not incompatible with this theory, it makes no explicit mention of labor providing the justification for a person's class status. It instead justifies class status as an opportunity for God to "show forth the glory of his wisdom," a means to "manifest the work of his Spirit," and so that men "might be all knit more nearly together" (Winthrop). The work that men do is conspicuously absent in this accounting. If there can be a cohesive idea about labor drawn from Winthrop, it is that labor is a force that keeps society bound together, sometimes through love and unity, other times through works that prevent class fissures from erupting into even more profound divisions.

Work provides the means by which this accepted inequality is maintained through what Winthrop calls charity (in the sermon's title) and mercy. The text provides very specific prescriptions on lending. In one section, Winthrop's text highlights the way that lending to the poor is a duty:

Thou must observe whether thy brother hath present or probable or possible means of repaying thee, if there be none of those, thou must give him according to his necessity, rather then lend him as he requires. If he hath present means of repaying thee, thou art to look at him not as an act of mercy, but by way of commerce, wherein thou art to walk by the rule of justice; but if his means of repaying thee be only probable or possible, then he is an object of thy mercy, thou must lend him, though there be danger of losing it. (Winthrop)

This passage does not use the terms "work" or "duty" to describe lending. It is easily understood, though, that it is the duty of those with money to lend to those who have not enough. Even if there is a chance that the debtor will not be able to repay what is lent to him, the duty of lending is still present: "thou must lend him, though there be danger of losing it." In essence, this duty is

the work that the upper class must carry out. The advice on lending is presented within a document that outlines how work will provide a sense of unity within a future society, a document that speaks in praise of the work to be undertaken to build the new “City on a Hill.” Lending to the poor is the work that the wealthy must do to maintain a sense of cohesion within society.

The cohesion that the rich must work to maintain is tenuous, built on the unstable ground of pacifying the underclass in order to prevent them from causing serious disruptions. The introduction to the “Modell” bespeaks this danger in explaining why God maintains class hierarchy: “Secondly, that He might have the more occasion to manifest the work of his Spirit: first upon the wicked in moderating and restraining them, so that the rich and mighty should not eat up the poor, nor the poor and despised rise up against and shake off their yoke.” (Winthrop) This rhetoric indicates the fear that the lower classes might revolt. The work of lending to the poor is, therefore, to be undertaken with the implicit goal of maintaining class divisions. Thus, work is more than the force of unity in society. It is also a tool the upper class will use to continue subjugating the poor under the auspices of charity.

It is arguable that the work of lending is an act of love too, and that there is therefore no tension between this work and the other work presented in this text. The idea that this is an act of “mercy” shows, however, that unlike the other mentions of love in the text, the action of lending is actually one of that enacts inequality. The text frequently sounds notes of equality in its praise of familial love and brotherly love, but its use of the term “mercy” here indicates a disparate distribution of power. To have mercy on someone, a person must be in the position to punish or harm her in some way, a position that indicates class differences. The word “danger,” too, indicates that there are very real consequences if a person does not lend money to those in dire

economic straits. The word “danger” is used in the context of the lent money not being returned, but it underscores that there is a broader danger in not lending at all. Withholding money could lead to unrest among the underclass, which may lead to violence or rebellion.

“A Modell of Christian Charity” provides the reader with a contradictory sense of how work will function, as well as what the new society will look like. The audience is primed to expect a society in which people will work together, both giving and receiving in a beneficial manner that creates the foundations needed for the utopic “City on a Hill”. Ominously, amid this lofty rhetoric is an embrace of class divisions decidedly in the style of the Old World. These divisions are depicted as natural and ordained by God and are thus justified. The text provides tools to maintain these class divisions by offering detailed advice on lending to the poor. Indeed, as this work-focused text offers advice emphasizing the necessity of lending to the poor, it paints this lending process as a way in which the wealthy must work to maintain class divisions. Even as work is shown to be something which will provide a greater sense of unity, cohesion and functionality to the utopic society to be built in the new world, it is also shown as a tool that the wealthy will use to prevent any kind of uprising from the destitute masses. Work seems to unify, but the stability it offers is built on maintaining a system of inequality and division.

Robert Keayne

The Apologia of Robert Keayne, an accounting of how the author’s property should be divided following his death, engages in discourse on work that invokes the power of the marketplace. Keayne’s work is distinguished from the others because it focuses so heavily on the market as a way to do good and to create benefits for all. The market is, for Keayne, a

unifying force. And in order for the benefits of the market to be created, work must be done through it. Keayne's piece comes much later than either Bradford or Winthrop's, at a time when the city of Boston had been established and Massachusetts was poised as an important commercial hub. Unlike the earlier eras described by Bradford and Winthrop, the era of Keayne is one in which Massachusetts is well settled, and class distinctions are more pronounced. Keayne's work provides a great deal of praise for the work that the upper class can do and the possibility of the market, while comparatively ignoring the less wealthy and masking the lessened ability of the elite to participate in the market. For Keayne, work through the market unites, but his ignorance of the way that the market is not open to all masks division.

