

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

John Eliot in Recent Scholarship

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0nb2x39t>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 14(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Cogley, Richard W.

**Publication Date**

1990-03-01

**DOI**

10.17953

**Copyright Information**

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

## REVIEW ESSAY

### John Eliot in Recent Scholarship

RICHARD W. COGLEY

---

---

In 1643, John Eliot (1604-1690), the Roxbury, Massachusetts minister and millenarian better known as the "Apostle to the Indians," began to learn an Algonquian dialect in preparation for missionary work. After three years of study, he started to preach to the Indians in Massachusetts Bay, and he continued to work among them until the late 1680s, when his advanced age no longer permitted him to leave Roxbury. Over the course of these forty years he attracted some eleven hundred Indians, primarily members of the Massachusett and Nipmuck tribes, to the Christian religion; established fourteen reservations ("praying towns") for his converts; and produced for the Indians' use a number of Algonquian language works, including a translation of the Bible.

During the past twenty-five years, Eliot's missionary career has received considerable critical attention from historians, anthropologists, religionists, and literary critics. Since 1965, substantial portions of eighteen articles, chapters in nine books, and a biography have been devoted to him, and a modern critical edition of his *Indian Dialogues* has appeared,<sup>1</sup> as well as an anthology which generously represents him. Three major reasons for this multidisciplinary interest in Eliot can be identified. First, in the 1960s students of American Puritanism began to look for topics left unexamined by Perry Miller, whose interpretive agenda had

---

Richard W. Cogley is assistant professor of religious studies at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

dominated the field since the 1930s. Miller did not explore Puritan-Indian relations, and he rarely mentioned Eliot in his writings.<sup>2</sup> A second reason is the academic interest in American Indians and other neglected subjects of investigation that was inspired by the protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s and also by the *Annales* school of historiography. This interest has extended not only to the missions of Eliot and other Europeans, but also to trade, law, demography, land, military history, archeology, diplomacy, and other aspects of pre- and postcontact Indian life in early America.<sup>3</sup> A third reason is the growing scholarly concern with late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English Protestant (especially Puritan) millenarianism. No fewer than fourteen monographs devoted in whole or large part to the subject have appeared since 1969.<sup>4</sup>

This body of scholarship has established Eliot's importance in colonial New English history. Yet due in large part to Francis Jennings, whose interpretation appeared in the 1970s, the literature is not uniform in its assessment of him. Debated issues include the nature of Eliot's missionary motivation, the impact of his missions on the Indians, and the Indians' response to him. This review essay begins with an examination of the disagreements between Alden Vaughan and Jennings over both the evaluation of Eliot's missionary writings and traditional Indian culture; it then discusses James Axtell's recent ethnohistorical interpretation of the Apostle as well as scholarship on Eliot's millenarianism; and it concludes with a call for the incorporation of millenarianism into the ethnohistorical study of Eliot's missions and with examples of the bearing of millenarianism on his conduct toward the Indians.

### THE VAUGHAN-JENNINGS DEBATE

Recent Eliot scholarship began with the publication of Vaughan's *New England Frontier* (1965), an examination of Puritan-Indian relations. In contrast to the progressive historians, who were critical of the colonists' treatment of the Indians, Vaughan argued that the "New England Puritans followed a remarkably humane, considerate, and just policy in their dealings with the Indians."<sup>5</sup> Vaughan devoted the last one-third of his book to Puritan missionaries, and particularly to Eliot. This location was significant,

for in many ways he used the Apostle to represent the idealism of the Puritans' Indian policy at its best.

In 1971 Jennings published an article in reaction to Vaughan's discussion of Eliot. Finding little evidence of what he termed *altruism* and *benevolence* in Eliot, Jennings maintained that the missionary objective of the Apostle was to subjugate the Indians by destroying their culture, removing them from their lands, and making them subject to the General Court of Massachusetts Bay. "The mission was conceived as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself," he charged. Jennings then incorporated this article, in a slightly expanded form, into his own comprehensive study of Puritan-Indian relations, *The Invasion of America*. In broadening his topical range in the book, Jennings also broadened the range of his disagreements with Vaughan to include land, diplomacy, trade, and other matters. In sharp contrast to Vaughan's "humane, considerate, and just" policy, Jennings's overall evaluation was that the "tough and callous men commanding colonies regarded the natives as mere objects for their own enrichment and advantage."<sup>6</sup>

Vaughan and Jennings reached conclusions about Eliot so dissimilar as to suggest that they were writing about two Apostles, the one good and the other evil. For instance, in his index under Eliot's name, Vaughan listed items such as "concept of Christianizing . . . Indian Bible . . . interest in the Indian language . . . missionary work . . . writings of." Jennings, in turn, included such subentries as "fraudulent claims by . . . attacks Indian institutions . . . use of armed force by . . . repressive rule of . . . ill success of, documented . . . plants Sassamon as spy on Philip." The conflicting conclusions that Vaughan and Jennings reached about Eliot's missions, and about other aspects of Puritan-Indian relations, may be traced to their contrasting approaches to the Puritan documents and to Indian culture.

