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ABSTRACT

‘Godly Violence: Military Providentialism in the Puritan Atlantic World, 1636–1676’
Matthew Patrick Rowley

This thesis recounts the Puritan struggle for military hegemony and the more difficult contest for an authoritative interpretation of divine communications through war. It asks a simple question: What did Puritans (‘the godly’) say God did in warfare; and how did they claim to know? I have given the term ‘military providentialism’ to the attempt to understand God’s will and agency in war; ‘godly violence’ to the conclusion that an act of killing was both just and holy. These twin themes are explored by looking at Puritan warfare against four groups: Native Americans, royalist Episcopalians, Irish Catholics and Scottish Presbyterians.

A situational case study approach is used to examine complex and competing providentialisms after decisive victories. The case studies bear witness to the complicated relationship between texts, beliefs, circumstances and actions. It also evidences the immense energy and creativity that went into dynamic and richly textured beliefs about God and warfare. Five victories are examined: Mystic Massacre (1637), Battle of Naseby (1645), Siege of Drogheda (1649), Battle of Dunbar (1650) and the Great Swamp Fight (1675).

This is the first comprehensive study of the providence surrounding these decisive victories. In the case of Naseby, Dunbar and Drogheda, none have given a detailed study of providentialism. Scholars have paid careful attention to the theology of the Mystic Massacre and the Great Swamp Fight. The primary contribution of the New England chapters is to compare the theology of killing Native Americans with that used against other enemies. These cross-conflict case studies facilitate many comparisons, some of which are explored in the concluding chapter. Additionally, the conclusion makes two contributions: it argues for a new understanding of the relationship between justice and holiness and for a deeper understanding of the function of Scripture and providence in conflict.
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CONVENTIONS

I have tried to retain the original spelling, grammar and punctuation. When an entire paragraph is italicised due to its location within a work, I reversed the ordering of the italicised material to preserve the emphasis. I have elongated some abbreviations in manuscripts and printed material (e.g. w[t], y[c], w[th]). I have replaced ‘v’ with ‘u’, and vice versa, where appropriate. I also changed the medial sigma ‘f’ to ‘s’, ‘i’ to ‘j’ and ‘vv’ to ‘w’ where appropriate. Primary source titles in the bibliography are unaltered.
1. Introduction: Just and Holy Warfare in the Puritan Atlantic World

Bloodshed communicated to God and could be a communication from him—so many Puritans believed. Cain learned this before expulsion from God’s presence for fratricide: ‘the voyce of thy brothers blood cryeth unto me, from the ground’ (Gen 4:10). The blood of Christ also spoke, and the covenant it created reversed condemnation (Heb 12:24). There was another sense in which God communicated through blood. Whether it involved the death of God’s friends or enemies, he was saying things through war. When God communicated through the medium of lethal force, the godly strained their ears.

1. Providence and Prejudice

The struggle for the orthodox interpretation of killing proved a battlefield in its own right. As one perceptive onlooker noted, there was a close relationship between providence and prejudice: ‘construction follows opposition’. Providential interpretations flowed out of how one prejudged the justice of the conflict. With more historical hindsight, David Hume noted how partisans, ‘by forced inferences’, interpreted events ‘as a confirmation of their particular prejudices’. This thesis recounts the Puritan struggle for military hegemony and the more difficult contest for an authoritative interpretation of divine communications through war. Political gains proved unsustainable, in part, because providential interpretations were unstable.

The moderate Puritan, Richard Sibbes, argued in Violence Victorious that all people violently (i.e. whole-heartedly and earnestly) pursued desires. Religion did not diminish this violence—it redirected it. According to Matthew 11:12, ‘the kingdome of heaven suffereth violence [βιάζεται], and the violent [βιασταὶ] take it by force’. This violence, however, was differentiated from ‘a violence of iniquity and injustice; and so the people of God, of all others, ought not to be violent people.... Violence rather debars

1. The 1611 Authorised Bible (King James) slowly replaced the 1650 Geneva Bible during the seventeenth century. The Authorised Bible is used in this thesis.
out of the kingdom of heaven than is any qualification for it’. Taking life was no light matter.

In 1644, Griffith Williams, a royalist chaplain, believed eminent Puritan divines would be damned. By leading the nation into an unjust and unholy so-called ‘bellum sanctum’, they would be ‘indicted at the barre of Gods justice for a felo de se’ (suicide). The sword they pointed at their sovereign pierced their souls. The difference between righteous killing and spiritual suicide was in the eye of the beholder—and views hinged on rival interpretations of God’s providential communications.

The story of godly hegemony begins with the settlements of Plymouth in 1620 and Massachusetts Bay at the end of the decade—though the first full-scale Puritan-led war with Native Americans began in 1636. In the spring of 1637, many combatants perceived God’s clear, but harsh, mercy. Deep in the forests of what is now southern Connecticut, God communicated through war. Scriptural and theological interpretations overflowed as the godly reflected on the charred remains of Pequot civilians and soldiers. This was God’s declaration of support in their struggle against heathens. King Philip’s War in the mid-1670s confirmed and amplified convictions.

At the time of the Pequot War, Puritan hegemony in England was largely unthinkable; by the time of King Philip’s War, it was a memory. Two months after the massacre of the Pequot at Mystic, a Presbyterian riot in St. Giles’ Cathedral (said to have been sparked by a stool-throwing Jenny Geddes), evidenced growing discontent in Scotland. In the British Isles, this jeopardised a delicate balancing act of king, creed and country. The subsequent Irish Rebellion of 1641 injected another dose of virulent anti-Catholicism into the bloodstream of English Protestantism. The English Long Parliament—a body that became known for innovative theological, constitutional and martial opposition to Charles I and the Church of England—was the last of the three kingdoms to revolt.

As in New England, partisans in England, Scotland and Ireland made many types of national and confessional claims about divine agency. In contrast to New England, all sides claimed to be within the Christian fold. Shades of Christian orthodoxy clashed as partisans of four main—though at times overlapping—

5. G. Williams, Jura majestatis, the rights of kings both in church and state (Oxford, 1644), 139.
confessional groups went to war: royalist Episcopalian, English Puritans, Scottish Presbyterians and Irish Catholics. To borrow language from Brad Gregory’s martyrdom study, combatants had ‘a shared and shattered worldview’, and the ‘combination of shared and incompatible beliefs’ made their quarrels so ‘explosive’. Identities were complicated by complex theology, the growth of factions and shifting allegiances. Victory could be, first and foremost, God’s declaration as to the merit of the cause and the godliness of the combatants. Success confirmed justice, evidenced orthodoxy and could even sanctify bloodshed. These scripturally-influenced ideas, coupled with the vagaries of war, made for complex providential debates.

The subtitle for this study, Military Providentialism in the Puritan Atlantic World, highlights the focus and geographic scope. It examines how partisans with broadly-Puritan sympathies interacted with the word of God (through Scripture) and the world (through interpreting providence) to create beliefs about God’s will and agency in war. One could arrange Puritan enemies along a spectrum in descending order of godliness: Scottish Presbyterians, royalist Episcopalian, Irish Catholics and Native Americans. If organised by kinship and political affiliation, the English trumped the Scots. In this thesis, war with each group occupies one chapter—with two devoted to war with Native Americans, for reasons that will be clear later.

The ambiguity of the title, Godly Violence, expresses another focus. The Puritans, as they were derisively known, preferred to be called ‘the godly’. This thesis describes ‘godly violence’—and this in three senses: It was performed by ‘the godly’; believed to be godly and thought to involve God as an active participant. All three senses of godly violence are essential to military providentialism—especially the relationship between human and divine agency.

I use ‘violence’ and ‘killing’ interchangeably, although many contemporaries (and some modern theorists) reserved ‘violence’ for the illegitimate use of force. I also use terms like ‘divine violence’, although the Hebrew Bible never refers to killing performed by God as violence (םִּמְתָּן). Seveneenth-century partisans rarely used the


more charged term ‘violence’ to describe their own life-taking. Oliver Cromwell, who repeatedly told enemies he would offer no ‘violence’ to surrenders, said his men ‘violently’ fell upon Wexford ‘with their ladders, and stormed it’.8 Scripture, although usually reserving ‘violence’ for unjust killing, said that ‘with violence (ὁρμῆματι) shall that great citie Babylon bee thrown downe’ (Rev 18:21). This popular wartime verse, as exemplified by Thomas Wilson’s 1642 fast sermon before the Commons, informed the parliamentarian understanding of their struggle against the king.9

Although the term ‘violence’ was rarely used positively, the concept of ‘godly violence’ was ubiquitous. For example, the reverend Thomas Shepard, reflecting on the massacre of Pequot men, women and children, called it ‘divine slaughter by the hand of the English’.10 Another New England minister urged his congregation (‘severall Regiments, or bands of Souldiers lying in ambush’) to fight in the British Isles through ‘deadly Fastings and Prayer’. The godly were ‘murtherers that will kill point blanke from one end of the world to the other’.11

2. Central Question

What did the godly say God did in war; and how did they claim to know? This is the driving question. I have given the term ‘military providentialism’ to the attempt to understand God’s will and agency in war. The godly analysed the details of war on several levels and used many competing interpretive frames. This thesis answers the central question by offering an explanation of complexity—not an attempt to explain away complexity by arguing for a monolithic military providentialism. It would be more accurate to speak of military providentialism as a discourse or mode of enquiry and reflection on God’s ways in war.

In telling the story of godly violence and military providentialism, the thesis also touches on issues of authority, law, toleration, identity, race, slavery and memory. It

8. ‘Oliver Cromwell to William Lenthall’ (14 Oct 1649), Abbott, Cromwell II:140–43.

9. T. Wilson, Jerichoes down-fall as it was presented in a sermon preached in St. Margarets Westminster before the honourable House of Commons at the late solemne fast, Septemb. 28, 1642 (London, 1642), 14–18.


draws on insights from several fields: the multidisciplinary scholarship on religion and violence; British, European, Atlantic and colonial history; political and military history; Protestant (particularly Puritan) history and theology; and biblical theology and the reception history of the Bible. I have also drawn on works of social history, ethnohistory and archaeology—particularly for the two New England chapters.

This study employs a wide range of printed and archival sources: sermons, treatises, official documents, newsbooks, letters, diaries, poems and objects related to material culture. In attempting to let sources drive the narrative, uneven distributions shape each case study. For example, primary source histories of the Pequot War play a significant role in reconstructing beliefs; sermons are less important because most were not recorded and preserved. Drogheda is the opposite. In each case study, the aim is to be inclusive and comprehensive. Private providential interpretations written by obscure individuals are considered alongside published counterparts by prominent persons. Although the latter might be more historically significant—in helping to win wars and influence people—they are both relevant for understanding military providentialism.