As a merchant, Keayne is navigating the tricky boundary between the Puritans' tendency to embrace work and their reluctance to endorse the marketplace and the dealings of merchants. Where Winthrop overtly and obviously recognizes the class divides of society and the need to maintain them, Keayne takes a different tact and chooses instead to focus on the way that the market provides both an avenue to do work and a way to give charity to the poor, obscuring the fact that the poor are not able to participate in the market as the elite are. While the market may use the labor of the poor, the wealthy are able to use it for trade. Indeed, Keayne is generally more focused on the work of the elite, which is why he shows scholarship as a form of work as well. Whereas Mather asserts that scholarship is what allows people to be better able to do good work, Keayne praises the act of scholarship itself as a form of eminently worthwhile labor, highlighting his more favorable outlook towards the work of the elite. Keayne's praise of the construction of a market house also echoes Bradford, who describes the meetinghouse in laudatory terms. Unlike the edifice created by Bradford's men, however, Keayne's market house does not immediately provide for all, but only gives secondary benefits to the impoverished. The

Apologia provides a merchant's perspective on work, using the discourse of labor to praise the power of the market while obscuring the inability of some to participate in elite institutions.

Keayne's particular perspective champions the power of labor within the market system to provide benefits for all, but also accepts and subtly hides the fact that not all have agency within this system.

Although the desire to strengthen community through work is a common theme in the texts examined in this paper, Keayne's praise of commercial work as a means to this end actually conflicts with other Puritans' views. Some saw the ideology of the market as opposite to the values a Christian community should keep. Mark Valeri explains,

Time and again, dissenting ministers warned that merchants were tempted to take advantage of their neighbors, forget their duty to the poor, and become self-interested. [...] Puritan John Field complained in 1583 that while London's market had once been a place to exchange "earthly commodities" such as meat, grain, and metals according to God's law, it had become a place where people dealt in sheer calculation: the arithmetic world of "profit". [...] Puritans often critiqued the market as being as false, disingenuous, fabricated and socially ruinous as its cultural twin, the theatre. (Valeri, 31)

Keayne is navigating the strange waters between the lands of civic-minded commercial ideology and suspicious Puritan dogma. His focus on community benefit is in keeping with more religiously oriented discourse of the same era, yet his mercantile perspective gives his rhetoric a different bent than that of his contemporaries. Keayne differentiates himself in his belief in the market.

Keayne recognizes the power of work, but prizes work that is geared towards promoting institutions of the elite, such as scholarship. As a scholar, Keayne is familiar with the field of scholastic inquiry and recognizes that it is itself a form of labor. Keayne praises scholarship continually, and his encouragement of written and print culture indicates that he is highly invested in the functioning of the upper echelons of society. In revealing himself to be a scholar and desirous that his work be continued after his death, Keayne reveals his great respect for

scholarship and the value he places on intellectual labor. He writes,

All these books are written with my own hand so far as they be writ. And I could desire that some able scholar or two that is active and diligent and addicted to reading and writing were ordered to carry on the same work by degrees as they have leisure and opportunity, in the same method and way as I have begun (if a better be not advised to), [especially] if it shall be esteemed for the profit of it to young students [...] though not so to as I have and do find it to myself worth all the pains and labor I have bestowed upon them. (9)

By using the word “leisure,” Keayne indicates that he is leaving this task to a certain kind of person: one who will be able to complete a scholarly undertaking in the extra time that he has. In other words, this kind of work is to be done by a member of a wealthier class. Keayne relates his own class bias to us in a subtler manner with his use of the word “profit.” As a merchant, Keayne is borrowing from the discourses of the marketplace in his praise of what can be learned from books. Both of these undertakings are the sole province of the wealthier classes, and thus Keayne shows the labor of the elite to be of more importance. By using the term “profit,” he conflates the gain that one makes from reading with the gain that one makes by selling something for value. He therefore legitimizes the gains that can be made from selling on the marketplace by writing about acquiring knowledge in the language of mercantilism. Keayne recognizes and praises the work done by the wealthier members of society through scholarship. His use of the word “profit” also praises the members of the rising merchant class, whose work also is focused in an entirely different way than that of manual laborers. Keayne has as much praise for labor as any Puritan, but his focus is on the upper crust of society.

It should be said that the society of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was a highly literate one. There is no doubt that many people who were not especially wealthy had work that involved reading and writing. However, scholarship was a profession that employed a comparatively small percentage of people.

Keayne reiterates his tie between the “profit” of scholarly study and the profit of selling

items for monetary gain, further reinforcing his praise of the values of the institutions held in highest esteem for the upper class. He writes,

[...] my will is that my brother Wilson and Mr. Norton, with my executor and overseers or the most of them, may view over the rest of my books and to choose from amongst them such of my divinity books and commentaries and my written sermon books or any others of them as they shall think profitable and useful for such a library (not simply for show but properly for use), they being all English, none Latin or Greek. Then the rest, both the written and printed ones, which remains may be sold for their due worth. (9)

This section ties the two notions of profit together even more closely by demonstrating that a book can yield both types of profit, depending on how it is used. If a book is studied, it will produce “profit” in the form of knowledge. The scholastic work done with the book is a form of labor, as is the act of selling books for money. If a book will not be of use through its study, then it can be sold. The type of profit is different, but both benefit the person who labors. Tying the market and the act of study together as forms of work that can yield profit shows that for Keayne, the benefits of a market economy serve as a model for the redemption of labor in general.