*The Puritan Documents*. Vaughan assumed that the sources were trustworthy. "The Puritans had no reason to conceal their attitudes or actions towards the Indians," he stated. Hence he took the Puritans at their word, and wrote his history accordingly. Jennings, however, insisted that the documents were unreliable. As he put it, "In the words of Alden T. Vaughan, 'the Puritans had no reason to conceal their attitudes or actions toward the Indians.' I have found plenty of reason." He explained that "persons or groups reaching for illicit power customarily assume attitudes of

great moral rectitude to divert attention from their abandonment of their own moral standards of behavior."<sup>7</sup> Thus Jennings was obliged to look beneath the documents in order to uncover the sordid agenda that the Puritans had concealed.

Eliot's contributions to the "Eliot tracts" provide an example. Between 1646 and 1670 the Apostle wrote a number of letters that were both progress reports about the missions and appeals for financial assistance from benefactors in England. These letters, along with materials from other persons involved in the missions, were published in London as the so-called "Eliot tracts." Vaughan took the letters at face value: Their accounts of the Indian work testified to Eliot's integrity. Jennings, however, claimed that Eliot's letters were intended to hoodwink unsuspecting Englishmen into funding the Indian work, to mask the nefarious program of subjugation that the missions pursued, and to silence criticism that had exposed these ugly realities.<sup>8</sup>

*Indian Culture.* Vaughan did not evaluate the Indians' contributions to seventeenth-century New England history. "I have concentrated on the acts and attitudes of the Puritans toward the Indians and have not, for the most part, attempted to account for the actions and reactions of the natives," he said. His virtual exclusion of the Indians as subjects was not an instance of the topical delimitation that scholars often make with their material. Rather, it was a consequence of his characterization of the two cultures and of the nature of their interaction:

One [Puritan culture] was unified, visionary, disciplined, and dynamic. The other was divided, self-satisfied, undisciplined, and static. It would be unreasonable to expect that such societies could live side by side indefinitely with no penetration of the more fragmented and passive by the more consolidated and active. What resulted, then, was not—as many have held—a clash of dissimilar ways of life, but rather the expansion of one into the areas in which the other was lacking.<sup>9</sup>

In contrast, Jennings used an approach known as "ethnohistory." Ethnohistory is an ambitious discipline that presumes expertise in the methods of history and ethnology and (in the case at hand) a knowledge of Puritan and Algonquian culture. According to Jennings its primary objective is to study the mutual acculturation that occurs when cultures meet.<sup>10</sup> The immediate

significance of the ethnohistorical approach is that it credits the Indians with what is often termed "cultural integrity," which is to say that the natives had traditional systems of law, religion, medicine, commerce, government, and morality that were as coherent, and as meaningful, as those of the Puritans. For the Puritans, Indian culture lacked integrity. It was "heathen," "savage," "barbarian," antithetical in every way to "civilization." Jennings argued that Vaughan's characterization of the two cultures was a polite restatement of the Puritans' "civilization/savagery" distinction, and that this invidious characterization then led him to interpret Puritan-Indian relations from the Puritan point of view and not from the double-sided perspective of ethnohistory.<sup>11</sup>

Eliot's "praying towns" illustrate the second point of contrast. After he convinced Indians sympathetic to Christianity to move into one of these reservations, Eliot set about replacing traditional native dress, laws, work habits, domestic relations, morality, government, and so forth with Puritan counterparts. All the while this "civilizing" process was taking place, he continued to instruct the Indians in Christianity in preparation for their communion in a church of "visible saints." In keeping with his characterization of native culture, Vaughan saw the "praying Indians" as the tractable recipients of an active and advantageous "Christian civilization"; and then in accordance with his assumptions about Eliot's writings, he interpreted the Apostle's actions in this regard as the idealistic use of "Christian civilization" to raise the Indians above their "benighted" condition. Jennings, on the other hand, underscored the baneful consequences of Eliot's missionary program for the Indians. In coming under the regimen of the praying towns, the converts surrendered most of their lands, saw much of their traditional culture destroyed, and lost their political and legal autonomy. Jennings's own assumptions about Eliot's writings then prompted him to charge that the natives lost their land, their culture, and their autonomy because the Apostle had sought these unseemly ends all along. Thus the subjugation of the Indians, and not their elevation through "Christian civilization," was Eliot's actual goal.<sup>12</sup>