3. John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards

This present study, as well as some of its methodology and contours, grew out of a reading of the eighteenth-century New England philosopher-theologian, Jonathan Edwards. As mentioned, the driving question asks: ‘what did the godly say God did in war; and how did they claim to know?’ Edwards wrote voluminously about both of these—though his subject was usually not God’s activity in war. God’s special providence, as explained in The ‘Miscellanies’, were commonplace and essential for everyday survival.12 In ‘A Divine and Supernatural Light’ (1734), he claimed spiritual awakening came through a direct experiential knowledge of God.13 In ‘Images of Divine Things’ (1744), he argued that everything in the world ‘represents’ spiritual realities and speaks of God.14 These works promoted a deeply personal and experiential knowledge of God. This intimacy with God presented epistemic problems. Especially during the First Great Awakening (1730s and 1740s), many wanted criteria for distinguishing

between genuine and counterfeit religion.15

Edwards met this challenge in Religious Affections (1746) where he carefully diagnosed evidence of divine activity.16 This work represented the culmination of a long Puritan tradition of looking for signs in experiences.17 He structured the treatise around claimed ‘signs’ of God’s agency in the believer’s life. The second part of Religious Affections examined signs—like elevated emotion, holy conversation, comfort or confidence—that were actually unsure, unreliable or inconclusive signs. X and Y accompany regeneration and can be properly understood as signs of it, however, since one can experience X and Y without salvation, they are not sure signs of the imputation of grace. Edwards, here, was very cautious about inferring what was not directly visible (imputation of grace) from what was visible (e.g. elevated emotion).

There was, however, more to Edwards’ providentialism. In certain circumstances, he spoke with heightened confidence and linked visible events (judgement or mercy) with the invisible intentions of God. The unfinished and posthumously published A History of the Work of Redemption was, in the words of Michael J. McClymond and Gerald R. McDermott, an effort to delineate the entire story of God’s dealings with humanity’.18 Whereas Religious Affections interrogated attempts at discerning God’s agency in the life of an individual, A History of the Work of Redemption evidenced more certainty in speaking about God’s agency in the life of many nations. Perhaps historical hindsight—made possible by the unified promises and aims of God—facilitated this confidence.19 He also spoke with certitude concerning events in his day. For example, after a damaging earthquake, Edwards attributed the spiritual cause—for he also recognised natural causes—to the late-night frolicking of

the youth. Similarly, the failed Jacobite rebellion (1745–46), success against the French at Cape Breton Island (1745) and a weather-thwarted French armada (1746) prompted clear providential interpretations. The latter two ‘come perhaps the nearest to a parallel with God’s wonderful works of old, in Moses’ Joshua’s, and Hezekiah’s time’. Like Religious Affections, this thesis looks at the signs and countersigns claimed by the godly concerning divine activity in warfare. It then uses some of Edwards’ methodology to understand how the godly—Edwards included—shifted from cautious to confident providentialism. This morphing occurred in stressful, politically charged, situations.

This tension between providential caution and confidence was not unique to Edwards. John Calvin, founding father of the Reformed tradition, is well known for the comprehensive nature of his understanding of providence. Every ‘particle of light’ had an intentional divine cause. God ‘holds the helm, and overrules all events’. However, concerning the knowability of God’s intentions behind particular providences, his Institutes and The Secret Providence of God reveal a complex providentialism. He often praised a ‘wise ignorance’ and referred to the inner workings of providence as ‘secret’, ‘hidden’ or ‘mysterious’. Epistemically humbling texts, like Deuteronomy 29:29, Romans 11:33–34 and the book of Job, informed his thinking. Calvin’s providential caution here was similar to that espoused by Jonathan Edwards in Religious Affections.

Alexandra Walsham notes another side to Calvin—evidenced by his slide towards certainty in some circumstances:

Even Calvin himself took note of judgements on sabbath-breakers and persecutors.... Notwithstanding his stern caveats about divine inscrutability in the Institutes, he seems to have had no scruples about denouncing the untimely and accidental deaths of Henri II and François II of France as a punishment for

22. Calvin, Institutes I.2.1.
molesting Protestants.  

Calvin slid towards confident and clear providential assertions—particularly where God’s judgement or mercy was unexpected, dramatic or related to politics and justice. Sandwiched between John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards, the Puritan wars of the seventeenth century provide ideal case studies for examining cautious and confident military providentialism.

4. Religion, Violence and Military Providentialism

(a) The Historical and Modern Debate

All of the characters in this historical investigation are long dead. We view their story from the standpoint of our era—another age where many killers explicitly invoke the divine. Scholars across many disciplines devote great energy towards comprehension and prevention. Their work on modern violence shapes the questions I ask. Although I aim to avoid explaining the past through the lens of these disciplines, they have influenced my approach to religion and violence—most notably a resistance to reductionism. Elsewhere I have pushed for a complex understanding of violence in the name of God—and this complexity in three particular areas: ‘religion’ as a cause of violence, the relationship between readers, beliefs, texts and violence throughout Christian history, and the relationship between justice and holiness in conflict.  

(b) Just and Holy Warfare

It is not within the scope of this thesis to detail the relationship between Christianity and


violence from the early Church to the Protestant Reformation. That study would have to be versatile and multifaceted: considering major thinkers like Tertullian, Eusebius, Augustine, Einhard, Urban II, Aquinas, wider medieval theology, Luther, Zwingli, Bullinger, and Calvin; prominent rulers like Constantine, Justinian, Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Emperors and early Reformation and counter-Reformation kings and queens; important texts ranging in style from the Venerable Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica to the Germanic poem ‘The Dream of the Rood’; and notable events like the Fall of Rome, Norman Conquest, Early and Later Crusades, Inquisition, Hussite Wars, Radical Reformation, conquest of the Americas and the many instances of anti-semitic violence across the centuries.

Additionally, this thesis does not survey Christian thought on just warfare. It is necessary, however, to discuss an important turn in thinking about the just war tradition. The main scholarly bifurcation between ‘just war’ and ‘holy war’ came through Roland Bainton’s influential 1942 paper that formed part of a 1960 book. In Bainton’s section on the English Civil War, he wrote the oft-quoted lines:

[A] The crusading idea requires that the cause shall be holy (and no cause is more holy than religion) [B] that the cause shall be fought under God and with his help, [C] that the crusaders shall be godly and their enemies ungodly, [D] and that the war shall be prosecuted unsparingly.  

In James Turner Johnson’s words, the impact of this paragraph ‘on a generation of scholarship is too pervasive to catalogue’.  

Bainton’s influence has not waned in the four decades since Johnson critiqued these crusading criteria. Although differing from Johnson, I agree that they are not helpful. Points A–C, to varying degrees, are common to most warfare involving Christians. Thus, their efficacy for separating sheep (just warrior) from goats (crusading Christian) is questionable at best. The term ‘unsparingly’ in Point D is vague and unhelpful. Johnson pushes back on this point. Many religiously motivated warriors have increased grounds to act with justice and show restraint.


33. See J.T. Johnson’s critique (citing Gouge positively) where he ‘reject[s] the equation between holy war and total war’ (Just War Tradition and the Restraint of War: A Moral and Historical Inquiry
Bainton largely treats justice and holiness in a zero-sum manner: to the degree that a cause was deemed holy, concern for justice faded. Johnson is far more sophisticated and nuanced. He says the ‘holy war doctrine’ grew out of ‘classic just war doctrine’ and then promoted war through ‘religious sanctions only’. This stream of holy war thinking became sickly and mostly died out within Christendom. Just war developed and grew into the ‘just war doctrine of international law’.34 Both Bainton and Johnson argue that many bellicose Puritans had a strong holy war, or crusading, bent.35 For Johnson, William Gouge was important. This Westminster divine represented the pinnacle of holy war thought: ‘if “complete” holy war doctrine is anywhere to be found... it is perhaps in the treatise of William Gouge’.36 Johnson distinguishes between thinkers like Gouge and those who actually fought—arguing the Puritan Revolution should not be considered a holy war or crusade.37

Other equally-serious scholars, though noting Gouge’s pervasive use of Scripture and theology, argue that he remained firmly within the just war tradition. For example, Barbara Donagan argues that

[T]he precepts and distinctions offered by the modern theorists on grounds for a just war, or treatment of prisoners, or division of spoils did not differ substantively from those of traditional and religious mentors such as the ministers William Gouge or Richard Bernard.38

If one were to peel away the theological language, we might find an argument that sounds uncomfortably modern. Similarly, Matthew Muehlbauer notes Gouge’s intent: he ‘was not so much endorsing holy war as offering spiritual reassurance that war, conducted in a lawful manner, would not bring divine displeasure upon Christians’.39

---

34. Ibid., 25.


36. Ibid., 117.

37. Ibid., 134–46.


Gouge’s text itself, *The Churches Conquest Over the Sword*, provides ample support for the opposite conclusions reached by Johnson and Donagan / Muehlbauer. This disagreement is indicative of the larger endeavour to bifurcate unrestrained and irrational holy war, crusade or religious war on the one hand from rationally restrained just war or secular war on the other.

Similarly, Rachel Foxley reevaluates a ‘prime exemplar’ of religiously motivated fighting—‘Oliver Cromwell himself’. She argues that he ‘held out against the notion that resistance on grounds of religion could be legitimate’. A war’s spiritual significance needed to be brought about by God and it complemented (‘by way of redundancy’—to quote Cromwell) the just cause. She cautions against misunderstanding his reasons for war by being distracted by his ‘obsessively providentialist view of the war’. The examples of Gouge and Cromwell evidence the need to seriously consider beliefs about politics and justice in the minds of those thought to advocate ‘religious war’.

