Seth Harden is currently a graduate student at the University of Memphis in the English Department. He graduated with his Bachelor of Arts in History in August of 2015. By completing this paper and several honors courses, Seth graduated *magna cum laude* and as an Undergraduate Research Scholar. This paper will also be given at the National Conference on Undergraduate Research at the University of North Carolina, Asheville in April 2016. He hopes to finish his Masters of Arts in English Literature, teach at a community college, and eventually complete his doctoral degree. Even more so, Seth is ready to start his life with his best friend and future wife, Abbigail.

Seth Harden

"A New Found Golgotha": Puritan Perspectives On Violence In Native American New England, 1630-1704

Faculty Sponsor
Dr. Christine Eisel

Abstract

Seventeenth-Century colonial America was an incredibly violent place. When English settlers came to the New World, hostilities occurred between them and Native American groups as they all sought to control land and resources. Puritans came out of what Susan Juster calls "The apex of human savagery": specifically, the religious wars of seventeenth century Europe. The New World was equally violent, but Native Americans used violence for different purposes and in different ways. Both European and Native American strategies in violence were grounded in religion and shared similar characteristics. Dismemberments, flayings, scalpings, and beheadings were common features on both English and Indian fronts. In this paper, I argue that English colonists who immigrated to New England in the seventeenth-century brought certain perceptions of violence, which were put to use in the New World on Native American bodies, and those perceptions were framed in the light of Puritan and European ideologies.

"The hand of God fell heavily upon them, with such a mortal stroke that they died on heapes…And the bones and skulls upon the several places of their habitations, made such a spectacle after my coming into those partes, that as I travailed in that Forrest, near the Massachusetts, it seemed to me a new found Golgotha." [1]

- Thomas Morton, New English Canaan, 1634

Thomas Morton, an English colonist living in Massachusetts and biographer from Devon, walked into a violent world that was taken over by disease, war, and chaos. His first reaction was to place what he saw in a framework he understood: the crucifixion of Jesus at Golgotha, the "place of the skull." When Morton arrived in southern New England he saw blood, death, and violence; things he associated with the death of Jesus and "a new found Golgotha." In New England, where Morton was, Pequot numbers before the plague of 1633 were around 16,000. At the beginning of the Pequot War, that number went to a dismal 3,000. Though sickness tore through the Pequot people, physical acts of violence also had their place.

Arising through the age of religious wars, Puritan English leaders in colonial America brought with them certain forms and ideas about violence, which did not die easily. After defending their faith for so long in the Old World, religious violence was a paramount feature of English society. Over the course of New World contact, violent outbreaks happened over and again. Land use, language barriers, mixed social signals, clothing, religion; all of these created friction between the English and Native Americans of New England which included the Wampanoag, Algonquian, Pequot, Nipmuck, and Narragansett. Violence was everywhere in the colonies. Though scholars tend to deflate some of the rhetoric used to describe these scenes and instances, archeological and ethno-historical methods have been used to prove them relatively accurate.[2] I argue that English perceptions of the violence were shaped by Puritan religion and ideologies, which were brought with them from the Old World. To make such a claim, I will examine the firsthand accounts of Captain John Mason, Colonel Benjamin Church, and Miss Mary Rowlandson. Finally, I will analyze

John Williams' *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion* and the events of the early eighteenth century, including the Deerfield Raid during Queen Anne's War, in order to understand these events as a continuation of the same forms of violence.

Several historians have extensively researched violence, European immigration, Puritan rhetoric, and English-Indian relations in early America. Daniel Richter's work, *Before the Revolution*, explores ancient America all the way through to the Revolution. He tries to connect the Old World with the new by looking at how politically, socially, and environmentally they were both experiencing the same changes; power systems from Middle Europe slowly declined as centers of power in America—like Cahokia—were also dissipating. A large part of his work is dedicated to understanding where colonial leaders were coming from, what they brought with them ideologically, and how that shaped the colonies. Daniel Richter gleaned much from Bernard Bailyn who wrote, amongst many other important works, *The Barbarous Years*, in which he closely examines violence in the colonies from 1600-1675, a particularly grisly era. Bailyn surveys Native American culture, English culture, Dutch ideologies, and the politics of the seventeenth century to provide a complete view of what was happening in the colonies. He reveals people's experiences in the New World and puts those encounters into the wider frame of Atlantic History. For the wars, three works in particular shaped this paper. Alfred Cave's book, *The Pequot War*, is the most extensive investigation into the war and its causes. In it, he crafts and develops the "The Satanic Principle" which is his theory on how Puritans viewed Native Americans; as an "other" separate from their Christian doctrine. Jill Lepore's, *The Name of War*, surveys the events and the rhetoric of King Philip's War, an event that was written about more than any other seventeenth-century struggle. Her work is useful for this approach, but at the same time, she provides a detailed account of the war and how both Puritans and Wampanoags perceived what happened. Finally, Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney have compiled an extensive inquiry into the Deerfield Raid of 1704 in *Captors and Captives*. Like Bailyn, they sought to show personal instances of encounters and how those might speak to the overall problems in the colonies. They evaluate French-English relations and French-Indian relations, which helps give a greater context to what transpired in and around New England and why those events, like the Deerfield Raid, affected New England.