Keayne’s sense of the importance of working towards profit is tied deeply with a moral sense of duty to serve the community as a whole. As Weber points out,

It is true that the usefulness of a calling, and thus its favor in the sight of God, is measured primarily in moral terms, and thus in terms of the importance of the goods produced in it for the community. But a further, and, above all, in practice the most important, criterion is found in private profitableness. For if that God, whose hand the Puritan sees in all the occurrences in life, shows one of His elect a chance of profit, he must do it with a purpose. Hence the faithful Christian must follow the call by taking advantage of the opportunity. (Weber, 162)

Thus, Keayne’s drive towards profit and his constant invocation of this term in his Apologia are both indicators of his attempts to chart a more moral course. As Weber shows, by achieving profit Keayne can see himself as producing something worthwhile for the community. He is doing work that produces for all. By contributing to the community through his labor towards profit, Keayne helps build community as well.

Keayne expresses an expectation that money can be easily converted into labor when he explains how a sum of three hundred pounds is being left for the express purpose of building a market house in the middle of a downtown square. The equation of money with labor is reflective of a man whose profession is dealing in trade. Mercantilism, the system under which Keayne worked, promoted trade under government and military scrutiny, to further the aims of empire. For a man working as part of this system, the exchange of money was so frequent and inconsequential that it was itself a form of labor. This notion shows Keayne's high esteem for the market, because it shows that the market has the ability to, as Cotton Mather would say, "do good." The market's ability incorporate labor further justifies its benefit to all. Keayne explains,

Besides, if I were about to build a thing that I conceive would be very useful and advantageous to me but am not comfortably able to bear the charge of it, if any friend out of love to me would lend me 300 lb. [for] some considerable time gratis it would be a great encouragement to me to go on with the work. But if he should offer to give me freely 300 lb. towards it I should think myself bound to be very thankful to him and to be willing to make up what is wanting rather than [to] lose so free a kindness by my neglecting of the work. (15)

Keayne contrasts being "willing to make up what is wanting" and having to "lose so free a kindness," hinting at the social contract that is created by the market. The market binds seller and buyer together through their interchange, and compels each to offer what he thinks is a fair amount for the other good. A market-based economy allows for the transfer of money for other goods. Money is offered for this project in the same way that money is so commonly traded on the market for labor. Keayne's mercantile sensibilities are obviously at play here; he is used to the way the market can convert money to labor and goods, and vice versa. His expectation that "I should be [...] willing to make up what is wanting rather than lose so free a kindness by my neglecting of the work" demonstrates his expectation that this exchange of money for labor will be no different. In part, his view is that work is nothing more than a commodity, something else that the market system incorporates into its general workings. The market makes it possible for a

merchant to trade one good for money, for companies to be formed and stocks to be sold.

Interchangeability and liquidity are hugely important features of this new system. Keayne's expectation of an easy conversion from currency to manual labor belies an ignorance of the conditions of the poor, because he ignores that their familiarity with the stock market is more limited. The section adds to the impression that he is more concerned with the institutions of the elite.

Keayne views leaving money for the construction of the market house as just as much "work" as would be entailed in its actual construction, demonstrating that participation in the market system is what determines something is work. As a merchant, Keayne elevates the market to the highest level of legitimacy as he equates trading and using the market with labor. To explain the benefits of the market house that will be created, he writes,

The market house is more for the conveniency of strangers and their accommodation in winter and summer, in wet and dry, [than] for the inhabitants of the town. And in that respect it is a work of charity and mercy, and though some particular persons that trade may have more benefit by it than some other persons that dwell further off, yet the advantage and profit of it will redound to the whole town in general. For my own particular—I have given over trade long ago—the nearness of the market is more chargeable than beneficial to me if I looked not at a general and public good more than my private. (Keayne, 16)

Keayne wants to have a house erected that will serve tradesmen. He couches his work in the language of "charity and mercy," which indicates that this edifice will serve the greater good. Charity and Mercy, after all, are not acts that are undertaken to serve the wealthy. Typical acts of charity give more directly to the poor, but Keayne sees his bequest of money for a market house as an act of Charity because it will ultimately benefit the people of Boston. His Apolgia is written long before the notion of "trickle down economics" is coined, yet Keayne's belief in a robust market benefiting non-traders bears a striking resemblance to this more recent conception. Keayne believes that his work, giving the funds necessary to erect this house, is truly going to be helpful to people of all kinds. In using the term "work" both for his efforts as well as for the

efforts undertaken to actually construct the market house, and providing an idea of equality between these notions of work, Keayne indicates that anything that is done to further the development of the market system is deserving of praise.

Keayne is most specifically interested and aware of how the market house will help those who are engaged with trade, however. He explains that “some particular persons that trade may have more benefit by it than some other persons that dwell further off,” admitting that the immediate benefit is indeed for the members of the commercial class more than the general population. His ideology of the benefit of commerce is laid out quite plainly in his assertion that “the advantage and profit of it will redound the whole town in general.” The underlying assumption in this part of the text is that the market is a force that benefits every person, even those who are not directly participating in its essential functioning. Adam Smith famously asserted that the “Invisible Hand” of the market serves to distribute goods and services where they are needed; Keayne believes his very physical and tangible marketplace will serve to facilitate the invisible hand. Through the assertion of the goodness of his work, Keayne reveals an ideology that assumes the function of the market is an adequate means of distributing wealth and reveals his own class bias.

