

of people in every possible way. The old customs of courts and councils he thought common law, and nothing that they authorized was wrong. So he favored the establishment of English liberty and law without a sovereign here, and with the unadulterated Protestant religion and church of Christ. Now that was a great advance, so much so that he could not live in England and practice his principles. To give up our New England to be inhabited and governed by all sorts of sectaries and heretics was as bad, he considered, as to give it over to Satan—indeed about the same thing. People all believed in a ramping, roaring, hell-fire Devil in those days. Nobody but Atheists could doubt that. Our fathers thought it their chief business to keep themselves and their government out of Satan's hands. No wonder the wise ones rejected heretics, who were the spies and emissaries of Satan surely, unless their whole system of religion was false and the Bible too. This was their view of it.

Some found fault with Gov. D's hatred of heresy. Sir Richard Saltonstall was one. But I fear he had a little leaven of the cavalier in his blood. He was not quite up to the highest standard of New England Puritanism. His Knighthood was not puritanic. But that was all the fault there was in him perhaps. We have a letter of his addressed to the Revs. John Cotton and John Wilson of Boston, in which he refers to Gov. Dudley as follows :

“When I was in Holland about the beginning of the wars, I remember some Christians there that then had serious thoughts of planting in New England, and desired me to write to the Governor thereof, if those who differ from you in opinion, yet holding the same foundation in religion, as Anabaptists, Seekers, Antinomians and the like, might be permitted to live among you ; to which I received the short answer from your then Governor, Mr. Dudley : ‘God forbid,’ said he, ‘our love for the truth should be grown so cold that we should tolerate errors.’ And when (for satisfaction of myself and others) I desired to know your grounds, he referred me to books written here between the Presbyterians and Independents, which, if that had been sufficient, I need not have sent so far to understand the reasons of your practice. I hope you do not assume to yourselves infallibility of judgment,” &c.

So we are struck with the thought, that it is never best to have too much religion, even Puritanism. Charles the Second, with all his looseness of morals, was better to live under than the more strict James, or Charles the First.

The sectaries got terribly handled and mauled. I have heard that church-mauling is still practiced here on a small scale. It amazes