The Violent Old World

From the Middle Ages to the time the pilgrims migrated from England, the power of monarchies was grounded in different forms and ideas about violence. In both the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I, the government used violence to control their subjects. During their reigns, some three hundred Catholics were executed compared to only a few that were merely labeled as "heretics."[3] One of the most common forms of punishment was the act of beheading, literally removing someone's crown for opposing the crown of England. For the monarchs of the time, beheadings held deep political meanings.[4] Historians have noted beheadings as a form of political and social assimilation. Sir Humphrey Gilbert, in the wars with Ireland, lined the streets with severed heads in the city of Munster to assert English dominance.[5] Once the English reached the colonies, they controlled physical bodies in similar ways repeatedly to exercise their divine right to be in the New World.

The violent outbreaks that took place between England and Ireland during the Irish wars were a prelude to violence in the New World. Sir Humphrey Gilbert, an Englishmen sent by the crown to put down the Irish "problem," used brutal military tactics to exert English dominance over the local Gaelic people. In one instance, Thomas Churchyard noted, "that the heddes of all those (of what sort they were) which were killed in the date, should be cutte from their bodies and brought the the place where he incamped at night." These heads would line the path that the local Irish would have to walk in order to speak to Gilbert so that "their sawe the heddes of their deeded fathers, brothers, children, kinsfolke, and friends."[6] Though this small part of historiography is based on actions in the Chesapeake area, the same actions and ideas are seen in New England. Pequots, Wampanoags, Nipmucks, Puritans and other European powers took heads as trophies and displayed them proudly, because their enemies understood how powerful the action was. The English would then bring these strategies to the New World to subvert the various cultural groups they encountered.

In England, the state used violence also as a spectacle in order to gain power over the people. Authorities shamed individuals publically for crimes they had committed. Similarly, with beheadings, the point was to always create a spectacle; something that the people could see and learn from.[7] Moreover, spectacles of violence did not happen in flux, they were

a part of everyday English life. John Coffey, professor of early modern history at the University of Leicester, has researched this area of English punishment, religion, and Puritan ideologies extensively. He asserts that from 1535-1681 around three hundred Roman Catholics were killed for their beliefs. The larger portion of those executed at the chopping block were there for heretical reasons.[8] These numbers show that Elizabeth and other monarchs, though tolerant of other religions, were conscious of how to use violence and the spectacle of public punishment to sway people politically.

Old World Puritans

The chaos in the Old World created the New World Puritans—those who left England to pursue the fortune of the New World. Ministers such as John Winthrop felt that England, with its riotous, secular ways, was being torn apart; by God or the devil was not made clear, but for most it was attributed to the wrath of God.[9] The colonists were deeply concerned with how God was interwoven into their decisions. Leaving England was not merely just that; they were also crossing the mighty sea, finding their Eden, wandering through their wilderness, and abiding in a Canaan all at the same time.

Puritan thought called upon a literal interpretation of the Bible. When John Winthrop left England in 1630, his aim was to create a city on a hill. He and the colonists who followed wanted to be a light in a world of pure darkness, even though their impression of the New World was glowing.[10] Every aspect of the Puritan's life was steeped in religion, whether it be rhetorical, physical, or spiritual. While in sinful England, they were the Israelite slaves of Egypt. When crossing the Atlantic to Massachusetts, they were pushing through the Red Sea. Once they reached the shore, their attitudes changed with the severe reality of barren ground with no milk and honey; yet, they were still the people of God walking through the wilderness making the best of their God-given trial.

Their Biblical interpretations in turn solidified their ideas about land, sovereignty, and divine right. Propaganda, which was spreading through England, emphasized Indian inferiority to the English. Coming out of an era of fear of infidels and intruders, Francis Jennings notes that, "what Europeans saw of Indian religion passed through refracting and filtering lenses of preconceptions" that were formed through propa-

ganda.[11] Once they reached the New World, Puritan ideals preached that the land was available for settling. Sovereignty, therefore, fell into their hands. With language and cultural barriers, Indians were rarely consulted on legal matters. Divine right pervaded all the other senses and ideas the Puritans carried. This was their land; their sanctuary in the wilderness. The land was their escape from the evil land of England. Soon, however, they would find that their sanctuary was already in turmoil.