As with other discourses on work in Puritan texts, the good work of Keayne’s gift is in part an attempt at unification. The market place is seen as a structure that will facilitate stronger community bonds. Valeri explains, “As a public moral gesture, Keayne’s gift conveyed mixed concepts of social exchange. The very plan of the structure evoked the humanist ideal that commerce should be an instrument for social cohesion.” (12) Through the work of strengthening commercial exchange, Valeri argues, Keayne sees himself as contributing to a more unified Boston.

Keayne acknowledges the destitution of the poor, but only in the course of providing yet another praise of the market system: its ability to generate wealth for charity. Even this selfless “good work” is used to complement his rhetoric establishing the legitimacy of the market as a means of doing good for the world. Keayne explains his actions as follows:

This stock I have gathered and from week to week laid apart by taking one penny out of every shilling which I have gotten my trade, with other goods and merchandise that I have dealt in. So that when I gained much in a week there hath been the more laid aside for any good use and when trading hath been dead and the gains less, there hath been the less laid aside for this stock and use. This course I have constantly kept above this 40 years. And I now mention this the more particularly not in any way of boasting for any good work that I have either done or can do [...] but that all that know it or may hear of it may take notice of the blessing of God upon such a free and voluntary course. (20)

The “good work” that Keayne has undertaken is saving a portion of each of his trades for the poor. His work, however, would not be possible without his participation in the market. The act of trading on the market is precisely what makes his “good work” possible. Further, he explains the direct correlation between how much good he is able to do and how well the market is performing when he writes, “when I gained much in a week there hath been the more laid aside for any good use.” Keayne is able to benefit the poor to the extent that the market allows him to perform his good works. He is a conduit for the beneficial force of the market.

As with all of the discussions of labor that this paper examines, Keayne’s rhetoric adopts a perspective on work that is more favorable to the upper class. What is unique about Keayne’s writing is his continual praise of the market. He praises the market’s ability to “do good,” and sees the market as able to help all people through its mere existence, as well as to allow philanthropists such as himself to acquire funds that can be given to the poor. The market is, for Keayne, a place where labor is converted to and from money, and he legitimizes the market by showing trading as a form of work. Even in discussing academic work, Keayne uses the term “profit” to mean both monetary gain and beneficial outcome. Through his mentions of work in

The Apologia, Keayne continually elevates the value and worth of the market system, and advances his own perspective as a merchant.

Cotton Mather

Cotton Mather's "Bonifacius" draws on ideas first seen within Bradford, Winthrop, and Keayne to call for the building of a utopia through while simultaneously offering justification for class division based on work. Mather's piece also calls for the creation of utopia through work that unites people, much like the "Modell" does. Bonifacius pushes further, though, as it not only suggests that work will generally bond people together, but that connecting with other people is actually a form of work. What is new, and perhaps most important in Mather, is that he sees the lack of good work as sinful, and therefore portrays those who do not work as causing evil to enter the world. This suggests that those who do not work hard enough, or do not have sufficient capacity to do good, are not helping enough, and thus deserve punishment in the form of inferior class status. More resoundingly than Winthrop, Bradford or Keayne, Mather's piece reflects the Puritan insistence on work to glorify God without cessation.

Mather's book urges people to connect with distant relatives and neighbors in order to push towards a more cohesive society. Bonifacius also extends the concept suggested in Bradford's text that work is a justification for wealth. Indeed, Mather suggests that building and extending a community that is free from evil depends upon good works, and that those who do not work allow the tyranny of evil to enter into the world and oppress people. It is for this reason that people who have more power to do good are therefore more fit to lead and occupy elevated

positions. Where Bradford merely suggests that people who do more work should be better rewarded, Mather shows that education and scholarly learning are the tools that allow certain people, such as doctors, teachers, and rulers, to do more good. Servants, by contrast, are limited in their education, and so must be content to glorify their masters. While he does not criticize the lower class per se, there is a definite emphasis on the power that the most educated and elite members of society possess to do good and comparatively faint praise of the manual labor and hard work that many members of the underclass are able to perform. In this regard he borrows from Keayne, who also has a definite focus on work in institutions of the elite, although Mather's perspective is not so heavily rooted in an interest in promoting the market. Instead, Mather's aim is to justify the position of the upper class by their ability to do good, and effectively criticize those who are unable to do as much good by the describing the forces of evil that threaten the world.

In order to better understand Mather's thoughts on labor, it is also important to understand the historical conditions in which he was writing. Unlike Bradford, Winthrop and Keayne, Mather was born and raised in Massachusetts, and was educated at Harvard. While other early American writers of the period see the possibility of utopia in virgin territory of the New World, Mather instead sees the possibility of utopia in the future through work, and in the spreading of the of community outside of the boundaries of Massachusetts through work. Mather also wrote at a time when the Puritan empire was declining; he oversaw the witch trials that are often marked as a turning point in the end of Puritan's influence. The call to spread community outward, then, can also be read as a cry of desperation to save a failing community.