Jennings soon established hegemony over Vaughan on the second methodological point of contrast, the perspective on Indian culture. Within a few years of the appearance of "Goals and Functions of Puritan Missions," two other scholars published

ethnohistorical studies of Eliot. One of these ethnohistorians was Kenneth Morrison, who investigated the discrepancies, particularly in dress, sex roles, and social ethics, between traditional Indian culture and the version of Puritan culture that Eliot introduced in the praying towns. The other was Neal Salisbury, whose interpretation of Eliot was more wide-ranging than Morrison's and also was more indebted to Jennings's article. Like Jennings, Salisbury argued that the missions were successful only among Indians previously devastated by epidemic disease and victimized by Puritan aggression; that Eliot "advance[d] the cultural values and . . . the political goals of the white conquerors"; that Indians converted to Christianity because they saw in the praying towns the only available refuge from Puritan expansion and because in their debilitated condition they were powerless to resist Eliot's intrusions into their culture; that Eliot forced the Christian Indians to "renounce their entire ethnic and cultural past" and to "adopt a new identity created for them by . . . an entirely foreign culture"; that Indian conversions were often superficial because of the constraining circumstances under which they occurred and because of the alien and intellectually demanding nature of the culture that Eliot imposed; and that the missions were a failure because most praying Indians were never baptized or permitted to receive communion.<sup>13</sup>

By 1979 Vaughan had become convinced of the value of ethnohistory in the interpretation of European and Indian interaction in colonial North America, and in 1980 he co-authored a broadly based essay that utilized the approach. But like several reviewers of *The Invasion of America*, he was not persuaded that Jennings had employed the ethnohistorical method properly. Vaughan argued that despite his professed commitment to a dual-cultural perspective, Jennings had written an "essentially European-focused account," misrepresented the colonists' Indian policies because of his "anti-Puritan bias" and "frequent misreading of the evidence," and presented a "comparably uncritical assessment of Indian society." Nevertheless, Vaughan conceded that *New England Frontier* had "magnified—unintentionally but persistently—the Puritans' benign aims and mitigated their less admirable accomplishments," and he acknowledged that Eliot was "destructive of Indian culture" and that his missions "undermined tribal leadership, reduced tribal strength, and cut ties of kinship." Yet he otherwise defended his original interpretation

of Eliot's "motives and methods," and he insisted that the Apostle did not regard the Indian work as a "quasi-militaristic arm of Puritan aggression."<sup>14</sup>

### AXTELL'S CONTRIBUTION TO ELIOT SCHOLARSHIP

James Axtell's recent work represents the first major ethnohistorical interpretation of Eliot since the studies of Jennings, Morrison, and Salisbury appeared in the early to mid-1970s. Axtell agrees with the earlier ethnohistorians that Eliot's missions were successful only among tribes already debilitated by Puritan imperialism and by epidemic disease; that the missions operated to the political and economic advantage of Massachusetts Bay; and that they destroyed much of traditional Indian culture. Yet he also maintains that his predecessors wrongly assumed that the missionary program entailed a repudiation of Indian identity; that they inadequately evaluated Eliot's character; and that they underestimated the Indians' attraction to Christianity, the success of the missions, the courage of the praying Indians, and the integrity of their conversions to Christianity.<sup>15</sup>

Axtell argues that the cultural and political devastation that preceded and accompanied Eliot's missions "presented the natives with a wholly new set of . . . problems and imperatives." Eliot offered the Indians a "better—comparatively better—answer to . . . urgent social and religious questions" than could their decimated traditional culture and their weakened leadership. The Indians' acceptance of "Christian civilization" provided them with more persuasive explanations of disease, death, iniquity, human destiny, the workings of history, and the processes of nature; at that same time, it also enabled them to "preserve their ethnic identity as particular Indian groups on familiar pieces of land that carried their inner history." Under the circumstances, the Indians' attraction to Eliot's program was more an act of affirmation than a betrayal of their heritage:

It would be easy—and foolish—to lament this particular revitalizing break with their pre-Columbian past as a tragic loss of innocence for the Indians. It was indeed a loss for them, but not necessarily a tragic one. Only if we continue to see the precontact Indian as the only



real Indian, as the "noble savage" in other words, can we mourn his loss of innocence. Only if we persist in equating courage with mortal resistance to the forces of change can we condemn the praying Indians as cultural cop-outs or moral cowards.