On the other side, many scholars background or ignore comments about holiness made by advocates of ‘just war’. For example, Jill Lepore elevates Samuel Nowell as her just war exemplar by pulling the very present Grotian needle out of the biblical haystack. Similarly, Roger Williams is best known for his voluminous work promoting freedom of conscience, toleration and disclaiming Christian religious war. He charged that ‘all pretend an *Holy War*.... He that *kills*, and he that’s *killed*, they both cry out, It is for *God*, and for their *Conscience*’. Williams, however, cautiously and critically supported all five wars considered in this thesis because he considered them to be, for the most part, just. He once said ‘I never was agst the righteous use of the Civil sword of Men or ⟨Nations ⟩’. His use of ‘righteous’ shows how a just cause stood in relation


43. ‘Roger Williams to the General Court of Massachusetts Bay’ (5 Oct 1654), Williams, *Corr.* II:408–16.
to God. Similarly, prominent just war theorists, like Hugo Grotius in *De jure belli ac pacis*, frequently related holiness, justice and killing. The ‘note on the text’ in a recent Cambridge edition of this work says: ‘Grotius shows his prowess as a theologian by proving the compatibility of warfare (i.e. of just warfare) with the New Testament.... This has been omitted’ from the present edition.\(^{44}\)

This brief discussion of Gouge, Cromwell, Nowell, Williams and Grotius makes a simple point: early modern ‘just war’ thinking was usually more ‘religious’ than some indicate, and early modern ‘holy war’ thinking was usually more concerned with justice than others acknowledged. Rather than pitting the theories against each other, the chapters that follow show some of the overlap and interplay between justice and holiness in the minds of partisans. David Smith notes of the moderate parliamentarian, Benjamin Rudyerd, that his

\[\text{religious, political and personal motives were analytically distinct but they cannot be fully understood in isolation from each other. This in turn suggests the fundamental — and psychologically plausible — conclusion than an individual with several reasons for doing something is even more likely to do it than someone with only one reason.}\(^{45}\)

In the English Civil Wars, as argued by Barbara Donagan, ‘The law of God and the secular law of nature and nations converged, and together they had long been deployed in support of righteous violence’.\(^{46}\) The godly thought it was possible to have a war that was robustly just and holy. ‘Godly violence’ is the term I have chosen for this belief.

If the use of Scripture and theology in seventeenth-century warfare is to be understood, scholars must treat it as the rule, not the exception. This then allows one to differentiate between its various uses. ‘Christendom’, according to Mark Noll, ‘represented an ideal of civilization marked by the thorough intermingling of religion with everything else’.\(^{47}\) Part of ‘everything else’ was the regrettable reality of conflict

\[\text{\textendash}\]


and, in extreme circumstances, warfare. God was present on the battlefield because he was, in some way, present everywhere. This was particularly true when church and state were legally connected, as Christopher Hill summarised: ‘religion became politics, with the Bible as text book for both’.\(^48\) Two other broadly-accepted convictions undergirded the ubiquitous use of religious language: beliefs concerning the nature of violence were rooted in beliefs about human nature. Both were inextricably linked with Scripture, theology and the nature of God.

First, the nature of violence itself was significant. Jill Lepore notes that warfare, by its very nature, produces language that grapples with meaning: ‘War twice cultivates language: it requires justification, it demands description’.\(^49\) The struggle for military hegemony was intimately tied with the contested meaning of violence. All of seventeenth-century life was infused with transcendent meaning. This was particularly true of warfare.\(^50\) Meaning, however, was ambiguous and volatile—inspiring some of humanity’s greatest and worst acts. Meaningless and meaningful violence are both unsettling. The lone wolf with no apparent motive terrifies at least as much as the one who clearly articulates repulsive motivations. Violence and meaning usually go together—whether one is advocating or protesting it.

Second, there was another link between theology and killing. Janet Jakobsen, when arguing that secularism is more violent than religion, says ‘religion and secularism are intertwined, and they are intertwined specifically at the point of legitimating violence’.\(^51\) There is something about killing a human that ties theories of justice with beliefs about what is sacred. This was particularly true for seventeenth-century Christians who believed persons were God’s creations and endowed with eternal souls.\(^52\) Because of this, invoking God when discussing killing—in


\(^{52}\) Although the Puritans are well known for speaking of the ruin of the image of God due to sin, they also thought remnants of it existed, thus proscribing murder. On John Calvin’s complex views, see J. Van
commendation or condemnation—was normative.

(c) Post-Reformation Warfare
Post-Reformation conflict provides an important backdrop to Puritan warfare. Many scholars have questioned the simplistic categorisation of these conflicts as ‘religious’ wars or argued for a complex understanding of them.53 Two major changes prompted sixteenth and seventeenth-century theorists to re-examine the relationship between Christianity and violence: Schism within Christendom and encounters with new peoples. Notable persons who addressed this topic include Desiderius Erasmus, Martin Luther, Bartolomé de las Casas, Francisco de Vitoria, Heinrich Bullinger, John Calvin, Lancelot Andrewes, Francis Bacon, Hugo Grotius, William Ames, Thomas Barnes and William Gouge. Although different in emphasis, they all mingled thick appeals to justice with robust claims about holiness when calling for or critiquing Christian killing.

The Thirty Years War was the most significant foreign conflict for the Puritans. Peter Wilson recently emphasised the role of religion throughout while casting doubt on it as the decisive factor for the majority of partisans.54 This conflict occasioned many influential works on warfare, notably by Thomas Barnes, Francis Bacon and William Gouge.55 Many in England saw the turmoil in Europe as a direct cause of—or in some way connected with—later violence in the British Civil Wars. The Puritan solidification of power roughly coincided with the Peace of Westphalia (1648) that ended the Thirty Years War. Scholars often treat Westphalia as a watershed moment that led to a decline in religious warfare. This presents a simplistic account of change, as argued by David Onnekink. He notes how some scholars treat post-Westphalian wars as religious and others excise religion from discussions of them. Instead of debating the classification of these as ‘wars of religion’, his edited volume is more concerned with the themes of ‘war


53. For perspectives, see the bibliography for works by William T. Cavanaugh, Natalie Zemon Davis, Ian M. Green, Norman Housley, Ephraim Radner, Konrad Repgen and the edited volume by Wolfgang Palaver, Harriet Rudolph and Deitmar Regensburger.


and religion’. 56 Between the Peace of Westphalia and the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), there were significant continuities and discontinuities with the wars that came before. 57 Although wars were increasingly justified and described in this-worldly terms, supernatural claims persisted.

The Thirty Years War is also important for understanding training, tactics and the rules of war. There are well-known links between the British Civil Wars and continental European warfare. Of particular interest are the transatlantic connections. Ronald Karr situates New England warfare in the context of gruesome, costly and often excessive European practices. 58 Combatants were also transatlantic—especially since colonial leaders in the Pequot War trained in Europe. 59 John Underhill is a prime example. Trained in the Netherlands, he went on to lead forces in the Pequot War and served in New Netherlands during Kieft’s War where he reenacted many of the features of the Pequot massacre. 60 These experiences of war would have marked migrant civilian, soldiers and statesman alike.

After the Pequot War, thousands of colonists then returned to England. Many participated in the British Civil Wars or served under the Protectorate. 61 Hugh Peter (who previously served in Holland) and Henry Vane were involved in the Pequot War before rising in prominence in the British Isles. The Restoration gibbet foreclosed participation in King Philip’s War. George Cooke fought in the Pequot War and at Drogheda and Wexford—becoming the military governor of the latter. 62 In the wake of


59. Ibid., 891–93.


Cromwell’s conquests, several New England ministers preached in Ireland and New Englanders governed both Edinburgh and Sterling. Many Pequot War veterans also fought in King Philip’s War four decades later. George Denison fought in the Pequot War, was wounded at Marston Moor and Naseby during the First English Civil War and led forces in King Philip’s War. Veterans of King Philip’s War would then served in the colonial wars of the eighteenth century. This brief sketch evidences the interconnected nature of transatlantic warfare spanning from the decades before the Thirty Years War and into Queen Anne’s War.

(d) Puritan Warfare

The starting point for understanding the modern debate about religion and violence in Puritan warfare is John Morrill’s 1984 essay, ‘The Religious Context of the English Civil War’. Pushing against Whig and Marxist interpretations, he ended with an explosive claim: ‘The English civil war was not the first European revolution, it was the last of the Wars of Religion’. This assertion gained many defenders and detractors and recently occasioned a collection of essays that cover aspects of debate. Morrill has, at many points, provided further clarification. In the 1998 introduction to the second edition of Revolt in the Provinces, he said ‘I wish I had written “not so much the first... as the last...”. That would fulfil the rhetorical expectation of the penultimate sentence and would represent my views more exactly’. In 2011 he argued that in classifying the English Civil Wars as the ‘last of the Wars of Religion’, he was not claiming religion was the only factor or that one could entirely separate religious factors from secular ones.

Several authors use analogies to underscore the role of religion in the early modern world—and each reveals an aspect of the role of Scripture and theology. In 1984 and 2011, Morrill argued that ‘talk of “popery” was not a form of white noise, a constant fuzzy background in the rhetoric and argument of the time against which significant changes in secular thought were taking place’. Religious interpretations were not merely a façade covering secular conflict. Sacred arguments were ‘load-bearing’. Similarly, Mark Noll cautions against seeing Scripture’s ubiquity as ‘wallpaper’. Instead, it ‘should be viewed as a sturdy piece of furniture smack in the middle of the room’. Concerning early modern politics, Kevin Killeen critiques those who see the use of Scripture as ‘biblical Tourette’s syndrome, blurted out without its having much substantive content and without much tonal subtlety’.

In addition to scholarship on religion and violence, this thesis also draws deeply on thematic studies of providence in the seventeenth century—most notably those by Blair Worden, Barbara Donagan, Alexandra Walsham, David Hall and Michael Winship. Also, Nicholas Guyatt’s *Providence and the Invention of the United States* has been particularly helpful in distinguishing between types of providential discourse. This study also leans on biographies that highlight providence and politics. For example, two recent works on John Owen show continuity and change in his providential outlook as he participated in the upheavals of the Civil Wars and Restoration.

__Wars of Religion Revisited__ (Farnham, 2011), 318.
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Rather than looking at godly violence and military providentialism thematically or biographically, this thesis uses a situational case study approach to examine complex and competing providentialisms after decisive victories. The case studies bear witness to the immense energy and creativity that went into their dynamic and richly textured understanding of God and warfare. Providential utterances varied, ranging from academic treatises to quicksilver reactions to the events of the day.

Beliefs about providence were relatively similar across Christian confessions, as noted by Barbara Donagan: ‘Puritan providentialism was doctrinally indistinguishable from Anglican or Catholic’. She continues: ‘The intensity of Puritan providentialism did not... derive from a new or distinctive doctrine. It was Augustinian as well as Calvinist, and Puritan preachers acknowledged it to be so’.\(^{76}\) There were subtle differences in how they held and articulated these shared beliefs. As Mark Noll notes in his discussion of competing providential interpretations in the American Civil War: ‘With these convictions, the chorus, though singing different notes, sang them all in the same way’.\(^{77}\)

Seemingly minor events and beliefs influenced major decisions. As John Morrill demonstrated with Oliver Cromwell, a passage of Scripture, a sermon, a prayer or theological interpretive frame seems to have been a determining factor at pivotal moments in the British Civil Wars. He rightly emphasised the importance of belief-formation: ‘What Cromwell believed may well be less important than how he came to believe it’.\(^{78}\) In 2011 he wrote that much of his scholarship had been a historical ‘exercise in political psychology’.\(^{79}\) With trepidation, this thesis endeavours to follow suit. In each case study, I aim to show what Puritans believed about godly violence and military providentialism, and how they formed some of these beliefs. The attempt is to make their beliefs and actions as comprehensible as possible.\(^{80}\) Since the Puritan grip on power did not last, each chapter briefly discusses how the godly reevaluated providence

---


77. M. Noll, The Civil War as a Theological Crisis (Chapel Hill, 2006), 81.


after the loss of hegemony.