Along with literal biblical interpretation came ideas of war and violence. According to Francis Jennings, Puritan ideas of war were directly born out of Biblical traditions from the medieval period. He asserts that the distinction between "heathen" and "Christian" was important for the colonizers in Medieval times, because it was how they waged war; specifically, "just" wars. "When religion was bad," he writes, "its people were necessarily also bad."[12]He also argues that without this critical distinction, there can be no "arguably proper" war.[13] However, we must remember that Puritans were people, and they were a fervent people at that. Winning souls to God, creating a new home for themselves, and setting it on a hill were their goals. Indians, for these settlers, were souls, not merely "red" men and women distinct from themselves.[14] Soon, however, the peaceful aspect of their preaching would be interrupted by America's first climactic war.

The Pequot War: Mystic and Mason

The Pequot War, 1636-1637, reshaped southern New England. The war paved the way for the English to establish governmental institutions and further their colonial expansions. However, the road it paved was marked with blood, disfigured bodies, lies, and deceit. Puritans at this time saw the Pequot as ferocious and sought to separate themselves by labeling the tribe as "Devils in the Woods."

The war between the Pequot and the Puritans began as a struggle for power. Pequot Indians of New England were already in a struggle with the Narragansett Indians and Dutch traders for the control of trade routes and access to goods.[15] After killing a group of Narragansett Indians who were going to trade with the Dutch, the Pequots officially became their enemies. Tatobem, the Pequot sachem who had been in a peace agreement since 1633 with the Dutch, was lured to one of their ships in order to negotiate a trade agreement. He was captured instead. Told that he was being

held for ransom, the Pequots under Tatobem anxiously sent "a bushel of wampum" to his captors; however, "they received in return his corpse."[16] Even so, the Pequots still sought to trade with the Dutch traders; never was it their goal to break off any kind of trade connections. In retribution for the murder, the Pequots murdered a group of Europeans, (thought to be Dutch by the Pequots), anchored hopelessly in their ship on the Connecticut River. However, they were not Dutch. They were English Colonists, and their captain was John Stone.[17]

John Stone's murder led to a series of misunderstandings between the Pequots and the Puritans. In terms of the Puritan response, John Stone was hardly the sole reason for such a conflict in 1636. Stone is known by scholars now to be a "privateer, smuggler, drunkard, and adulterer" who had a less than dazzling reputation. Nonetheless, he was an English Puritan and a captain at that.[18] What is difficult to reconcile about this murder is the fact that most Pequots, and their counterpart New England neighbors, could distinguish Dutch from English. The Dutch were much more crude, rough, and overall forceful in their interactions with the Native Americans.[19] Stone's murder was more than likely not accidental, but part of the Pequot's strategic plan. This murder pushed Pequot-English relations to a breaking point, especially with the increasing tensions that were already at work in the region amongst Native American cultural groups.

The actual violence of the Pequot War began with small skirmishes. In one instance, before the attack on Saybrook led by the Pequots and their Western Niantic allies, Joseph Tilly, a river trader in the Connecticut River Valley, was taken captive while hunting. His friend was killed immediately, but he was used for a more violent purpose and one that was stock full of meaning. As John Underhill records, the Pequots "tied him to a stake, flayed his skin off, put hot embers between his flesh and the skin, cut off his fingers and toes, [to] make hatbands of them."[20] The brutality of the scene, the calculated measures of removing certain parts of the body, the time it took to create the hot embers to be placed in Tilly's body, darkened the mind of those who witnessed the event. Torture practices used by the Pequots did not differ greatly from traditional New England. If a warrior was captured by their enemy, and was found to be guilty of a crime against them, "they would most likely be burned to death after disembowelment, some parts of their bodies having been eaten and their blood drunk in celebration by their captors."[21] The Puritans, however, who

were constantly in a struggle to reconcile what they saw with what they believed, labeled the Indians as brutes, barbarians, and completely void of a benevolent God, despite the fact that they themselves often committed similar barbaric acts.

On May 26 1637, the English Puritans of New England launched an attack on the Pequots at Fort Mystic that was designed to be devastating. The attack was a hallmark of English Puritan retaliatory brutality and aggressiveness. Built in an area of around two acres, the fort contained several wigwams, women, and children, and the English found the place so packed tight with the Pequots that they "wanted foot room to grapple with their adversaries.[22] The plan was to "destroy them by the sword" and then take the plunder of the town. However, after completely surrounding the town, the soldiers laid waste to it. John Mason recorded the burning of the town to be "a dreadful Terror did the Almighty let fall upon their Spirits, that they would fly from us and run into the very Flames, where many of them perished. And when the Fort was thoroughly Fired, Command was given, that all should fall off and surround the Fort."[23]

The fighting and ensuing devastation happened quickly. Mason suggests that some six to seven hundred Pequots were killed, but scholars conservatively say around four hundred.[24] Two invaders were killed and twenty were wounded. William Bradford stated, "It was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fire and the streams of blood quenching the same, and horrible was the stink and scent thereof."[25] Bodies of Pequot Indians undoubtedly littered the entire scene, and even the retreat was scattered in violence.