"For life is preferable to death," he concludes, "and those who bend to live are also possessed of courage, the courage to change and live in the face of overwhelming odds as well as the contempt of their brothers who died with stiff necks."<sup>16</sup>

Axtell insists that an appreciation of the intellectual and social appeal of "Christian civilization" for the Indians leads to a better ethnohistorical evaluation of the effectiveness of the missions. He argues that the proper criterion for measuring missionary success is not the number of baptized and communicant Indians, but rather the sum total of persons resident in the old praying towns. Regardless of their ecclesiastical status, these Indians (primarily Massachusetts) managed to survive as a group instead of "splintering off into vulnerable fragments or resorting to arms in a futile effort to stem the colonial tide." The enduring attraction of the Massachusetts Indians to Eliot's program, moreover, suggests that their conversions were meaningful for them. The presence of "distinctively Indian elements" in the extant confessions of faith, the elevated standards for baptism and communion in the Indian churches, and the theological learning and missionary commitment of native preachers also indicate the integrity of Indian conversions to Christianity.<sup>17</sup>

Like his interpretations of other aspects of European-Indian relations, Axtell's discussion of Eliot's missions illustrates his conviction that the ethnohistorical method must "ensure that each culture is treated with equal empathy, rigor, and discernment." He claims that the earlier ethnohistorians, especially Jennings and Salisbury, were willing to "bend over backwards for the natives without performing the same gyration" for Eliot. Their explanation of Eliot's motivation served to "reduc[e] religion, in the manner of cultural materialists, to a mere epiphenomenon of socio-economic realities." For Axtell the Apostle was an idealistic though domineering missionary whose "goals were . . . [not] tainted by a barely hidden political agenda." He argues that Eliot's missionary practice is best understood within the framework of Puritanism. Eliot's authoritarian discipline, educational

program, intolerance of syncretism, perceptions of the Indians' alleged cultural deficiencies, and assurance about the rectitude of his views were products of the Puritan tradition he zealously championed.<sup>18</sup>

### ELIOT'S MILLENARIANISM

In the meantime, a shift in Eliot scholarship had come about through the recognition of the significance of millenarianism in the interpretation of his missionary career. The first persons to argue that millenarianism pervaded Eliot's Indian program were Sidney Rooy (1965) and James deJong (1970), who included lengthy discussions of the Apostle in their histories of Puritan missions, and James Maclear, who in 1974 published an essay on Eliot and several other early American Puritan millenarians. In the 1980s other scholars offered interpretations that were superior to Maclear's in length and to Rooy's and deJong's in critical insight: Timothy Sehr published an overview of Eliot's millenarianism that extended the discussion beyond the 1640s and 1650s, the period on which the three earlier scholars had focused; James Holstun located Eliot's millenarianism within a certain English Protestant utopian tradition; Theodore Dwight Bozeman placed the Apostle's millenarianism in the context of Puritan primitivism; and Richard Cogley authored essays on Eliot's thinking about the origins of the American Indians and about the millennium.<sup>19</sup>

In combined effect, these studies show that Eliot began his missionary preaching in 1646 in order to proselytize Indians and to settle them into a congregational church of "visible saints." Like other Puritan millenarians, he believed that the Indians' acceptance of Christianity contributed to "latter-day" conversion of non-Christian peoples.<sup>20</sup> In 1649 the execution of King Charles I of England transformed Eliot from a moderate millenarian with a conventional evangelical and ecclesiastical agenda into a politically radical one. He saw the regicide as a sign from God that the millennial order included a non-monarchical form of political organization, and he began to anticipate the destruction of the nearly universal dominion of kings. He understood the coming millennial civil polity as the restoration of a primitive scriptural institution, the system of rulers of tens, fifties, hundreds, and

thousands found in Exodus 18. In 1651 Eliot established this polity, up through a ruler of one hundred, in the praying town at Natick, and in 1652 he designed a millennial blueprint for England, *The Christian Commonwealth: The Civil Polity of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ* (London, 1659), and dispatched it to London for publication. *The Christian Commonwealth*, however, was not published until 1659, and it was never adopted in England.<sup>21</sup>