This thesis evidences the complicated relationship between texts, beliefs, circumstances and actions. A major theme throughout is shifting beliefs in war. In the essay ‘Of Atheism’, Francis Bacon noted the dual effect of fighting. Fighting over ‘Religion’ facilitated atheism. Also, ‘troubles and adversities do more bow Mens minds to Religion’. 

In the essay ‘Of Atheism’, Francis Bacon noted the dual effect of fighting. Fighting over ‘Religion’ facilitated atheism. Also, ‘troubles and adversities do more bow Mens minds to Religion’. 

In 1682 John Flavel, the Nonconformist divine, argued that clear thinking was a ‘thousand times harder in the hurries and tumults of fear’. Similarly, according to Thomas Watson, it was easy to remember wrongs suffered and easy to forget the Christian obligation to forgive. When personally wronged, godly ministers frequently decried vengeance as they encouraged forgiveness, forbearance and love of enemies. When the wrong was corporate or political, the response often differed.

Shifting beliefs often went unnoticed. In 1650 Richard Baxter tried to dissuade his countrysmen from war with Scottish Presbyterians. He doubted the power of his words ‘when the dust of Contention is in mens eyes’. 

In King Philip’s War, Daniel Gookin fell under suspicion for advocating restraint towards those considered possible enemies. He noted a change in his fellow countrysmen: ‘but ’tis no strange thing for men’s reason to be darkened, if not almost lost, when the mists of passion and temptation do prevail’. In this war, Algonquian fighters acknowledged their mental shift and ‘Confessed they were in A Strang Way’.

In the very moments when war placed strains on one’s thinking, the godly sensed a unique opportunity to sensing God. Warfare, according to Jeremiah Burroughs

81. F. Bacon, The essays, or councils, civil and moral (London, 1696), 43.
83. T. Watson, A divine cordial, or, The transcendent priviledge of those that love God and are savingly called (London, 1663), 110; cf. idem., Αυταρκεια, or, The art of divine contentment (London, 1654), 7.
86. D. Gookin, Historical account of the doings and sufferings of the Christian Indians, AAS Col. 2, no. 6 (Cambridge, 1836), 470.
87. ‘Roger Williams to [Robert Williams?]’ (1 April 1676), Williams, Corr. II:720–28.
in 1643, was a particularly fertile time for seeing providence. Many of John Owen’s most confident and controversial providential claims, as detailed by Martyn Cowan, came in the context of war. Although Owen once gave caution concerning the near-intoxicating power of providential interpretations, he did this in an attempt to sway detractors towards his side. His providential interpretations left him open to critics who challenged his methods and conclusions.

In addition to changing views about justice and providence, many other beliefs shifted in war. First, there was a turn towards the Hebrew Bible. Second, eschatology grew in importance. Third, the Gospels—along with the example of Christ and his many commands—were largely absent from many warfare sermons, letters, treatises and diaries. Fourth, spiritual warfare was used to justify or describe actual warfare. Fifth, while flagellating themselves as war-provoking sinners, the godly rarely considered sin against their enemy as a cause of God’s anger. Sixth, there was a shift towards confident assertions about God’s activity in the world.

The beliefs analysed throughout were rarely articulated for academic purposes. A pitfall in trying to follow their thinking is to emphasise the brain over the heart. Although the convictions of the godly are studied here, they were first felt, believed and acted upon. Beliefs about the imminence of God and the intimacy of his purposes permeated their writings on war. Most claims about God were heartfelt— emphasising the deeply visceral nature of their words.

The historian has little access to most intimate providential interpretations—the conversations between daughter and father, wife and husband, master and servant, pastor and neighbour, civilian and soldier. Doubtless, the average soldier spoke of God during or after battle. Most words are irretrievable, be they the faint thanksgiving of the victor or the desperate Godward plea of the dying.

Written or printed accounts were often intended to be loving and pastoral. Letters, sermons and even official declarations or histories tried to make the trauma of

war comprehensible. In a very personal letter from Samuel Rutherford to Barbara Hamilton after a son-in-law’s battlefield death, Rutherford comforted her with the knowledge that God ‘was directing the bullet against His servant’.\textsuperscript{92} By embracing God, Puritans faced the world and all its suffering. They wrapped deeply uncomfortable conclusions in the intimate confidence of God’s purposes.

It seems reasonable that many did not want to make sense of war—for they would have preferred peace. The times dictated a duty. As Increase Mather said of a providential ‘warning piece from Heaven’—‘if God Preach, his Ministers should preach too’.\textsuperscript{93} In an autobiographical note, Richard Baxter said ‘Necessity hath been the Conductor of my studies and life:... it chooseth my Text, and makes my Sermon for matter and manner’.\textsuperscript{94} God was already involved in war, and minister’s words—even when they might sound cold or detached—applied cherished beliefs to particular crises. To refuse to help a neighbour see God’s hand was worse than negligent; it was sinful.

(e) Beyond Puritan Hegemony

As Mark Noll notes, the manner by which Puritans acquired and lost power—which differed in Old and New England—profoundly shaped their influence beyond the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{95} In post-Restoration England, political Puritanism was initially discredited and ridiculed as zealously excessive. In modified form, it eventually reentered British politics and undergirded progressive ideas. In the words of Mark Goldie, ‘The Puritan turned Whig. Yet the argument here is that the Whig still contained the Puritan, and that Puritanism remained at the heart of early Whig politics’.\textsuperscript{96} In contrast, colonial hegemony over Native Americans increased—even after the loss of political autonomy in the wake of King Philip’s War. Seventeenth-century providential interpretations of colonial New England grew even as they morphed—nourished by the
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American Revolution, Manifest Destiny, messianic interventionism, scientific racism and determinism, economic affluence, victory in the World Wars, and continued dominance in foreign relations.

With references to beliefs about God, there were discernible changes in thinking between medieval, early modern and modern thinking. ‘The change’, in the words of Barbara Donagan, ‘was glacial rather than volcanic; the old views retreated slowly, leaving deposits and never wholly disappearing’. In *Seers of God* and *The Erosion of Biblical Certainty*, Michael Winship and Michael Lee respectively show how interpretations of providence and views of the Bible began shifting in the latter half of the seventeenth century and more profoundly in the eighteenth. Charles Taylor has similarly traced movement from belief in God as agent to belief in him as architect. Of our current times, Robert Wuthnow notes how, even for Christians, ‘the tacit epistemology of everyday life is quite naturalistic’. This shift influenced language, particularly in war. Although attributing causality to God in warfare was once normative, modern public discourse allows little space for it. In the words of Taylor, whereas talking of causal-connections between sin and misfortune used to be natural, verbalising this connection ‘goes against the grain of the modern identity in a fundamental way’. Someone who believes God acted in war may no longer articulate this belief.

The shift should not be overstated, particularly in the United States. At the national level, church and state formally separated after the American Revolution. The break was not so clean with Christianity and violence. Many historians emphasise the role of religion in later conflict—for example in the American Revolution (James Bell, James Byrd, J. C. D. Clark, Matthew J. Franck, Nicholas Guyatt and Thomas Kidd), Spanish-American War (Matthew McCullough), American Civil War (Mark Noll) and

World War I (Phillip Jenkins).

George McKeans *The Puritan Origins of American Patriotism* and Andrew Preston’s *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith* cover nearly four centuries of American history. Some authors, like Philippe Buc, trace the themes of religion and violence from the early church into the War on Terror.

5. Overview

(a) Limitations

A thesis like this has many limitations. I mention a few here. Focusing on violence draws attention away from individuals and groups who lived with confessional and cultural differences. Wayne P. Te Brake’s new monograph, *Religious War and Religious Peace in Early Modern Europe*, highlights often-successful attempts to accommodate differences between 1529 and 1651. This thesis on godly violence omits many of the contributions of Christianity, particularly in relation to the idea of freedom, dignity and rights. In ‘The Roots of Religious Freedom in Early Christian Thought’, Timothy Samuel Shah balanced the contributions and culpability of Christians. In focusing on benefits, he did not intend to ‘diminish the historical guilt of Christianity.... or exaggerate Christianity’s contribution to freedom and liberalism’. Rather he wanted to have the Christian contribution ‘set alongside’ the well-known stories of complicity in violence and persecution. ‘This other story’, he argues, ‘in no way cancels out or even qualifies the record of Christian cruelties’. This thesis focuses on the bellicose streak in Puritanism. Puritans also made contributions to the language of sympathy, the project of irenicism and debates over toleration. These complicated stories are not told here.

102. See works in the bibliography.


Additionally, a detailed assessment of Puritan theology is absent. This lacuna exists for three reasons. First, space constraints. Second, far too many scriptural texts and theological themes were used to justify or describe warfare in this period. For example, one single verse—called by David Hume ‘the famous curse of Meroz’ (Judg 5:23)—is the subject of a lengthy article.108 Without giving a comprehensive account of how Puritans employed Meroz’ curse, this thesis showcases its use in each case study. Third, Puritan theology fragmented over the period. Both victory and defeat facilitated this splintering. ‘Puritanism’ in the words of John Morrill, ‘both triumphed and disintegrated in the English Revolution’.109 The Westminster Assembly of Divines, as noted by Chad Van Dixhoorn, experienced a similar rise and decline:

It was an hour of glory for the puritan experiment…. It has often been said that the godly were unified in times of opposition, but could not survive the experience of power….. [H]owever, the minutes of the assembly suggest that it was not a taste of power that ruined them but the fear that they had so little power at all.110

Given the political and religious fragmentation, one sub-theme in this thesis is that there was no authoritative interpretation of victory. Each victory might be viewed radially—spawning an increasing number of interpretations that often pointed in opposite directions.

Third, classical sources, though cited profusely by the godly, are rarely analysed here. As Kevin Killeen has recently argued, the Bible was considered authoritative and relevant to a degree unmatched by other ancient sources.111

Fourth, I could have arranged this thesis thematically or biographically. For example, instead of detailing providential beliefs as they arise in each case study, I could have organised each chapter around a theme—charting continuity and change.

---
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over time. Similarly, I could have framed it around a transatlantic figure like Roger Williams. I chose the case study approach because it allowed each conflict to be considered on its own terms. This facilitated a more meaningful cross-conflict examination of godly violence and military providentialism.