Prominent in Mason's narrative is the concern with God's hand on the war. In fact, Bernard Bailyn theorizes that the soldiers who were under John Mason experienced some form of a trance-like state when engaging in the battle at Mystic. "We were like Men in a Dream…then was our mouth filled with Laughter, and our tongues with Singing." Many of the men at that battle had never seen war before, especially one that was so bloody and ruthless. And Captain Underhill himself was intrigued by the way God sat his vengeance upon the Indians.[26] The men were ecstatic, driven by the desire to conquer all those who stood in their way of God's glory. This enlivened them, but it also caused many of the problems that followed in the area of Southern New England and New England at large, for fear became one of the Puritan's greatest tools.

Fear led Puritans in Southern New England to distance themselves from the Pequots. Alfred Cave assesses this phenomena calling it the "Satanic Principle": the English Puritan belief that the Pequots, and all other Native American groups, were agents of Satan who were bent on the destruction of the English.[27] For the most part, the ideas and rhetoric used to describe the battles and interchanges with the Pequots were tactical; the English understood that if the stake was driven deep enough between the two cultures that a natural hate would evolve. There was no actual Satan in the woods howling at the English until destruction came; rather, the English Puritans created this myth to justify English acts of violence, fears, and war.[28] Where the real difference came was in religious perspective. Whereas flaying and scalping a body was appropriate in Indian cultures, devastation and destruction in the name of God was acceptable in Puritan ideology. The texts reveal how people viewed these events, and for the Puritans, these stories were "the fulfillment of a prewar mythology that foretold conflicts in the wilderness between the people of God and the hosts of Satan."[29] These ideas can be seen in John Mason's account of the war and in Winthrop's journals. They were often full of violent stories that travelled back to old world England to let Englishmen and women know how violent the New World was.

The Pequot War left a wake of destruction in southern New England. Rumors, insecurities, distrust, and violence all loomed after the Pequots were nearly annihilated.[30] After the battle, not only did English troops track down and kill as many Pequot Indians as they could find, they also forbade anyone from calling themselves "Pequots."[31] Through killings and political domination, the Puritan objective was to eliminate the Pequots from the region by death and cultural genocide in order to completely dominate the suffering group. And even though the Pequot lineage survived, the war laid the foundation for the brutal wars that were still to come between the Puritans and the Algonquian tribes led by eponymous leader, Metacomet.

King Phillips' War: Popularity of Violence

> *"As they were leading them away in this lamentable condition, one of the Sisters being big with childe, going into the Woods to be privately delivered, the Indians followed, and in a jeering manner, they would help her, and be her Midwives, and thereupon they*

barbarously ript up her body and burnt the chide before her face, and then in a merciful cruelty, to put her out of her pain, knockt her o'th head."[32]

- A New and Further Narrative of the State of New England, 1676

Much like the Pequot War, King Philips' War began with confusion. Some scholars attribute the war to the death of Massasoit, the Algonquin leader who's son, Metacomet, was labeled "King Philip" by the colonists. Metacomet's agreements with the Puritans kept a decent level of peace in New England, and in effect kept the English alive.[33] Even so, Massasoit's death complicated the political climate between the Wampanoag's and the Puritans, and the contempt Metacomet later acquired for the Puritans made the situation all the more volatile.

While some attribute King Philip's war to Metacoment, Jill Lepore marks the beginning of battles and skirmishes (although not the entire war itself) with the murder of John Sassamon, a Christian Indian who was sympathetic towards colonial causes and who served as a linguist who worked between the Wampanoag and English (including King Philip's own people).[34] Regardless of the cause, it is during this war that the split from thinking of Indians as fellow saints to barbaric enemies can be seen explicitly.

During and after the conflict, colonists were eager to write about what transpired. Jill Lepore is the foremost scholar to study this literary phenomenon, and she asserts that the war had a profound psychological effect on the English. Though not everyone penned their own opinion about the war, those who did were not lacking in their material. Lepore believes that, "even while the English lamented their helplessness against Indian attacks, they took comfort in the knowledge that they controlled the pens and the printing press."[35] When writing back to the Old World, authors made it their goal to do two things: first, to present that Indians in a distasteful light, and second, to suggest that America was actually "a bucolic world of peaceful settlers."[36] It is easy to see the hypocrisy at work here. But if Cave's "Satanic Principle" holds true, the creation of the "Other" in Puritan documents can be understood. Puritans were still seeking ways to attract settlers to the New World and future potential sponsors. There was no way that the English could simply write all New England Indians out of their histories. To juxtapose them against traditional English views of the world was the best way to deal with them.