The literature also indicates that the restoration of the House of Stuart in 1660 brought an end to Eliot's radical millenarianism. In 1661 he publicly recanted the antimonarchical passages in *The Christian Commonwealth*. Thereafter he adopted a positive attitude toward the institution of monarchy, and he even assigned to the British Crown the primary responsibility for installing in England his version of the millennial ecclesiastical polity, *The Communion of Churches* (Cambridge, 1665). Eliot was unable to establish the millennial church order among the Indians because he lacked a sufficient number of congregations. Nevertheless, he continued to assume that the Indians' conversions contributed to the latter-day harvest of souls, and he also began to locate the natives' educational progress within the framework of an end-time "advancement of learning." Eliot's commitment to a millenarian interpretation of history was diminished but not destroyed by King Philip's War (1675-76), the loss of the Massachusetts charter (1684), and other events that transpired over the final portion of his life.<sup>22</sup>

This body of scholarship represents a new perspective on Eliot. Vaughan, Jennings, Salisbury, and Axtell did not investigate millenarianism in their studies of Eliot's missionary career. The work on millenarianism nevertheless is not a problem for the interpretations of Vaughan and Axtell, for it gives greater substance to the idealism they attributed to the Apostle. Yet, at the same time, this work directly challenges the evaluations offered by Jennings and Salisbury, for as we shall now see, Eliot's conduct towards the Indians becomes more intelligible within the millenarian framework presented in his writings.<sup>23</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The critical scholarship that developed after the publication of Vaughan's *New England Frontier* has established the importance

of millenarianism in the interpretation of Eliot's writings as well as the value of ethnohistory in the analysis of his missions. Yet the intellectual historians and literary critics who write about his millenarianism do not have ethnohistorical interests, and Axtell, the best representative of the ethnohistorical approach to Eliot's missions, has not incorporated the scholarship on millenarianism into his work.

The integration of millenarianism into the ethnohistorical study of the missions can illuminate many aspects of Eliot's behavior. One example is his conduct toward the sachems (chiefs), whom he considered the Indian counterparts to European monarchs. The politically radical millenarianism that Eliot espoused following the regicide (1649) predisposed him to acts of aggression against the sachems: He elevated subordinate Indians to positions of political authority, encouraged tribesmen to withhold tribute and other symbols of allegiance from the sachems, and perhaps threatened sachems with violence. These actions reflected his conviction that monarchical government was doomed to latter-day destruction to make way for the millennial civil polity. The subsequent restoration of the House of Stuart in 1660 obliged Eliot to revise his judgment about the institution of monarchy. He then began to explain to unconverted sachems that acceptance of Christianity no longer destroyed their political authority, and also to encourage the Puritan leaders to respect the sachems' traditional prerogatives.<sup>24</sup>

A second illustration is Eliot's rationale for "civilizing" the Indians in the praying towns. Throughout his long missionary career, he remained convinced that his Indian work contributed to the end-time conversion of non-Christian peoples. Like other Puritans, Eliot assumed that converting (efficacious) grace was a gift from God. But while the unregenerate could not receive grace until God chose to grant it, they could prepare for its advent through a series of antecedent steps: attendance at sermons, assent to orthodox theological doctrine, observance of the Sabbath, frequent prayer, and godly behavior. For Eliot, the Indians' preparation for grace also had to include growth in "civility," a step that unconverted Puritans could take for granted. Thus, when viewed within the context of Eliot's millenarian commitment to latter-day conversion, the rigid program of "civilizing" the Indians becomes part of their preparation for efficacious grace.<sup>25</sup>

A third example is Eliot's relationship with the magistrates of

the Massachusetts General Court and the commissioners of the United Colonies. The existing ethnohistorical literature has showed that Eliot's missions worked to the material benefit of these powerful men. Yet Eliot's millenarian agenda did not always correspond with the Indian policies of the magistrates and the commissioners. His disagreements with them about the continuation of a mission to the Narragansett Indians in Rhode Island, and also about the prosecution of King Philip's War, are cases in point.<sup>26</sup>

Yet we must emphasize that there is a limit to the exculpatory power of millenarianism. As Robert Berkhofer has observed, "what historians label 'good' and 'bad' motives or policies all too often produced like results for Native Americans."<sup>27</sup> The marriage of millenarianism and ethnohistory in future Eliot scholarship will not alter the fact that the Apostle contributed to the destruction of coastal Algonquian culture and to the aggrandizement of Puritan power in New England. Jennings was the first contemporary scholar to insist on recognition of this fact, even though he misconstrued Eliot's motivation. A similar insistence must remain central in Eliot scholarship.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to thank Susannah Heschel for her contributions to this essay.