Fifth, this thesis focuses mainly on the beliefs and actions of groups. Killing in response to crime, witchcraft or heresy—as well as individualised acts like assassination or iconoclasm—are not the focus. Although all killing is personal, this thesis mainly examines group dynamics.

Finally, the godly had many enemies and these five case studies only detail a sliver of their warfare theology. It covers a mere five days in the life of Puritanism—and the theological aftershocks of those pivotal days. In the British Civil Wars, there were at least ‘463 military clashes in which one or more persons was killed’. Doubtless, some conclusions about godly violence and military providentialism may have differed slightly had I undertaken other case studies: if, for example, chapter three centred on the siege of Basing House, Marston Moor or Langport instead of Naseby. Another tempting road not taken was an examination of decisive defeats. Although many defeats—and the theological reactions to them—are referenced throughout, this study focuses on victories. I picked decisive victories in these five conflicts. These comprised three attacks on armed settlements (Mystic Massacre, Drogheda and the Great Swamp Fight) and two set-piece battles (Naseby and Dunbar). New England warfare differed from its European counterpart—particularly because there were no set-piece battles in either the Pequot War or King Philip’s War. This made examining different types of victory, to some degree, unavoidable. Finally, additional insights into military providentialism during the age of Puritan hegemony would have come from examining conflict with other European powers (on the continent, open seas or in the colonies)—particularly the French, Dutch and Spanish in the 1650s.

(b) Shape

This thesis tells the story of military providentialism in the Puritan Atlantic world by


113. See the bibliography for works by Karen Ordahl Kupperman, Carla Gardina Pestana, Steven Pincus, L.H. Roper and David L. Smith.
looking at case studies that span the rise and fall of Puritan hegemony. The story of Puritan hegemony differs from the story of Puritan theology—the latter enjoying a much larger and longer influence. These five case studies are framed around dawn, day and dusk. This illustrates another sub-theme: Puritan military providentialism was influenced by whether they thought they were entering the light, passing into unparalleled brightness or grasping at former glory. Although they frequently used the language of light and darkness, this is just one of many ways they communicated beliefs about God, power and killing.

It is clear that godly hegemony waxed and waned. The godly themselves sensed this—and this perception influenced beliefs. They constructed narratives about the past, present and future; imbedding decisive victories within these narratives. The meaning of victory, in turn, informed their understanding of history. They also constructed narratives about the religious ‘other’—be they Scottish Presbyterians, royalist Episcopalians, Irish Catholics or Native American.

In addition to the frequent use of the light metaphor—as evidenced in the case studies—their theology changed over the period. For example, eschatology (often using imagery of light and darkness) was insignificant in the Pequot War, marginal after Naseby and prominent in Drogheda and Dunbar. The ever-present eschatology of King Philip’s War was shorn of confident optimism.

Dawn. An almost imperceptible dawn broke on godly hegemony when, in 1620, Separatist Pilgrims established a fledgeling colony at Plymouth in New England. Looking back from an ‘[eclip]st’ state in the mid 1670s, Philip Walker idealised ‘owr Light ffom Sixtene hundrd twenty’. Owing to the inauspicious and precarious nature of their undertaking, few Pilgrims in 1620 would have thought of this as a new dawn. America was a refuge and an opportunity. It was a unique environment where the godly could live out their covenant obligations to God and to each other. Sixteen years later, after waves of mostly Puritan immigrants arrived in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, the colonies engaged in their first full-scale war against the Pequot (chapter two). Drawing on familiar sources that have not been considered in relation to the war, this chapter argues that—even in massacring civilians at Mystic—most thought their actions

accorded with received standards of justice and with God’s will. This chapter argues that escalating cycles of violence deepened the sense that the cause was both just and holy. In the minds of the Puritans, grave and unremedied Pequot crimes justified war against combatants—and against all who obstinately harboured them. Victory seemed to confirm the special place of New England in God’s plan of redemption. Providential interpretations were shaped by the perception that this was an international conflict against those outside Christendom. Decades of increasing power confirmed and expanded providential interpretations.

With the outbreak of the First English Civil War, many sensed a dawning redemption for England. Parliament gained concessions from Charles I in the early 1640s. Still, the future seemed murky at best. Written in 1642 and published in England in 1650, the New England poet Anne Bradstreet assured the mother country that ‘now the Sun in’s brightnesse shall appear’ and there will be a happy resolution. After possible war with the Dutch, she foresaw a godly march against ‘Rome’ and ‘Turky’ until ‘No Canaanite shall then be found ith’ land’.  

Although some in England saw the light, it was unclear if it was the sunrise or sunset. In 1643, George Wither penned the following lines, unaware of which course the war would take:

Ah me! why was I borne  
So late? or why so soone?  
To see so bright, so cleare a Morne,  
So black an Afternoone?  

Into this struggle towards the light, the battle of Naseby in 1645 proved pivotal (chapter three). According to Joshua Sprigg in Anglia rediviva (1647), the formation of the New Model Army was like the ‘the Sun at its first rising [that] is clouded with some smal Mist’. A few months later ‘the victorious Beams of this Rising Sun brake forth so gloriously at Naseby field’. Although the struggle continued until the execution of Charles I in 1649, Naseby made a robust godly hegemony in England seem probable—

and indeed for many, providentially inevitable. They sealed their hegemony with the blood of their sovereign. Providential interpretations of Naseby were influenced by the fact that it was a civil war fought against enemies who were within the fold of Christendom. However, after the Restoration, providential interpretation of Naseby had to be revised—sometimes with hammer and chisel.

Day. After the execution of Charles I, English Independents entered the blazing daylight. Due to increased fragmentation, fewer ‘godly’ persons basked in the sun. As the godly splintered, this thesis will mainly follow the English Independents. Chapters four (Drogheda) and five (Dunbar) evidence providential interpretations that were often creative, bold, assertive, self-confident and aggressive. With providence urging them on, the godly undertook the subjugation of Ireland. The siege of Drogheda, followed by that of Wexford, decisively swung power towards the godly. This victory over Irish Catholics was also a judgment on royalists who refused to bend the knee under the providential dispensations of the previous decade. Although godly power over the Irish waned with the Restoration, English Protestant power over them did not. As a result, there was less of a need for a providential revision.

A year after Drogheda, Cromwell led forces north of the Tweed. Two godly, largely-undefeated armies came to blows at the battle of Dunbar (chapter five). As Parliament’s forces wasted away in Scotland, Peter Sterry said ‘the sun seemed to be gone backeward upon our dyall’. Dunbar reversed this. There the English Independent vision triumphed over that of the Scottish Covenanters. Like Christ rising from the dead, John Canne preached, ‘so this righteous Cause... shall rise, and shine as the Sun’. Theological similarities between opponents impact this study of military providentialism, as does the fact that English Protestant power over Covenanter Scotland largely continued after the Restoration. It was during this time of daylight that the godly gained power over England’s colonies and fought with several European powers—with some even advocating a march on Rome.

Dusk. For the author of A Lamenting word (1657), from Naseby into the Anglo-Dutch wars, God was ‘leading us on from one degree of light to another’. Now ‘he is departed from us, and hath left us in the Wildernesse to be scattered in the darknesses,

118. ‘Peter Sterry to Oliver Cromwell’ (9 Sept 1650), Letters to Cromwell, 18–19.

119. J. Canne, Emanuel, or, God with us (London, 1650), preface.
dreams and devices that we have chosen’. Oliver Cromwell, perhaps, sensed encroaching darkness after failure at Hispaniola forced him to think more cautiously about providence. On 12 September 1654, an exasperated Cromwell rebuked Parliament with imagined words from future Englishmen: ‘We hoped for light, and behold darkness, obscure darkness!’

Godly hegemony in the British Isles did not come to an end on the battlefield. Cromwell’s death exacerbated fault lines within the government and populace, eventually leading to the Restoration of the Stuarts. At the opening of the second half of *Paradise Lost*, Milton wrote of being ‘fall’n on evil dayes’ and of ‘darkness, and with dangers compast round’. The godly had to reconcile the belief that God never changed with a world where change seemed the rule. Now marginalised, they reinterpreted the past and their role in the present. Complex providentialism undergirded hope precisely because God would stay true to his word—in mercy and judgement. As Thomas Watson wrote in 1663, ‘when our outward comforts are declining, and it is almost Sun-setting, God often causeth a revival, and the Sun many degrees backward’. However, the godly would never again have such power in the British Isles.

The British Civil Wars diminished the importance of New England colonies; The Restoration of the Stuarts turned them into a scarce resource. This ‘shock’, in the words of Stephen Carl Arch, ‘jolt[ed] Massachusetts into a conception of itself, after 1660, as the last, isolated outpost of light in a world of darkness’. New Englanders sensed a precarious grip on daylight. In 1662, Michael Wigglesworth versified this feeling in *God’s Controversy with New-England*. They experienced light ‘all day long’ with ‘no night at all’ and ‘Yea many thought the light would last, / And be perpetuall’. ‘But,
Loe!’, it was not to be: ‘The brightest of our morning starrs / Did wholly disappeare’. 127

King Philip’s War (chapter six) was the swan song of political Puritanism. In 1676, in the midst of the war, Increase Mather wrote in fear of the ‘great darkness’ that ‘hath followed’ God’s removal of the godly ‘stars’ of the first generation from the earth. 128 Victory proved pyrrhic. Stuart-controlled England finally subdued the godly colonies—something attempted since before the Pequot War. Although godly hegemony declined in the decades after King Philip’s War, providential interpretations were confirmed and expanded. Even as their power of self-determination waned, power over Native Americans grew. The next century saw major shifts in religious and political beliefs. By the time autonomy was restored at the American Revolution, New England had moved on from seventeenth-century-style political Puritanism.

(c) Contribution

This is the first comprehensive study of the providence surrounding these decisive victories. In the case of Naseby, Dunbar and Drogheda, none have given a detailed study of providentialism. Most historical accounts, if theology is considered in detail, only interact with beliefs before or during the fighting. Additionally, limiting the scope to eyewitnesses or persons in political power, as many historians do, ignores most of the theological interpretations. Scholars have neglected the theological fallout from these decisive victories. With the Pequot War and King Philip’s War, scholars have paid careful attention to the theology, using a wide range of sources. Although considering these in light of a few new sources, the primary contribution of these chapters is to compare the theology of killing Native Americans with the theology of killing Scottish Presbyterians, Irish Catholics and royalist Episcopalians. These cross-conflict case studies facilitate many comparisons, some of which are explored in the concluding chapter. The conclusion (chapter seven) makes two contributions. First, it argues for a deeper understanding of the way in which Scripture and providence functioned in conflict. Second, it argues for a new understanding of the relationship between justice and holiness in conflict.