Mather stresses the importance of creating community as the key to building a utopia. If

people work to “do good,” as the subtitle of the text suggests, then they will achieve a spreading of Christian ideas and values to other people and to the larger world. The introduction states,

But it will be no breach of Modesty, to be very Positive in asserting, That only Wisdom of Man, lies in Conversing with the Great GOD, and His Glorious CHRIST; and in Engaging as many others as we can, to joyn with us in this our Blessedness; thereby Promoting His Kingdom among the Children of Men; and in Studying to Do Good unto all about us; to be Blessings in our several Relations; to heal the Disorders, and help the Distresses of a Miserable World, as far as ever we can Extend our Influences. (v- vi)

People are charged with engaging, promoting, and studying, all with the ultimate goal to “Do Good” in the world. To the extent that this utopic vision can be realized, these good actions will heal and help the “Distresses” of the world. Working to relieve the issues of a “Miserable World,” allows people to create a more enlightened society. Growing from the small Puritan community to reach out into the world is a key part of this vision, too. The readers of the text must, as mentioned, engage “with as many others as we can” to enlarge the group of saints. Bonifacius charges that in order to achieve this utopic state, it will take a great deal of work, more work than any known Christian community has undertaken:

This is the FIRST PROPOSAL, to be made unto us; *To be Exceedingly Humbled, that we have done so Little Good in the World.* I am not *Uncharitable*, in saying; I know not that Assembly of Christians upon Earth, which ought not be a *Bochim*, in this consideration. Oh! Tell me, what *Utopia*, I shall find it in! (25)

According to the text, no group of Christians has cause to be satisfied with how much work they have done. Declaring that all known assemblies of Christians on earth ought to be “a *Bochim*” is a reference to Israelites offering sacrifices to God in the book of Judges, indicating that all Christian communities should be doing more good works to glorify God on Earth. The rhetorical imprecation, “Tell me, what *Utopia*, I shall find it in!” indicates both that such a community does not exist, as well as that a community of people who do a fitting amount of work is able to create a utopia. By working more than any known community has done, people will be able to build

utopic world in which Christianity is glorified properly. It is here that the reader first gleans a sense that Mather's praise of work is a double edge sword which also cuts sharply against lack of work. This section criticizes the lack of good work done in the world by saying people should be "humbled" because of it, and invokes the term *Bochim* to further chide people's negligence of their labor. However, what comes out most strongly in this passage Mather's call for "utopia," which echoes the sentiment that runs through much of *Bonifacius* and focuses on building a better world through good deeds.

Among the numerous good deeds that *Bonifacius* outlines, one of the most important is doing good in a way that improves the lives of neighbors and family, because this creates the conditions for a more fully cohesive society. Building local community is a form of work that is highly praised. Mather writes, "Let that man be Better than his Neighbour, who Labours to be a Better neighbor; to Do most Good unto his Neighbour." (73) Mather's text exalts those who do what they can to help their neighbors, because these people have done actual labor to improve local community. The text is quite explicit in impelling people form stronger local ties, too. It admonishes the reader to gather regularly with his neighbors, and explains,

Such a Meeting should Look upon themselves, as bound up in One *Bundle of Love*; and count themselves obliged, in very Close and Strong Bonds, to be Serviceable unto one another. If any one in the Society should fall into Affliction, all the rest should presently Study to Relieve and Support the Afflicted Person, in all the ways imaginable. (83)

The description highlights the way in which local community is a source of unity. People will be provided for because these communities must have such a fervent compulsion to take care of each other; if any person becomes sick, for example, the rest must do what they can to "Relieve and Support" her. Moreover, there is a great sense of giving implied by the idea that these communities should be bound up in "*One Bundle of Love*," indicating that these communities are to be underlain with a shared sense of compassion for all.

The call for reciprocal care and compassion extends beyond the neighborhood and to family as well, providing another group to be unified in a larger utopic community.

Our Natural Affection is to be improved into a Religious Intention. Sir, Take a Catalogue of all your more **Distant Relatives**. Consider them One after another; and make every one of them, the Subjects of your *Good Devices*. Think; *Wherein may I pursue the Good of such a Relative?* And, *By what means may I render such a Relative the better for me?* (72)

The language of work is interwoven with an implication of interdependency in this passage. The tasks laid out in this section include cataloguing all relatives, considering them, and making them the subject of good devices. The overall implication is that people must go beyond their neighborhood in performing good deeds; they must go even to the people to whom they are related but may not be close. There is a form of mutual benefit in reaching out, too, because it provides ties which unite and aid both parties: not only is the reader urged to “pursue the Good of such a Relative,” but the reader is also asked to think about making “such a Relative the better for me,” meaning that it is also important to consider how this relative may be helpful to the reader. Thus, work improves community when a person reaches out to her relatives because doing so both helps both the relative and said person care for each other. In issuing a call to strengthen community both in neighborhoods and between distant relatives, Bonifacius indicates the importance of community building work as key to the creation of utopia.