King Phillip's War was entrenched in brutality. After the battle of Nashaway, the author of *A New and Further Narrative of the State of New England* penned a particularly horrible scene of violence in which two Indians followed a pregnant woman into the woods and "thereupon they barbarously ript up her body and burnt the childe before her face, and then in a merciful cruelty, to put her out of her pain, knockt her o'th head."[37] Though this act seems incredibly inhumane, the symbolic impact that a newborn child might have on the mind of a New England Indian was substantial. A child meant reproduction; reproduction meant more English; more English meant less land and resources for the Wampanoag. At an attack on Springfield, there was a similar reaction to English children. When Major Savage, one of the founders of Rhode Island and a colonial army major from Massachusetts, took after two of the raiders who had captured two infants, the Indians "took the two poor infants, and in the sight both of their Mothers and our men, tossed them up in the air, and dashed their brains out against the rocks."[38] In the worldview of the Puritan, these tactics were merciless, infringing on their God given rights to land and their call to replenish the earth.

The violence and torture on the physical body weighed heavy in the minds of both the English and the Indians. Benjamin Church, born in Plymouth, Massachusetts, played a key role in the colonial victories due to his passion for learning Indian militaristic strategies and using them for the colonial army. On Benjamin Church's approach to Mount Hope- the place where Metacomet was believed to be- he noted several incidents between the English and various axis enemy groups. After this contact with Indians, Church believed "they thirsted for English blood."[39] Linda Colley, in *Captives*, also states "when they stripped white captives naked and forced them to cover their genitals with pages ripped out of the Bible, they were making clear their opinion of Christianity."[40] What Church did not realize was that he was documenting a consistent Native American practice: dismemberment, beheading, scalping. Nathaniel Saltonstall, in "A True but Brief Account of our Losses" also mentions the treatment of English bodies. Note the detailed descriptions of these killings and how they aligned with Native American practice:

> "Of whom many have been destroyed with exquisite Torments, and most inhumane barbarities; the Heathen rarely giving Quarter to those that they take…either cutting off the Head, ripping open the belly, or

> skulping the Head of Skin and Hair, and hanging them up as Trophies; wearing Men's Fingers as Bracelets about their Necks, and Stripes of their Skins which they dress for Belts."[41]

The human head was the seat of power in English and in New England cultures, thus cutting it off asserted power. The belly was the place of reproduction, which was "perhaps a conscious strike at these invaders' capacity to reproduce themselves abundantly."[42] And fingers, scalps, heads and skin were signs that someone had been dominated.

Mary Rowlandson, who wrote her own captivity narrative during King Philip's War, was also caught up in this world of violence and brutality. In February of 1676, Rowlandson was taken captive after an attack on Lancaster. She spent a total of eleven weeks with the Nipmuck raiders. Just as in Cave's analysis of the Pequot War, the same principles can be applied to the Puritan thinking behind acts of violence in King Philip's War. Since the Indians were agents of Satan, "Indian captivity was apprehended as one of God's ways of testing, punishing, or instructing His creatures."[43] According to Rowlandson's narrative, the attack was sudden, unexpected, and lethal. Rowlandson noted how her sister, mother, children, and nephews were all either killed or taken captive.[44] "It is a solemn sight to see so many Christians lying in their own blood, some here, some there, like a company of Sheep torn by Wolves," Rowlandson reflected as she was take away on her first remove.[45] Throughout the narrative, she relates many scenes of violence, most of which could be associated with Native American ceremony instead of devilish barbarity. Subsequent scholars have sought to show why Rowlandson wrote to such an extent. On one hand, Susan Juster believes that such narratives were meant, "to capture for readers the physical sensations associated with a given activity (torture, enslavement, death, sex, birth)."[46] In any case, her narrative was reprinted several times, and, therefore, must have weighed heavily on Puritan minds.[47]

During the Battle of the Swamp, Benjamin Church placed his entire regiment all around the swamp. A mistake actually ignited the battle according to Church—Captain Golding fired at one of Philip's men who he thought saw him- and then the entire regiment unleashed their weapons as well. Philip was shot "through his heart" and fell face down into the mud of the swamp.[48] Church described him as "a doleful, great, naked, dirty beast" after being drug through the mud onto a nearby hill.[49] Then, he sent an executioner to the body of Philip:

> "Captain Church then said that, forasmuch as he had caused many an Englishman's body to lie unhurried and rot above ground, that not one of his bones should be buried. And, calling his old Indian executioner bid him behead and quarter him."[50]

And so the war ended in the minds of the New Englanders. Richard Hutchinson, an English Puritan who migrated to Massachusetts, wrote "The Warr in New England Visibly Ended," and ends his short letter by stating that "The English go many of them now to their Old Habitations" as if life was completely normal—whatever that may have been—once more.[51] The English rallied in their victory and praised God for his divine hand, once again juxtaposing the Puritans to the heathen "Others" who needed to be defeated in order to secure the Puritans a place in the world. Physical domination, therefore, led to spiritual domination. By killing the "creature," they were fulfilling a divine plan, not wiping out indigenous populations.