127 M. Wigglesworth, God’s Controversy with New-England (1662). This anxious experience of divine favour was there for many from the start, as evidenced by Thomas Tillam’s poem, ‘Uppon the first sight of New England’ (29 June 1638), John Davis Papers, 1627–1846 (MHS Ms. N-1097.4c).

128 I. Mather, An Earnest Exhortation To the Inhabitants of New England (Boston, 1676), 10.
6. Victims and Godly Warriors

The New Testament prepared Christians for persecution and abuse. As claimed in a preface to John Cotton’s sermons, ‘All Christophers that have taken up Christ on the shoulders of their Faith, must wade through a Sea of afflictions, disgraces, oppositions, Persecutions’.\(^{129}\) The godly could respond to this victimisation in many ways. For Roger Williams, victimisation drove him towards Christ. Although he supported military causes he considered just, he frequently advocated mercy by invoking Christ crucified. He found himself at odds with many of his coreligionists. When they reverted to the Hebrew Bible in order to justify violence, he forcefully questioned whether they had reversed the incarnation, ‘denying of the Lord Jesus, the great Messiah, to be yet come?’\(^{130}\) As will be shown in the case studies, the godly strongly inclined towards the warlike sections of Hebrew Bible when justifying or describing killing. They also preferred Revelation’s conquering Christ to the sacrificial lamb of the gospels. This had significant implications for their use of Scripture in war.

When the godly marched into battle, they went armed with a deep and abiding sense of victimisation. Across the case studies, there were similarities and differences in how they formed, nurtured, articulated and debated this belief. It was largely inconceivable that both sides might have grounds for viewing their cause as just. The sense of victimisation was similar. Self-identification as a victim facilitated viewing the outsider as an unadulterated perpetrator, thus drowning out mutual wrongs. Although they often had good reasons to view themselves as victims, this thesis recounts the ways in which they acted on that belief.

The godly in the transatlantic world were victims and made victims. Denial of the former renders their actions and beliefs in war incomprehensible. Denial of the latter washes their history of its darker elements. We must understand why and how they saw their actions: not as encroaching shadows but as the inbreaking of shafts of light.\(^{131}\) Telling both stories together, to borrow a phrase from Daniel Richter, allows for a

\(^{129}\)M. Swallowe, ‘To the Christian Reader’, in John Cotton, God’s mercie mixed with His justice (London, 1641), sig [A4r].


‘much more complicated, much more interesting, much more revealing, if no less tragic, tale’.  

Before the godly struck soldier and civilian at Mystic; before they loosed their fury on women at Naseby; before they decimated those captured at Drogheda; before they conquered and demonised brethren at Dunbar and before they preemptively massacred neutrals at the Great Swamp, they believed they had been wronged. Before they were victors, they viewed themselves as victims—and this is one key to understanding godly violence.

---

2. Mystic Massacre (1637): ‘Divine Slaughter by the Hand of the English’

1. Introduction

Violence evangelised the first Pequot. The decisive moment was the Mystic Massacre of 1637. Wequash changed sides before the massacre; he converted because of it. By the time of *New Englands First Fruits* (1643), he was already ‘that famous Indian’. This tract, as summarised by Kristina Bross, was ‘the first salvo against charges that New England did nothing to spread the gospel’.  

It recounted the conversion:

[S]eeing and beholding the mighty power of God in our English Forces, how they fell upon the *Pequits*, where divers hundreds of them were slaine in an houre: The Lord, as a God of glory in great terrour did appeare unto the Soule and Conscience of this poore Wretch [Wequash] in that very act; and though before that time he had low apprehensions of our God, having conceived him to be (as he said) but a *Musketto* God or a God like unto a flye... yet from that time he was convinced and perswaded that our God was a most dreadfull God; and that one *English* man by the help of his God was able to slay and put to flight an hundred *Indian* [Lev 26:8; Deut 32:30].

The exiled Roger Williams, who knew Wequash longer than others, doubted his regeneration. As Laura M. Stevens put it, there was a ‘competition for ownership of Wequash’s conversion’.

This foxhole narrative speaks volumes about godly beliefs—especially what they thought their killing should accomplish. In all five case studies, some targets of godly violence changed forces or faiths. By modifying allegiance, they confirmed righteousness. In the Pequot War, Wequash was Exhibit A. Because God embedded his will in events, the vanquished should have listened. To the frustration of the godly, the sun that melted also hardened, and there was far less wax than clay.


The Pequot War (1636–1638) was the first major campaign undertaken by the godly in the Puritan Atlantic world. It was a decisive victory. Previous accounts of the war, though mentioning providence throughout, have not provided a thorough analysis. This chapter focuses on how beliefs were formed and articulated, paying close attention to discourses of providence, justice and holiness. It shows how the English temporarily warmed up to the idea of controlling, killing and enslaving Algonquians. At centre stage is the Mystic Massacre (26 May 1637)—an event that was viewed as both an act of war and a legal prosecution.

2. Prelude to the Pequot War

As the 1630s wore on, the godly in New England braced for war. They feared aggressive forces in Old England and Europe—not mainly Algonquian neighbours. Colin G. Calloway described the ‘diplomatic landscape’ closer to home as ‘a kaleidoscope of shifting relationships where different Indian communities, nations, and confederacies pursued their own foreign policies’. As with Europeans, ‘Relations with any one group could affect relations with the others’. The Narragansett, Mohegan and Pequot were vital. They formed part of the Algonquian linguistic group. Plagues decimated native populations and redrafted power-relations. There were also many English communities (Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth, Saybrook and Connecticut), as well as Dutch and French traders.


The Dutch traded with the Pequot from the early 1620s and proved unpredictable and demanding. To provide satisfactory Wampum, the Pequot subjugated their neighbours and demanded tribute—further destabilising the region. The slow growth of Plymouth and rapid expansion of Massachusetts Bay challenged rising Dutch hegemony. In the 1630s Algonquian tribes had several potential European buyers. In June of 1633, the Dutch solidified control of trade with the Pequot who allowed them to establish a trading post named Good Hope in the Connecticut Valley. The English protested and Plymouth built a post further up the river.  

A decisive moment came in 1633 when the Dutch captured Tatobem, the Pequot Grand-Sachem. They accused him of treaty violations. ‘The Pequots promptly sent payment for Tatobem’s release to the House of Good Hope. They received his corpse in return’. Unable to differentiate between Europeans, the Pequot killed Captain John

---


141 A. Cave, ‘Who Killed John Stone? A Note on the Origins of the Pequot War’, *The William and Mary*
Stone, an Englishman. Stone was a notoriously problematic colonist whose death seemed God-wrought. At this point, ‘Puritan New England clearly had no intention of going to war over’ his death. After this retaliation, the Pequot tried to reestablish trade at Good Hope. The Dutch, however, killed another sachem. Concurrent with spiralling trade hostilities, a new wave of plague upset the power balance. The Pequot populations may have declined by eighty percent. Formerly subjugated neighbours acted on this fortuitous turn.

Colonists knew far more about the Dutch than the Pequot. Kristina Bross recently situated the Pequot War against the 1623 Amboyna massacre of the English by the Dutch, noting that killed (Amboyna) or killing (Mystic), the English thought they were victims. Before the Stone affair, the English were barely aware of the Pequot. On 12 March 1631, Thomas Dudley (later Governor of Massachusetts Bay) wrote of the Pequot as a distant people. He gave no hint that he perceived them as warlike or hostile. The map in William Wood’s *New Englands Prospect* (1634) did not include them, and his written descriptions were positive. He was less sparing when describing other tribes like the Mohawk. At the time of Wood’s writing, some Englishmen had heard other rumours concerning the Pequot. As Alden Vaughan notes, ‘Wood seems to have been unaware of that reputation’.

It is common to argue that the English planned the extermination of the Pequot.

---

One should differentiate between the classification of the war as genocide and claims about premeditated genocide.\textsuperscript{151} Drew Lopenzina exemplifies the latter:

In a journal passage of 1633, one can almost see the gears turning in [John] Winthrop’s head as he notes of Pequot land that ‘there they had stores of the best wampum-peak, both white and blue. The Indians there are very treacherous people.’ It would not be a mischaracterization to replace the period between these two sentences with an = sign.

Like a philosopher with his stone, Lopenzina extracted ‘deliberate genocide’ from these base materials.\textsuperscript{152} The beliefs expressed in these ‘two sentences’ could also have led Winthrop to cultivate good trade relations with the Pequot or to ignore them entirely. It is not surprising that Lopenzina’s account straightened the spiral of violence and offered simplistically implausible motivations for massacre. He claims the godly wanted the Mystic Massacre to be ‘forgotten’ because they were troubled by their actions.\textsuperscript{153} Yet it was the Puritans themselves who argued it was sinful to forget God’s mercies at Mystic.

As James Axtell argues, the ‘vast majority of settlers had no interest in killing Indians... and those who did took careful aim at temporary political or military enemies’.\textsuperscript{154} ‘The New England Colonies’, in the words of Allan Greer,

were not conquest regimes in quite the same way that New Spain was. Puritans did not enter the region waging offensive war and they did not usually rely heavily on the concept of ‘conquest’ to elaborate and justify colonial order.\textsuperscript{155}

Why, in particular, did they conquer from 1636–1638 and 1675–1676? Taking a cue from Margaret Ellen Newell’s work on shifting English beliefs about Algonquian slavery, we must understand how the Pequot War became a war of extirpation.\textsuperscript{156}

\textsuperscript{151} For classification as genocide, see the bibliography for works by Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn, Laurence M. Hauptman, Ben Kiernan and Benjamin Madley. Against such classification, see the work of Steven T. Katz.


\textsuperscript{153} Lopenzina, \textit{Red Ink}, 78.


\textsuperscript{155} A. Greer, \textit{Property and Dispossession: Natives, Empires and Land in Early Modern North America} (Cambridge, 2018), 200.

\textsuperscript{156} M.E. Newell, \textit{Brethren By Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American...
English attitudes towards Algonquians went through three important—though somewhat overlapping—phases: ambivalence (settlement–Pequot War), expectation (fueled by missionary zeal in the 1640s–early-1670s) and disillusionment (during and after King Philip’s War). Some scholars consider large-scale Anglo-Algonquian conflict (and English victory) to have been nearly inevitable. The example of relations on Martha’s Vineyard, however, shows paths not taken. Additionally, some colonists asserted that the two groups could coexist. In Roger Williams’ words from 1654, it might be ‘not only possible but very easie for the English to live and die in peace with all the Natives of this ⟨Countrey⟩’.