#### NOTES

1. The articles are James Axtell, "The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America," in *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America*, ed. James Axtell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 39-86; Axtell, "Some Thoughts on the Ethnohistory of Missions," *Ethnohistory* 29 (1982): 35-41, reprinted in *After Columbus: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America*, ed. James Axtell (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 47-57; Axtell, "Were Indian Conversions *Bona Fide*?" in *After Columbus*, 100-121; Elise M. Brenner, "To Pray or To Be Prey: That Is the Question: Strategies for Cultural Autonomy of Massachusetts Praying Town Indians," *Ethnohistory* 27 (1980): 135-52; Richard W. Cogley, "John Eliot and the Origins of the American Indians," *Early American Literature* 21 (1986/87): 210-25; Cogley, "John Eliot and the Millennium," *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation*, forthcoming; James Holstun, "John Eliot's Empirical Millenarianism," *Representations* 4 (1983): 128-53; Francis Jennings,

"Goals and Functions of Puritan Missions to the Indians," *Ethnohistory* 18 (1971): 197-212; Susan L. MacCullough, "A Tripartite Political System among the Christian Indians of Early Massachusetts," *Kroeber Anthropology Society Papers* 34 (1966): 63-73; James F. Maclear, "New England and the Fifth Monarchy: The Quest for the Millennium in Early American Puritanism," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 32 (1975): 223-60; Kenneth M. Morrison, "'That Art of Coyning Christians': John Eliot and the Praying Indians of Massachusetts," *Ethnohistory* 21 (1974): 77-92; Robert James Naeher, "Dialogue in the Wilderness: John Eliot and the Indian Exploration of Puritanism as a Source of Meaning, Comfort, and Ethnic Survival," *The New England Quarterly* 62 (1989): 346-68; Philip Ranlet, "Another Look at the Causes of King Philip's War," *The New England Quarterly* 61 (1988): 79-100; James P. Ronda, "'We Are Well as We Are': An Indian Critique of Seventeenth-Century Christian Missions," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 34 (1977): 66-82; Neal Salisbury, "Prospero in New England: The Puritan Missionary as Colonist," in *Papers of the Sixth Algonquian Conference, 1974*, ed. William Cowan (Ottawa: National Museum of Man, 1974), 253-73; Salisbury, "Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 31 (1975): 27-54; Timothy J. Sehr, "John Eliot, Millennialist and Missionary," *The Historian* 46 (1984): 187-203; and Norman Earl Tanis, "Education in John Eliot's Indian Utopias, 1646-1675," *The History of Education Quarterly* 10 (1970): 308-323.

The books are Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 131-241, 271-286 passim; Henry Warner Bowden, *American Indians and Christian Missions: Studies in Cultural Conflict* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 96-133; Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 263-86; Holstun, *A Rational Millennium: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 102-165, 208-216; Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975; New York: Norton, 1976), 228-53; James A. deJong, *As the Waters Cover the Seas: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions, 1640-1810* (Kampen, Netherlands: J. H. Kok, 1970), 34-78; Sidney H. Rooy, *The Theology of Missions in the Christian Tradition* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1965), 156-241; Margaret Connell Szasz, *Indian Education in the American Colonies, 1607-1783* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988), 101-129; and Alden T. Vaughan, *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1965; New York: Norton, 1979), 235-308 passim.

Ola Elizabeth Winslow, *John Eliot: "Apostle to the Indians"* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968); Bowden and Ronda, eds., *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues: A Study in Cultural Interaction* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1980); and Charles M. Segal and David C. Stineback, eds., *Puritans, Indians, and Manifest Destiny* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1977).

2. Miller confined his discussion to Eliot's orthodox thinking about Ramist logic and church polity. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1939; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954; Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), 114, 120, 140, 420, 449, 452. On many other matters, Eliot's

opinions were heterodox and for this reason were of little interest to Miller. See Philip F. Gura, *A Glimpse of Zion's Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620-1660* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1984), 5-7, 135-37.

3. For the bearing of the protest movements on the study of American Indians, see J. Frederick Fausz, "The Invasion of Virginia: Indians, Colonialism, and the Conquest of Cant," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 95 (1987): 136f; for the impact of the *Annales* school, see Raymond D. Fogelson, "The Ethnohistory of Events and Non-Events," *Ethnohistory* 36 (1989): 133-47.