Just as work is highlighted continually in Bonifacius as a way to improve the world through the strengthening of community and through other manifestations of “good works,” actions that inhibit people from working are lambasted for allowing evil to enter the world. Impeding good works by being idle, or by discouraging those who do good works, is harshly criticized as destructive. The world is described as “evil” at several points in Bonifacius, so it makes sense that idleness would be seen as a detriment, allowing this evil to fester. But the

reader is told that it is worse than merely allowing evil to continue. Mather writes scathingly,

Some have Observed, That the most Concealed, and yet the most *Violent*, of all our Passions, usually is that of Idleness. It lays *Adamantine Chains* of Death and of Darkness upon us. It holds in *Chains* that cannot be shaken off, all our other, tho' never so Impetuous Inclinations. (x)

This impassioned rhetoric indicates that idleness is not merely a lack of doing good deeds, but is actually a choice that makes conditions in the world worse. Lack of industry is labeled as “*Violent*” because it creates such awful results, indicating how strongly Mather believes that it is necessary to always be working. It produces “Adamantine Chains of Death and of Darkness,” indicating that it binds people in ways that are terrible, incapacitating and even murderous. The broader implication of idleness being described in this fashion is that those who do not work enough, who are lazy or lethargic, are condoning the spread of evil. If people who do not work are culpable for the spread of evil, it also stands to reason that those who work less, or who have less capacity to do good, also have a stain of evil on their hands. This notion is somewhat diminished by the wording, “our Passions” which suggests this issue is universal.

Mather’s severe warnings against idleness are part of his goal of growing community and extending it outward as a way of glorifying God. As Weber points out of idleness,

For the saints' everlasting rest is in the next world; on earth man must, to be certain of his state of grace, "do the works of him who sent him, as long as it is yet day." Not leisure and enjoyment, but only activity serves to increase the glory of God, according to the definite manifestations of his will. (Weber, 15)

Weber’s argument is in service of understanding how the capitalism and Puritanism are linked, but it also demonstrates how seriously the Puritans took their duty of service to God. For Mather, to be idle is to prevent the kind of unification that allows the community of saints to grow and to expel the evil forces in the world. Those who do not work hard enough, then, are worthy of blame and suppression.

The text continues to define the forces that reduce productivity and stop good works from

being done as essentially evil, furthering the notion that those who are not industrious are responsible for bad deeds. It draws a link between the will of the devil and scorn towards those who do not work hard enough, marking anyone who makes fun of hard workers as bound up with the forces of darkness. Mather writes,

I wish I may prove a False Prophet, when I foretel you one Discouragement more, which you will have to conflict withal. **Derision** is what I mean. [...] No *Cruelties* are so Insupportable to Humanity, as Cruel Mockings. It is extremely probable, that the *Devil* being somewhat *Chained* up in several Places, from the other ways of *Persecution*, will more than ever apply himself to this.
(xiii)

The derision people who labor will likely face is a product of Satanic desires. This statement also implies that those who might be termed “slackers” today, who criticize hard work, are manifesting evil intentions in their actions. Just as the text mentions that neighborhoods may be filled with people who threaten to “debauch,” it also cautions that there is an evil element that threatens the continuation of good works. But idleness is not an irredeemable trait. Mather urges,

Be concerned, Lest the Deceitfulness of Sin undo any of the Neighbours. If there be any Idle Persons among them, I beseech you, cure them of their Idleness; Don't nourish 'em & Harden 'em in that; but find Employment for them. Find 'em Work; Set 'em to *Work*; Keep 'em to *Work*. (77)

Work in this instance provides a way for the reader's neighbors to be saved from sin and deceitfulness. Similarly, it is work for the reader to ensure that her neighbors are employed. The repetition of the phrase “work” without any specific indication of what kind of work is to be done demonstrates that what is most important for a person to be kept from sin is that she is doing something. Work therefore provides a way for a community to expel evil forces both outside and from within. It rids a community of evil, and it also creates cohesion. People working together are able to share a sense of unity that would not be possible in a state of unemployment. This usage again suggests that work is a means of fostering community.

Mather calls for neighbors to work together continually, but also warns that there are

some whom the reader must work to exclude so that a greater level of function may be achieved:

If there be any *Base Houses*, which threaten to debauch, and Poison, and confound the Neighbourhood, Let your Charity to your Neighbours, make you do all you can, for the suppression of them. (78)

Clearly, there is an element in society that is not worthy of inclusion. Such “base houses” may not be filled with the irredeemable, but the mention of these houses needing “suppression” shows that the community being built is not meant for all. The reader’s “Charity,” like the charity Winthrop suggests, is to suppress this element.

The text paints idleness and derision as forces that impede work from being done, thereby allowing and also increasing evil. Those who are do not work, or who deride hard workers, are seen as acting under devilish influence. Yet those who are idle are not irredeemable: they need to be set to work in order to escape from sin. Beneath the sense that people who do not work can be redeemed, though, is a darker idea. Those who continue not to do good work are agitating their communities, and those who do less work are less helpful in ridding the world of evil. These notions contribute to a larger sense within *Bonifacius* that the lower class, with its lessened ability to do good, is actually more culpable for the evil of the world.

Despite the theme of unity through work, which is constant throughout *Bonifacius*, there is a clear affirmation throughout the prescriptions given that there is a class hierarchy that makes work divisive, like the one Winthrop overtly asserts. Teachers, rulers, and doctors are all shown to have a great deal of power to do good compared to servants, who are seen as being like children. The text implies that because certain members of society have an immense capacity to do good, their class position is justified. It follows that while utopia is the goal of doing good, it is not an egalitarian utopia.