A double blow hit the Pequot and jeopardised their independence: shambolic relations with the Dutch and the effects of plague. The English suddenly became a valuable asset. They established contact on 6 November 1634. The murder of Stone stood in the way. The Pequot messengers asserted that: (1) the responsible sachem was killed by the Dutch; (2) pox killed all but two of those involved; (3) they would, ‘if they were worthy of death move their sachem to have them delivered’; (4) Stone was kidnapping natives when he was killed. John Winthrop appears to have found these arguments compelling. His journal shows he no longer believed Stone’s death was unprovoked. As was common in legal proceedings, a trial was considered necessary—even if only to confirm innocence. From Winthrop’s perspective, the English reached an agreement with them. The Pequot would (1) turn over Stone’s murderers; (2) surrender up Connecticut; and (3) make proper material restitution. The English would ‘be at

---

157. Although the three phases are not clearly delineated, many works note similar transitions (e.g. J.E. Chaplin, Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500–1676 [Cambridge, 2001]).

158. See James Drake’s critique of this (King Philip’s War: Civil War in New England, 1675–1676 [Amherst, 1999], 3).


161. ‘Roger Williams to the General Court of Massachusetts Bay’ (5 Oct 1654), Williams, Corr. II:408–16.
peace’ with the Pequot and trade ‘as friends’. They would not, however, bind themselves to protect the Pequot against the Narragansett. Shortly after this meeting the colonists helped broker peace between the two tribes.\textsuperscript{162}

Although the English believed they entered into a treaty, the Pequot insisted it was never ratified.\textsuperscript{163} Part of the problem stemmed from misunderstanding Algonquian power relations. Many compared sachems to European monarchs.\textsuperscript{164} However, his or her power largely rested on the ability to win the favour of lesser sachems. A single Algonquian group, the Pequot, had twenty-six prominent sachems (all but two would be killed by war’s end).\textsuperscript{165}

The war, as Alfred Cave noted, ‘originated in a misunderstanding over retribution’. The English still demanded the surrender of Stone’s killers. The clergy, it seems, pressed the issue. Although the Pequot may have thought they atoned for Stone’s death through infrajudicial wampum payments, the English did not consider the matter resolved without a trial.\textsuperscript{166}

Yasuhide Kawashima has argued that, in cases of homicide, it was not a clash between astute legal Europeans and lawless natives. It was a ‘Clash of Legal Cultures’.\textsuperscript{167} When the English resorted to coercion, in the words of Adam J. Hirsch, a clash of ‘military cultures’ followed.\textsuperscript{168} Both of these clashes fueled the belief that the Pequot were illegitimate aggressors.

\textsuperscript{162}Winthrop, \textit{Journal}, 62–63, 74–76; Cave, \textit{Pequot War}, 69–76. Winthrop states the Pequot offered ‘to yield up Connecticut’—likely meaning they would allow the English to live or trade there.

\textsuperscript{163}Cave, \textit{Pequot War}, 98. See also H. Vane and J. Winthrop, ‘Commission and Instructions from the Colony of Massachusetts Bay to John Winthrop Jr., for Treating with the Pequots’ (4 July 1636), \textit{WP III:284–65}.
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3. Escalating Tension; Expanding Guilt

Anglo-Pequot and Anglo-Dutch conflict became more likely when settlers flowed into Connecticut in 1635–1636.¹⁶⁹ Those moving to Connecticut were authorised to take measures in a ‘defensive warr, (if the need so require)’¹⁷⁰ War with the natives did not seem a primary concern. One year and a day before the English massacred the Pequot at Mystic, the Massachusetts General Court deferred ‘all military affaires till the nexte General Court’.¹⁷¹

A letter dated 18 June 1636 from Jonathan Brewster to John Winthrop Jr. stoked fears. It detailed Pequot plans to attack vessels and recounted one providential deliverance from their malicious designs.¹⁷² The English believed and acted on this information. The claims, however, were ground in Uncas’ rumour mill. He was Sachem of the Mohegan, and it would not be the last time he stirred up the English against his enemies.¹⁷³ According to Julie Fisher and David Silverman, the war, ‘in all its phases, was an outgrowth of indigenous politics’. They reorientate the conflict to ‘an indigenous perspective’ and suggest ‘that it was the colonies who joined the Narragansetts and the Mohegans in their ongoing struggles with the Pequots’.¹⁷⁴

In early July 1636, Massachusetts Bay sent an ultimatum demanding the surrender of Stone’s murders. It was not too late for the Pequot to ‘cleare themselves’ of an ever-increasing list of offences. They told the Pequot that ‘it is not the Manner of the English to take revenge of Injuries untill the Partys that are guilty have been called to answer fairly for themselves’. Around this time the English met with the them at Saybrook. John Winthrop Jr. was commissioned to confront the Pequot on several matters: the broken treaty, their failure to turn over those who shed English blood, inadequate payment of wampum and rumoured attacks. Rather ominously, the instructions record that if individual murders were not turned over, then the Pequot

collectively become ‘a People guilty of English Blood’. Winthrop Jr. was authorised to return the Wampum given by the Pequot. Deprived of the normal legal procedures, the English would ‘hold ourselves free from any league or peace with them and shall revenge the blood of our Countrimen as occasion shall serve’.175

Lion Gardiner, who was in charge of the Saybrook garrison located near the Pequot, disagreed with the way Massachusetts Bay destabilised the region. At the request of the Pequot, he cautiously sent a trading vessel along the Pequot River. The crew disobeyed his orders and went ashore in search of promised horses. Upon entering a wigwam, an Englishman startled the inhabitants. The English interpreted the scared reaction as a warning of grave danger. Misunderstanding the situation, they fled.176

In this climate of fear, the region seemed like a tinderbox. Algonquians put a spark this. The catalyst that made armed confrontation more likely was the gruesome death of John Oldham. On the 20 July 1636, John Gallop discovered Oldham’s ship anchored along Block Island. Natives were onboard.177 They had butchered Captain Oldham and taken his children captive. They seem to have blamed Oldham for bringing plague to the region.178

The Narragansett chief Sachem, Canonicus, promised retribution against his tributaries—the Block Islanders. Further examination complicated guilt. It appeared that other Narragansett sachems were complicit in Oldham’s murder, possibly as retaliation for trading with the Pequot. Sensing a complex situation with the Narragansett, John Winthrop urged Roger Williams to keep a cautious eye on them. Oldham’s children and some of his stolen goods were returned. Winthrop demanded the surrender of any remaining murderers.179

The Pequot also came under suspicion. According to Roger Williams, they claimed a ‘witch among them’ would sink English ships by drilling holes underneath...
them.\textsuperscript{180} Now rumours circulated—furthered by both Englishmen and Indians—that the Pequot sheltered murderers. This further soured relations.\textsuperscript{181} By harbouring the guilty, the Pequot risked collective guilt. Roger Williams, Henry Vane and Lion Gardiner, for various reasons, questioned these claims of Pequot guilt.\textsuperscript{182}

In search of the murderers, the Massachusetts Bay Colony launched an expedition (22–24 August 1636) against the Block Islanders and the Pequot. The expedition to the Pequot seems added on. With a force assembled and in the vicinity, they could enforce the ultimatum given to the Pequot earlier in the year.\textsuperscript{183} It comprised ninety men under General John Endecott, Captain Nathaniel Turner and Captain John Underhill. According to Winthrop:

They had commission to put to death the men of Block Island, but to spare the women and children and to bring them away, and to take possession of the island, and from thence to go to the Pequots to demand the murders of Captain Stone and the other English, and 1000 fathom of wampum for damages, etc., and some of their children as hostages. Which if they should refuse, they were to obtain it by force.\textsuperscript{184}

This was a deviation from former relations with the Pequot. This use of force seemed to stem from frustration with Pequot obstruction of justice. The English could not try—and possibly acquit—Stone’s murderers if they did not appear in court.

It seems plausible that the English would have acquitted Stone’s killers. For example, shortly after the Pequot War, they acquitted Sequin after he accounted for his actions. He helped instigate an attack that killed English civilians at Wethersfield. In the words of Cave, Massachusetts Bay

advised that the Wangunk Sachem had been unfairly treated and thus ‘by the law of nations’ had waged a ‘just war’ to remedy the violation of the ‘covenant’ he had with the English. On that advice, Connecticut held Sequin blameless and

\begin{itemize}
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'made a new agreement with the Indians on the river'.

These deaths were numerically higher than the attacks on either Stone or Oldham and the targets were civilian men, women and children. In light of this, it seems at least plausible, given Winthrop’s earlier journal entry, that the English would have acquitted Stone’s murderers. Deprived of the normal means of redressing grievances, coercion reached where persuasion could not.

The mission on Block Island was largely unsuccessful, though they fought and burned along the way. When Endecott arrived at Saybrook, Lion Gardiner was less than enthused. He feared the expedition would only stir up the Pequot. Endecott sailed down the Pequot River. The Pequot seemed to believe this was a welcomed trading mission. They ‘came running in multitudes along the water side, crying, what cheere Englishmen’. Underhill wrote that they did not think ‘we intended warre’ and ‘went on cheerefully’. Even the following year—only four days before the Mystic Massacre—Edward Winslow wrote that the Pequot were carrying on ‘as if they had no enemies’. Ignorance was not bliss.

The Pequot mood sobered. The English were bent on confrontation, not commerce. The English demanded ‘the heads of the murderers’. Wronged by the Dutch, the Pequot said they misdirected their revenge on an Englishman—‘for we distinguish not betweene the Dutch and English.... therefore we crave pardon, wee have not wilfully wronged the English’. Failed negotiations ended with an exchange of
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fire. The English killed a few natives and burnt property. According to Underhill, the stated intention was to redress grievances—not to start a war.

Endecott’s troops returned ‘safe to Boston, which’, Winthrop wrote, ‘was a marvelous providence of God that not a hair fell from the head of any of them’. By war’s end, the godly lost many hairs on many heads as a result of Endecott’s counterproductive mission. Alfred Cave attributes blame primarily to the colonists who produced the aggressors they feared. ‘Pequot belligerence’ went from rumour to ‘frightening reality’. Endecott’s skirmish led to a series of minor retaliations, mostly on Saybrook. That garrison already felt materially and martially neglected. By 7 November, Gardiner claimed the Pequot shot at boats on the river.

The Pequot attempted to ally with the Narragansett. The largely-unappreciated intervention of Roger Williams dissuaded them. His letters cautiously passed along rumours of native aggression and alliances. Eventually, the Narragansett joined the English. Violence, mistrust, cultural differences and failed expectations drove the Pequot and English further apart.

In January 1637, a ‘general fast was kept in all the churches’. Winthrop recorded many reasons for prayer: war in continental Europe, escalating conflict in the British Isles, heterodoxy in New England and the Pequot. By March, the civilian population
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of Massachusetts Bay braced for attack.  