General discussions of recent literature about Indians in colonial North America may be found in Axtell, "The Ethnohistory of Early America: A Review Essay," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 35 (1978): 110-44; Fausz, "The Invasion of Virginia," 133-56; James H. Merrell, "Some Thoughts on Colonial Historians and the American Indians," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 46 (1989): 94-119; H. C. Porter, "Reflections on the Ethnohistory of Early America," *American Studies* 16 (1982): 243-54; Bernard Sheehan, "Indian-White Relations in Early America," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 26 (1969): 267-86; Stineback, "The Status of Puritan-Indian Relations," *The New England Quarterly* 51 (1978): 80-90; and Bruce G. Trigger, "American Archaeology as Native History," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 40 (1983): 413-452. For a recent discussion of Indian population in northeastern America, see Henry F. Dobyns, Dean R. Snow, Kim M. Lanphear, and David Henige, "Commentary on Native American Demography," *Ethnohistory* 36 (1989): 285-307.

4. The literature on Puritan millenarianism is discussed by Cogley, "Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism," *Religion* 17 (1987): 379-96.

5. Vaughan, *New England Frontier*, xlix.

6. Jennings, "Goals and Functions," 207, and *Invasion of America*, 53.

7. Vaughan, *New England Frontier*, xlix; Jennings, *Invasion of America*, 180, viii.

8. Vaughan, *New England Frontier*, 254f; Jennings, *Invasion of America*, 236-39. Many of the "Eliot tracts" are printed in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections* 3rd ser. 4 (1834).

9. Vaughan, *New England Frontier*, xlix, 323.

10. Jennings, *Invasion of America*, 13f, and "A Growing Partnership: Historians, Anthropologists, and American Indian History," *Ethnohistory* 29 (1982): 21-34. There is no agreement about the meaning of the term *ethnohistory*. For alternative definitions, see Axtell, "The Ethnohistory of Early America," 113-120; Trigger, "Ethnohistory: Problems and Prospects," *Ethnohistory* 29 (1982): 1-19; Trigger, "Ethnohistory: The Unfinished Edifice," *Ethnohistory* 33 (1986): 253-67; Merrell, "Some Thoughts," 114-16; and Merrell, "High Priests and Missionaries," *Reviews in American History* 17 (1989): 180f.

11. Jennings, *Invasion of America*, 11-14, 145. The integrity of traditional Indian culture is not an issue in the debate about the meaning of *ethnohistory*.

12. Vaughan, *New England Frontier*, 260-62, 323, 326; Jennings, *Invasion of America*, 248f, 251-53.

13. Morrison, "That Art of Coyning Christians," 81-87. The quotations from Salisbury are found in "Red Puritans," 28, 47, and "Prospero in New England," 260. Salisbury later published a highly regarded ethnohistorical study of coastal Algonquian culture, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and*

*the Making of New England, 1500-1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982). In this book he is not concerned with Eliot, who did not begin his Indian language studies until 1643.

14. For Vaughan's endorsement of ethnohistory, see *New England Frontier, "Introduction to the Norton Edition"* (1979), xliii-xlv; and for his use of the method, see Vaughan and Daniel K. Richter, "Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 90 (1980): 23-99. Vaughan did not credit Jennings, but rather Cornelius Jaenan, Calvin Martin, Axtell, Trigger and others, for convincing him of the value of ethnohistory. See "Introduction to the Norton Edition," xxvi, xlv-xlv. The quotations are found in *ibid.*, vi, viii, xi, xxx, xxxi, and in his review of Jennings, *The Invasion of America*, in *The Western Historical Quarterly* 7 (1976): 422.

For reviewers who questioned Jennings's command of the ethnohistorical method, see Axtell, "The Ethnohistory of Early America," 133-36; Dena Dincauze, *American Anthropologist* 79 (1977): 150f; Nancy Oestreich Lurie, *Reviews in American History* 4 (1976): 365-71; Ronda, *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 7:2 (1979): 88-94; and Sheehan, *The Journal of American History* 63 (1976-77): 378f. With the exception of Sheehan, none of these reviewers was as skeptical as Vaughan about Jennings's use of the method. For strongly positive reviews of *The Invasion of America*, see Salisbury, *The New England Quarterly* 49 (1976): 158-61, and William C. Sturtevant, *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser. 34 (1977): 312-314.

15. Axtell's major discussions of Eliot are included in note 1. *The Invasion Within* is the first in a three-volume narrative history of French, British, and Indian interaction in colonial North America. The anticipated publication of the remaining installments, tentatively entitled *American Encounter: The Confluence of Cultures in Colonial North America* and *The European Presence: The Conflict of Cultures in Colonial North America*, ensures that Eliot's missions, as well as other aspects of European-Indian relations, will remain exciting subjects for study.