Mather's writing on servants praises them for their ability to good by glorifying their

masters. Their position as members of an underclass is fixed; they are not afforded an opportunity to occupy a different position in society based on their work. This is different from the view Bradford presents, which seems more favorable to allowing people to become wealthier if they are able to work more. The text tells servants, "You should Set your selves to *Devise*; *How shall I approve my self such a Servant, that the Lord may bless the House of my Master, the more for my being in it?*" (71) A servant must devote herself wholeheartedly to serving her master. The position of servants is further concretized in the text by Mather's advice to masters:

Methinks, common Principles of Gratitude should incline you, to Study the Happiness of those, by whose Obsequious Labours, your Lives are so much accommodated. Certainly, They would be the *Better Servants* to you, the more Faithful, the more Honest, the more Industrious, and Submissive *Servants* to you, for your bringing them into the Service of your *Common Lord*. (68)

The work of masters is to instill a stronger sense of Christianity in their servants. By doing so, they will benefit themselves, of course, but they will also help strengthen the Christian values Bonifacius promotes as a centerpiece of community. Contrary to a spirit of equality within community, however, the text asserts again that servants are to be "Submissive," indicating that these people are to retain a very definite, subservient position. Mather goes so far as to say that Masters should remember, "my Servants are in some sort my Children. In a Care, That they may want nothing that may be good for them, I would make them as my Children." (69) Not only is a certain class tasked with serving, their position in society is also justified in another way because they are infantilized. Servants have a limited ability to do good, and their work is to glorify the houses of their masters while accepting their underclass status.

Mather's promotion of servants remaining fully devoted to their masters helps to separate people by the goodness of their works, justifying class divisions, while maintaining an idea of unity in society. As Elizabeth Ceppi suggests, "To sustain [the idea of compulsory labor] Puritans had to paper over the apparent contradictions within Puritan ideologies of labor, which

at once valorized human labor and insisted upon the total depravity of all human activity.”

(Ceppi, 265) By separating people into different classes, Mather is able to suggest one group as elevated, and another as embodying the lowest and most uninspiring aspects of humanity. Yet because these two groups both doing good, he showcases the idea of unity through work as well.

This rhetoric stands in stark contrast to the lofty praise that is awarded to the abilities of teachers, rulers, and physicians. These people are praised for their advanced learning and their immense power to do good, suggesting that because of their greater ability to do good they have deserve a commensurate degree of status. Teachers, for example, are seen as having an immense capacity to work towards a larger utopia vision because they are able to craft the minds of their pupils. The text explains,

Tutors, Will you not look upon the Children under your Wing as committed unto you, by the Glorious LORD, with a charge of the Importance; Take them, and bring them up for me, and I will pay you your Wages! Every time any New Children come under your Tuition, why should you not think; Here, my Glorious Lord sends me another Object, on which I may do something, that He may be Served in the World! (107)

The ability of a teacher is tremendous. He can introduce ideas to his students that will in turn cause them to go in to the world and serve the lord accordingly. Each student is referred to as an "Object," indicating that pupils are as easily influenced by a teacher as an inanimate lump of clay might be. The teacher is told to "bring them up," and it is understood that this means that he is not only provide them with a role model and "book learning," but with spiritual awareness as well. The teacher's status is inherently justified because he has such power to labor for a better world. Further, the text subtly implies that the teacher's position as a man of learning means that he has an improved capacity for work. Rulers are even more explicitly shown to have a great ability to do good. The reader finds that,

The opportunities that **Rulers** have to Do Good, are so Evident, so Numerous, and they have so much *Power to Do Good*, that he who addresses them, cannot but be overwhelmed with some Confusion of Thought, where to Begin, or when to Conclude, or How to assign a fit Order unto them. (117)

Mather's conception of "rulers" is vague, and could be applied to kings as well as to rulers within the Massachusetts Bay Colony. If these rulers are within the Bay Colony, however, we can again assume that they were learned, again indicating a prizing of academic knowledge as an indicator of power. As Keayne suggests earlier, the value of an education is that it justifies a higher class status. Whoever these men are, their powers dwarf all others. They are such forces of pious work that they "overwhelm" any who speak to them. It is difficult to "assign a fit Order unto them," in that their powers are so great that it is not easy to rank them properly. Nonetheless, it is clear that these men are deserving of some higher rank than others. The text acknowledges that those who possess greater ability to do good as being able to also determine what they will be most useful in doing: "You are Persons of that Acumen, that you need not be told, *What!* You will soon discover Excellent Things and Ways, wherein *Good* may be done, if you will please to deliberate upon it." (128) This quotation, taken from Mather's advice to physicians, demonstrates that the wealthy and powerful are generally more trusted to their own devices, and that they are assumed to be knowledgeable about how they may best do good in the world. They need only to "deliberate" to determine what their task should be.

Bonifacius shows some work to be more valuable than others, particularly the work of the elite. Servants are praised for their ability to glorify their masters, while it is understood that they are like children and that they must remain members of an unchanging underclass. These servants do not have the power to do good that would justify a more elevated class position. Teachers, rulers and physicians all have elevated positions in society because they possess so much raw power to do good. Physicians and teachers are learned men by definition, and rulers generally are men of letters as well. Their education allows them the intelligence to determine

what good may be done, and to have a larger view of what work society needs to have undertaken. Work, again, provides a justification for class division, this time with education being seen as a key factor in a person's ability to do good.