King Philip's War forever changed the landscape of New England. Not only was the land at certain times scattered with the bodies of English and Indian warriors, but the political and social realms shifted as well. "The killing of Metacomet came to symbolize an end to Indian independence."[52] From this point onward, Native Americans seemed to struggle to climb out from under the thumb of European politics. Colonial towns now realized the necessity of effective coordination, court systems gained power, and investors sought a more controlled environment through which to do their business.[53] Thus, the wars of seventeenth century New England carried over into the eighteenth century as the United Colonies began to take shape.

Queen Anne's War: Deerfield and John Williams

> *"The history I am going to write, proves, that days of fasting and prayer, without reformation will not avail to turn away the anger of God."*[54]
>
> *- John Williams, The Redeemed Captive, 1707*

By the turn of the century, Native America (and New England to some extent), was in complete disarray. Not only were Native Americans caught in worsening political situations with New England, they were also caught between a European power struggle for land and resources. French and Dutch influences grew. Both New Netherland and New France devel-

oped at fast rates, although, much like England, their supporters at home became leery of the charge to take North America. The wars that burned through Europe did not help in the cause for North America. By 1704, France had become a dominating force in New England and played a key role in its immediate future. Despite new players and circumstances, the violence still continued and in many cases worsened.

Even after the Pequots were burned out of Fort Mystic, even when Metacomet's head swung from the flagpole of Plymouth, the wars never ended. In both cases, hate, rage, memory, and revenge weighed heavy in the hearts and minds of the Indians. Combat, battles, and mutilation all still continued into the eighteenth century. "New England Indians did not stop fighting after King Philip's War, and men continued to be called away to war."[55] Calloway proposes that this is the case because Puritans had the tendency to write Indians out of their histories. Since King Phillip's War, perceptions had switched from the Indians being brothers who were in sin to enemies causing problems. The political landscape of New England had shifted leaving the Indians to fuse themselves, in many cases, to European powers.

Deerfield, Massachusetts was ground-zero for one of the most devastating attacks in the eighteenth century and early American history in general. Deerfield was notoriously poorly placed on the outskirts of New England, and it had a dark history of exposure that led to many attacks.[56] It was more than a small, vulnerable town in the eyes of the English; it was England in the eyes of the French. New France, a few hundred miles from Deerfield, was pictured as a massive industrial and urban center on maps of the time, but in reality it was still relatively small as well. A raid on Deerfield would prove to be profitable for the French; a "solution to diplomatic problems that had their roots in the collapse of the Canadian beaver trade and uncertain relations with their Native allies."[57]

The actual assault was devastating, according to an eyewitness account from Rev. John Williams. He starts out his narrative of *The Redeemed Captive* by noting, "The history I am going to write, proves, that days of fasting and prayer, without reformation will not avail to turn away the anger of God."[58] The attack was swift and ungoverned. According to historians Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney, warfare at the turn of the century became about inflicting damage, not about keeping honor. "Stealth, surprise, and quick withdrawal had become the essence of Indian warfare

by the later 1600's" and the French, who were joined to the Mohawks, Iroquois, and Hurons, used these same tactics.[59] Militarily, the Indians had fused the way they made war with the way Europeans conducted themselves; destruction over preservation. John Williams records their infiltration to the household, their thievery, and their eventual imprisonment.

Refreshingly for the historian, Williams' account of his captivity is not covered with scathing comments about the savageness of the Native Americans. In his writings, he does not constantly refer to his Canadian captors as "savages" or "devils." When faced with acts of violence, Williams instead relays what happened and how he actually perceived it, much like what is in Mary Rowlandson's account. For example Williams gives us an account about the death of his wife:

> "I asked each of the prisoners (as they passed by me) after her, and heard that in passing through the above said river, she fell down, and was plunged over head and ears in the water; after which she travelled not far; for at the foot of this mountain, the cruel and blood-thirsty savage, who took her, flew her with his hatchet at one stroke."[60]

Though Williams endured many hardships throughout his trek, this instance was the worst. The language of Williams, writing years after his return to Deerfield, is cool and calculated. Clearly, he is not in the business of creating an "Other" effect with the Indians, which is what many writers tried to do. At the beginning of his trek, Williams simply quotes Job 1:21: "Naked came I out of my mother's womb and naked shall I return thither." Williams believed God gave him this scripture "to perfuade to a patient bearing of my affliction."[61] In many cases, "The extreme pathos of many of these early American captivity narratives was partly calculated," and by looking at them, we can see that Williams' world, and the world of New England, was in chaos and shock.[62] The reality is obvious; even though the Indians were helpful to the English, it was more on business principle than one of courtesy. Killing off or hurting your source of income and resources amounted to nothing. But this is what the Indians were driven into—taking prisoners to the French for money.