16. Axtell, "Some Thoughts," in *After Columbus*, 47-57; "Were Indian Conversions *Bona Fide*?" 120f; and *The Invasion Within*, 219-34, 275f, 284-86, 332f. The quotations are found in "Some Thoughts," 53, 49, 51, 52.

17. Axtell, "Some Thoughts," 49-52, 55; "Were Indian Conversions *Bona Fide*?" 101f, 108, 111-16, 120f; and *The Invasion Within*, 280-86. The quotation is in "Some Thoughts," 55. Axtell does not evaluate the effectiveness of Eliot's mission to the Nipmuck Indians, whose exposure to Christianity proved short-lived. He also observes that approximately 40 percent of the Massachusetts Indians were baptized or communicant church members, and that this percentage is equivalent to that found in contemporary Puritan congregations.

While helpful, Naeher's recent analysis of the Massachusetts confessions of faith fails to include the two "Eliot tracts" most relevant for this purpose, *A Further Account of the Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England* (London, 1659), and *A Further Account of the Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England* (London, 1660). See Naeher, "Dialogue in the Wilderness."

18. Axtell, "Ethnohistory: An Historian's Viewpoint," in *The European and the Indian*, 15; "Some Thoughts," 49; and "Were Indian Conversions *Bona Fide*?" 101, 118.



19. Rooy, *The Theology of Missions*, 201–208, 224–35; deJong, *As the Waters Cover the Seas*, 67–73; Maclear, “New England and the Fifth Monarchy,” 243–48, 253–55, 257f; Holstun, *A Rational Millennium*, 18–33, 120–131; and Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 11f, 151–236 passim. The Sehr and Cogley citations are given in note 1.

20. Cogley, “John Eliot and the Origins of the Indians,” 210–12. Recent scholarship has overestimated Eliot’s commitment to the “Lost Tribes of Israel” theory of the Indians’ origins. For most of his life, he believed that the Indians were a gentile people. See “John Eliot,” 216–22.

21. Eliot’s radical millenarianism is discussed by Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 271–75; Cogley, “John Eliot and the Millennium”; Holstun, *A Rational Millennium*, 115–20, 145–58; Maclear, “New England and the Fifth Monarchy,” 247f, 253–55; and Sehr, 193–95. The *Christian Commonwealth* may be found in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections* 3rd ser. 9 (1846): 127–64.

22. For Eliot’s millenarianism after the Restoration, see Cogley, “John Eliot and the Millennium”; Holstun, *A Rational Millennium*, 158–65; and Sehr, “John Eliot,” 196–203. *The Communion of Churches* is in *Evan’s Collection of Early American Imprints*. Like *The Christian Commonwealth*, it was never established in England.

23. Morrison also did not evaluate Eliot’s millenarianism, and Vaughan did not incorporate a discussion of it into the introduction to the Norton edition of *New England Frontier*.

24. Jennings was the first recent scholar to call attention to Eliot’s acts of aggression against the sachems. See *Invasion of America*, 235, 239–42, 248. For examples of Eliot’s later respect for the office of sachem, see Daniel Gookin, *The Historical Collections of the Indians in New England* (1674), in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections* 1st ser. 1 (1794): 191f; Bowden and Ronda, eds., *John Eliot’s Indian Dialogues*, 59f, 120–28; and “The Petition of John Eliot, Aug. 13, 1675,” in *The Records of the Colony of New Plymouth*, ed. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff and David Pulsifer (Boston, 1855–61), 10: 451–53.

25. Cogley, “John Eliot and the Origins of the Indians,” 213f; and Holstun, *A Rational Millennium*, 117f, 156f. The Indians were ineligible for communion until they had made sufficient progress in their religious and cultural preparation for grace. This point has been misunderstood by Salisbury: “Puritan missionaries first directed their efforts at detaching the Indians from their ‘savage’ culture and initiating them to the ways of ‘civilization’ before introducing them to Christianity. In the words of John Eliot . . . , they must ‘have visible civility before they can rightly enjoy . . . ecclesiastical communion.’” See “Red Puritans,” 28. “Ecclesiastical communion,” which Salisbury equates with the “introduction of Christianity,” presupposed considerable religious instruction.

26. See Eliot to William Steele, 8 October 1652, in *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 36 (1882): 294f; and “The Petition of John Eliot.”

27. Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 114.