Bonifacius presents a complex depiction of labor that praises those who do more good and criticizes those who labor less and are less productive. Much of the good that people must do comes in the form of building community, from strengthening neighborhoods to contacting distant relatives. These communal ties are to be strong enough that people will exist in symbiosis with each other; they will help and be helped. This growth of community is all part of the larger project of building a Christian utopia, which will spread outwards. It is important to do these good works because it is through this labor that the evil of the world is mitigated and perhaps abolished. Indeed by not doing anything, a person is actually allowing evil in the world to strengthen its hold; those who aim derision at hard workers are acting in the devil's interest. Servants, while not criticized as acting at Satan's behest, are still portrayed as deserving their subservient position in society compared to more productive professions, such as physicians. Community is praised in Bonifacius, but those who do the most for the community are worthy of the most praise, while those who do less are seen as deserving their lower class status or acting in a manner that is actually evil.

Conclusion

The notes of hope are so high in these texts that it is sad to see them dashed by division. Mather calls out for utopia most explicitly, but Winthrop suggests it as well in his idea of “a City on a Hill.” Keayne’s excitement comes from the market, with its ability to provide for all by the work done through it. Even Bradford’s descriptions, far more factual, hint at the possibility of a

united society in their praise of the unity that comes through work. A reader can glean the hope and promise that labor holds to build bonds that unite men in the New World. There is a possibility for something new to be built not just by people here, but between people as well. Through the act of labor, and as an act of labor, unity and cohesion are shimmering ideals.

And yet it seems that the possibility of greater social cohesion through work is threatened from the start, and by the time we reach Keayne it has become pronounced, and for Mather it is all but too late. Bradford illuminates for the reader a scene in which the division caused by work results in violence as men are whipped. There is a sense of honor in the way that work is asked to justify individual earnings, and in the way that work is divided so that those who work better are rewarded more. But the violence remains a haunting reminder of how powerful the division is between those who work enough to justify their earnings and those who do not. The problem continues with Winthrop, who calls on the wealthy people of the *Arabella* to work to suppress the poor with lending. He hopes that there can be a utopic society in the new world, but he is mindful of the work that has to be done, both loving and hateful, to make this society possible with the specter of class division. Keayne's Apologia focuses extensively on the market because he hopes that something about this new creation of social organization will ultimately allow for a solution to the deepening problems within the Massachusetts Bay Colony. He praises the work that the market can do to provide for all in hopes that it will be doing Winthrop's work of "Charity" on a mass scale, and continuing to suppress the poor. Keayne does more, though, to mask class inequalities by portraying the market as something that incorporates all types of labor, not noting that it benefits those who trade far more than those who do manual labor. Mather only hopes that the outward spread of community will save the waning Puritan nation, and urges his reader on through both praise of utopia and the necessity of doing good as well as

threats of a more evil world, and curses of idleness. His attempt to cast unity as a form of work is an attempt to reify a declining empire, and he adds still more to the problem of division by suggesting that those who work less, or have less ability to do good works, are deserving of lower status. The pull of division is a constant one and debilitating one as the Puritans' change from recent immigrants to permanent residents of New England.

The legacy of work that Americans unknowingly inherit from the Puritans is therefore a complex one. It embodies the possibilities of labor to unite a person with his or her fellow humans, and the hope that something larger and exemplary can be built from work. It contains the promise utopia and of social cohesion like a body's symbiosis. And it draws from the early reflection that the market system may offer new, bold solutions. Discouragingly, it also offers the individuality that can divide people, the elitism of class division and even the threat of violence. Work may even be a force to sustain class divisions, or to mask problems. Clearly, though, work is an immensely important part of the American landscape, even hundreds of years after the Puritan impetus to work constantly to glorify God has disappeared.

Bibliography:

Mather, Cotton. Bonifacius: Essays to Do Good. Gainesville: Scholars Facsimiles & Reprints, 1967. PDF. <http://archive.org/details/bonifaciussay00math>. Accessed 3/2/13.

Keayne, Robert. The Apologia of Robert Keayne: The Self Portrait of a Puritan Merchant. Ed. Bernard Bailyn. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Winthrop, John. "A Model of Christian Charity"
<http://religiousfreedom.lib.virginia.edu/sacred/charity.html>. Accessed 2/15/13.

Bradford, William. Bradford's History of Plymouth Plantation, 1606-1646. Ed. William T. Davis. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908. Online Text.
http://mith.umd.edu/eada/html/display.php?docs=bradford_history.xml. Accessed 2/10/13.

Anderson, Virginia. The Origins of New England Culture. William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 48, No. 2 (April, 1991) pp. 231-237

Bailyn, Bernard. "Puritan Social Ideals and the Dilemma of the New England Merchants." Tensions in American Puritanism. Ed. Richard Reinitz. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1970.

Ceppi, Elizabeth. Invisible Labor: Puritan Servitude and the Demonic Possession of Elizabeth Knapp. American Literature: 78.2, June 2006.

Gray, Stanley. The Political Thought of John Winthrop. The New England Quarterly, Volume 3, No. 4, Oct, 1930 pp 681 - 705

Johnson, Ellwood. The Pursuit of Power: Studies in the Vocabulary of Puritanism. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1995.

Valeri, Mark. Heavenly Merchandize: How Religion Shaped Commerce in Puritan America. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. California: BN Publishing, 2008.