From the mutilation of English bodies during the Pequot War to the hanging of King Philip's head outside of the Plymouth colony, violence and the perceptions surrounding it pervaded seventeenth century American minds. Thomas Morton located what he thought to be "a new found Golgotha." John Winthrop and his fellow Puritans, along with a host of believers in England, believed they were settling New Canaan, inhab-

iting their Eden, and having their own wilderness experience at the same time. What they saw, they perceived through the lenses of Puritan religion. Every Englishmen killed was a sign of God's vengeance. Any Indian who was killed was seen as God's victory. Thomas Morton, at the beginning of this century of great brutality, did not see what he had expected. What he found was far more complex; a world being disrupted by Puritan forces that would eventually, in later years, come to take over the landscape of New England.

Endnotes

1. Thomas Morton, "Description of the Indians in New England, 1637," Accessed June 3, 2015, http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorsey1/41docs/08-mor.html.

2. Jill Lepore, Alfred Cave, and Emma Anderson are a few scholars who show in their works how Puritan rhetoric may or may not have created many of these scenes of violence alone. Jason Urbanas and Kevin McBride are two archeologists who have shown how many of the texts that we have now recount impressively true stories.

3. John Coffey. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000), 23.

4. Andrew Lipman, "A Meanes to Knitt Them Together':The Exchange of Body Parts in the Pequot War." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 65.1 (2008): 3-28, accessed 30 June 2015, 6.

5. Ibid, 8.

6. Nicholas Canny, "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 30.4 (1973): 575-598, accessed 26 July 2015, 582.

7. Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, n.d. PDF accessed from www.soc.iastate.edu. Web. 12 Nov. 2014.

8. John Coffey, 26.

9. Peter N. Carroll, *Puritanism and the Wilderness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier, 1629-1700*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969),

17. Winthrop believed that the "land doe call for judgementes rather then blessings."

10. Ibid, 5. Carroll states that the colonizers were bold, yet ignorant; their vision of the New World came from expository pamphlets, which placed the Americas in Edenic terms.

11. Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conques*t, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1975), 45.

12. Ibid, 43.

13. Ibid, 44.

14. Peter Carroll, 12.

15. Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War,* (University of Massachusetts Press: Amherst, 1996). Cave, who is possibly the most well read of the Pequot War historians, titled the section in his book, "Wampum, pelts, and power."

16. Ibid, 58-59.

17. Ibid, 59.

18. Bernard Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years: The Peopling of British North America: The Conflicts of Civilizations, 1600-1675*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2013), 443. See also Alfred Cave's *The Pequot War,* 74. Cave believes that Stone's murder was no matter to the Massachusetts government, because it was simply reported and forgotten about. William Bradford claimed that he more than likely provoked the Indians.

19. See Baiyln's chapter on "The Dutch Farrgo" for a detailed discussion of Dutch involvement in the New World, 191-241.

20. Cave, 130-131. Cave cites John Underhill's Newes from America, 66-67.

21. Bailyn, 9.

22. Cave, 148.

23. Ibid, 8.

24. Jason Urbanus, "America's First War," *Archeology* 68.1 (2015): 32-37.

25. Daniel Richter, *Before the Revolution: America's Ancient Pasts*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011), 166. Excerpt found in William Bradford's *Of Plymouth Plantation, 1620-1647*, ed. Samuel Eliot Morison (New York, 1952): 296.

26. Bailyn, 446-447.

27. Cave, 8.

28. Ibid, 168-169. It should be noted to not be overly critical of these texts, because it is nearly impossible to assess personal sentiments from any historical document.

29. Cave, 177.

30. Katherine Grandjean, "The Long Wake of the Pequot War," *Early American Studies* 9.2 (2011): 379-411. Project Muse. accessed 10 July 2015. See Grandjean's article for a full study of how the sociopolitical environment of New England was in a crisis state in terms of its relations with the New England tribes.

31. Ibid, Bernard Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years*, 448: Bailyn states that "Obliteration- total and final annihilation- of the Satanic enemy was the ultimate, if unobtainable, object."

32. "A New and Further Narrative of the State of New-England Being a continued Account of the Bloudy Indian War, 1676" *King Philip's War Narratives*, (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966), 4-5.

33. Ian K. Steele, *Warpaths: Invasions of North America*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 87. Steele shows how Massasoit watched the English at Plymouth closely to see if they were potential allies. Though the English would "fraudulently" claim their inheritance of his land because of their peace treaty, relations were still decent.

34. Eric B. Schultz and Michael J. Tougas, King Philip's War: *The History and Legacy of America's Forgotten Conflict* (Vermont: The Countryman Press, 1999), 25.

35. Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Phillip's War and the Origins of American Identity*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1999), 68.

36. Bailyn, 501.

37. "A New and Further Narrative of the State of New England Being a continued Account of the Bloudy Indian War," *King Philip's War Narratives*, (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966), 4-5.

38. Ibid, 6.

39. Benjamin Church, *Diary of King Philip's War, 1675-1676*, (Connecticut: The Pequot Press, 1975), 75.

40. Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600-1850*, (New York: Anchor Books, 2002), 145.

41. Nathaniel Saltonstall, *New and Further Narratives*, "A True but Brief Account of our Losses sustained since this Cruel and Mischievous War began" 1676. Found in Jill Lepore's *The Name of War*, 72.

42. Colley, 145.

43. Richard VanDerbeets, *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973), 42. Reference here comes from VanDerbeets introduction to Rowlandson's narrative.

44. Mary Rowlandson, "A Narrative of the Captivity and Restauration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson," 42-90. Richard VanDerbeets Ed. *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836*, 44.

45. Ibid, 45.

46. Susan Juster, "What's Sacred about Violence?" *Common-Place* 6.1 (2005). accessed 25 June 2015, http://www.common-place.org/vol-06/no-01/juster/.

47. Lepore, 128-129.

48. Church, 153.

49. Ibid, 154.

50. Ibid, 156.

51. Richard Hutchinson, "The Warr in New-England Visibly Ended," in *King Philip's War Narratives*, (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966), 1-2.

52. Colin G. Calloway Ed., *After King Phillips War: Presence and Persistence in Indian New England*, (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997), 2.

53. Steele, 108.

54. John Williams, *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966), 1.

55. Calloway, 7.

56. Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney, *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 28.

57. Ibid, 35.

58. Williams, 7.

59. Haefeli and Sweeney, 102.

60. Ibid, 14.

61. Williams, 15.

62. Colley, 150.

Bibliography

A New and Further Narrative of the State of New-England Being a continued Account of the Bloudy Indian War, 1676" *King Philip's War Narratives.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966.

Bailyn, Bernard. *The Barbarous Years: The Peopling of British North America: The Conflicts of Civilizations, 1600-1675.* New York: Vintage Books, 2013.

Calloway, Colin G. Ed. *After King Phillips War: Presence and Persistence in Indian New England*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1997.

Canny, Nicholas. "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 30.4 (1973): 575-598, accessed 26 July 2015.

Carroll, Peter N. *Puritanism and the Wilderness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier, 1629-1700*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969. Print.

Cave, Alfred A. *The Pequot War.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.

Church, Benjamin. *Diary of King Philip's War, 1675-1676.* Connecticut: The Pequot Press, 1975.

Coffey, John. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.

Colley, Linda. *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600-1850*. New York: Anchor Books, 2002.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison* New York: Vintage Books, n.d. PDF accessed from www.soc.iastate.edu. Web. 12 Nov. 2014.

Grandjean, Katherine. "The Long Wake of the Pequot War," *Early American Studies* 9.2 (2011): 379-411. *Project Muse*. accessed 10 July 2015.

Haefeli, Evan and Kevin Sweeney. *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

Hutchinson, Richard. "The Warr in New-England Visibly Ended," in *King Philip's War Narratives.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966.

Jennings, Francis. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest.* Williamsburg: The University of North Carolina Press, 1975. Print.

Juster, Susan. "What's Sacred about Violence?" *Common-Place* 6.1 (2005). accessed 25 June 2015, http://www.common-place.org/vol-06/no-01/juster/.

Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Phillip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Vintage Books, 1999.

Lipman, Andrew. "A Meanes to Knitt Them Together':The Exchange of Body Parts in the Pequot War." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 65.1 (2008): 3-28, accessed 30 June 2015.

Mason, John. *A Brief History of the Pequot War.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms Inc, 1966.

Morton, Thomas. "Description of the Indians in New England, 1634." Accessed June 3, 2015. http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorsey1/41docs/08-mor.html

Richter, Daniel. *Before the Revolution: America's Ancient Pasts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Rowlandson, Mary. "A Narrative of the Captivity and Restauration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson," 42-90. VanDerbeets, Richard. Ed. *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836.* Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973.

Schultz, Eric B. and Michael J. Tougas. *King Philip's War: The History and Legacy of America's Forgotten Conflict.* Vermont: The Countryman Press, 1999.

Steele, Ian K. *Warpaths: Invasions of North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Urbanus, Jason. "America's First War," *Archeology* 68.1 (2015): 32-37. *JSTOR*. accessed 30 June 2015.

Williams, John. *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966.