One ominous verbal exchange took place at Saybrook. The Pequot questioned Gardiner about the duration of the war and the nature of English warfare practices. Although Gardiner, trained in the Netherlands, knew the practices of war, he was unwilling to give specifics because he knew ‘not the mind of the rest of the English’. His superiors had yet to declare the Pequot conventional or unconventional enemies. He was not sure if they were legitimate foes, rebels or criminals. The Pequot plainly asked him ‘if we did use to kill women and children?’ Targeting civilians, though occasional in nonconventional European wars, was not the norm. However, Gardiner responded inconclusively: ‘we said they should see that herafter’. The Pequot response was telling: ‘So they weare silent a small space and then they said we are pequits and have killed Englishmen and can kill them as musketoes, & we will goe to conectecott and kill men women & children’. Gardiner warned authorities; authorities returned ‘scoff’ rather than ‘thanks’.  

The Massachusetts General Court met for a special meeting on 18 April 1637. According to Muehlbauer, ‘the earliest official, public declaration by the colony on the conflict’ was that ‘the war was “undertaken upon just ground”’. They believed the Pequot were preparing for war. On 23 April the Pequot attacked Wethersfield Connecticut, at the behest of local natives wronged by the English. They killed nine colonists, including women. They also took two young maidens captive. The Pequot then taunted the Saybrook garrison with clothing from the slain. In the words of Peter Hoffer, the Pequot ‘proved they could do what they told Gardiner and the garrison at Saybrook they would do—strike anywhere, kill and cause terror, and then retreat
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without casualties’. By this date, Vaughan calculates, thirty colonists lost their lives. The Wethersfield attack pulled the English towards Mystic. The newly founded colony of Connecticut declared war on 1 May 1637. Massachusetts Bay, having previously declared war, chose some of its military leaders and ministers by casting lots on the 17th of May.

With hindsight, English victory seems inevitable. However, one recent study of conflict in the last two centuries argues that underdogs in an asymmetrical war were victorious 63.6 percent of the time when they fought unconventionally. Algonquian tactics proved advantageous in many circumstances. The Pequot and the English both had grounds for confidence and fear. They could both turn weakness into strength. The English thought they possessed superior weapons against the plague-crippled Pequot. The Pequot could strike any town, killing civilians, without prior warning. Further, recent archaeological work suggests that the actual fight at Mystic was more evenly matched than historians often argue. English decisions made at Mystic might evidence the desperate situation they thought they were in.

4. The Mystic Massacre

In May of 1637, the minister John Higginson wrote a detailed theological justification for war. The Pequot menace was God’s response to English sin. External threat might heal schism. Although he did not dispute the superiority of English weapons, he discouraged ‘deeply-rooted securitie, and confidence in our owne supposed strength’. He wanted the English, and even the reluctant Winthrop, to listen as the ‘Lord calls’ them to war. Higginson warned that God was restraining a large group of heathens—

among whom the Pequot were the worst. If the English did not deal forcefully with
them, all the tribes would turn hostile. He then asked God to ‘raise up’ or even ‘create’
will ing supporters. Magistrates should shed their aversion to war. He then put forward
Judges 20:1–2, Ezra 10:3–4 and Haggai 2:4 as ‘presidents in scripture’ showing what
the godly, with God’s help, should do. The curse of Meroz (Judg 5:23) hung over those
who refused to take up the sword.221 Other ministers, like Thomas Hooker and Thomas
Shepard, separately called for a speedy and vigorous prosecution of justice.222

Through letters, Roger Williams served as a messenger of military strategy.
Native allies were nervous about English warfare practices and wished ‘the women and
children be spared’.223 The Mohegan, Narragansett and Niantics joined with
Massachusetts (led by John Underhill) and Connecticut (led by John Mason). Uncas led
the Mohegan. He stoked English fears through the rumours he spread. Although related
to the Pequot leadership, he frequently challenged their authority. In this tribal struggle,
the English were a valuable asset. Testing Mohegan loyalty, Lion Gardiner challenged
them to attack nearby Pequot.224 They slew four and took one captive. This captive was
torn limb from limb, shot by Gardiner, and then eaten by the Mohegan.225 According to
Underhill, this news of this act of Mohegan devotion—and consumption—was
welcomed as answer to prayer.226 The godly could now proceed.

The later-famed ‘apostle to the indians’, John Eliot, was considered for the
chaplaincy. The lots fell to John Wilson instead.227 He assured the soldiers that this was
a ‘just warre’. Due to the wickedness and violence of the natives ‘you need not question
your authority to execute those whom God... hath condemned.... every common
Souldier among you is now installed a Magistrate’.228 Wilson’s typification of soldiers
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as magistrates was telling, suggesting they viewed the Pequot as criminals.

Plymouth colony was noticeably absent. From the outset, Governor William Bradford was ambivalent.\footnote{229. Bradford, Of Plymouth Plantation II.XXVIII.} While there may be several reasons for this, scholars have not explored one possibility. Shortly after settling Plymouth, that colony intervened in a conflict, executing a few natives. John Robinson, a pastor to many of the Pilgrims in Leiden, wrote a scathing response. As an outsider on the other side of the Atlantic, he challenged these killings in the harshest of terms. Plymouth practised conduct unbecoming a Christian, and killing natives was antithetical to their stated attitudes towards them.\footnote{230. It is significant that Francis Jennings, who recounts this killing, fails to mention Robinson’s well-known letter.\footnote{231. F. Jennings, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (Chapel Hill, 1975), 186–88.} It might challenge his central thesis about the \textit{planned} conquest of America. It is possible that such a harsh response from a spiritual father tempered Plymouth. In this war with the Pequot, they reluctantly pledged support. When they finally deployed troops, most of the fighting was over.\footnote{232. Bradford, Of Plymouth Plantation II.XXVIII; ‘Edward Winslow to John Winthrop’ (17 Apr 1637), \textit{WP} III:391–93; ‘Edward Winslow to John Winthrop’ (5 June 1637), \textit{WP} III:428; \textit{Recs. Plymouth} I:60–61.}\

Once on campaign, military leaders from Connecticut and Massachusetts disagreed with some of their orders. They sought the counsel of their chaplain, Samuel Stone. That night Stone went before the Lord and returned ‘fully satisfied’ that orders could be amended. At every step, Mason records, the godly commended the cause to God. Like Israel’s march to Canaan, they took a providentially circuitous route. Mason’s proofs of divine favour ranged from heathen conquest to hardened cheese—the latter providentially blocking an arrow.\footnote{233. J. Mason, A Brief History of the Pequot War (Boston, 1736), 3–8, 22.}

On 26 May 1637, this English-led coalition ambushed a sleeping Pequot settlement at Mystic. The fact that the Pequot avoided pitched battle by retreating into the woods likely made ambush the preferred tactic. At some point before attacking,
according to Mason, they ‘concluded to destroy them by the Sword and save the Plunder’. It is unclear if ‘Plunder’ included women and children. Of later events in the war, Mason claimed they were ‘loth to destroy Women and Children’. They surrounded the fort, ambushed sleeping inhabitants and set fire to their homes. The walls of protection became a death-trap. In the heat of battle, Mason concluded: ‘WE MUST BURN THEM’. 234 A tympanum on the Connecticut State Capital Building in Hartford depicts this moment.


Native allies ‘cried mach it, mach it; that is, it is naught, it is naught, because it is too furious, and slaies too many men’. 235 Algonquians practised relatively limited, but symbolically gruesome, warfare. They grew stronger by absorbing the defeated into their community. 236 Although natives suggested the ambush, they were horrified by the
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slaughter. Casualty estimates vary. They usually range from four to eight hundred killed—many of them women, children and elderly men.237

Underhill’s *Newes From America* (1638) illustrated the massacre. It depicted the palisade at Mystic surrounded by concentric English (inner ring) and native (outer ring) combatants.


As Drew Lopenzina notes, this picture, and the literary descriptions produced by the Puritans, attempted to show symmetry and order in this chaotic and bloody event.238

The godly turned to Scripture and gave meaning to their actions. Accounts foregrounded conflict in the Hebrew Bible. Edward Johnson viewed the Pequot in light of Genesis 3: ‘Their quarrell being as antient as Adams time, propagated from that old

enmity betweene the Seede of the Woman, and the Seed of the Serpent’. The exodus, wilderness and conquest were also common interpretive frames. The Pequot War, Peter Hoffer notes, became ‘an extension of the biblical story’.240

Lion Gardiner’s account backgrounded divine agency, though he said ‘the Lord God blessed their disigne & way so that they returned with victory’ at Mystic.241 John Hull’s diary recorded the rumour that the Pequot had acquired, ‘by gods permission’, special Satanic protection so that ‘an Arrow should not peirce their skin’. They were relieved to find that ‘the lord permitted not Satan to hinder the penitration of the swords & bulletts of the English’.242

Underhill stressed victory through weakness and by ‘contrary meanes’. It was so remarkable that ‘unexpert’ soldiers fired so effectively. It was ‘as though the finger of God had touched both match and flint’. The wailing of the terrorised Pequot was so heart-rending that ‘if God had not fitted the hearts of men for the service, it would have bred in them a commiseration’. The ‘men, women, and children’ that escaped were ‘entertained with the point of the sword’ *en masse*.243

This lack of mercy lead Underhill to engage an interlocutor:

> Why should you be so furious (as some have said) should not Christians have more mercy and compassion? But I would referre you to *Davids* warre, when a people is growne to such a height of bloud, and sinne against God and man, and all confederates in the action, there hee hath no respect to persons, but harrowes them, and sawes them, and puts them to the sword, and the most terriblest death that may bee [2 Sam 12:31]: sometimes the Scripture declareth women and children must perish with their parents [Exod 20:5; Josh 7:25–26]; some-time the case alters [Ezek 18:21]: but we will not dispute it now. We had sufficient light from the word of God for our proceedings.244

Clothed with scriptural precedent, Underhill felt no need for shame. Although other verses might have preserved the lives of hundreds, ‘we will not dispute it now’. The

---
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synod could be called after the cemetery was filled.

John Mason’s account was full of imagery and excitement. It recounted the gifting, as it were, of ‘The Land of Canaan’. He invoked the ‘Terror’ of ‘the ALMIGHTY’ that gripped the Pequot. Although they haughtily rejoiced as they planned English destruction, now God mocked them:

GOD was above them, who laughed his Enemies and the Enemies of his People to Scorn [Ps 2:4], making them as a fiery Oven... Thus did the LORD judge among the Heathen, filling the Place with dead Bodies [Ps 110:6]! And here we may see the just Judgment of GOD.

They made their way back to their boats, fighting and burning along the way.

Upon their return, they were ‘Entertained with great Triumph and Rejoycing and Praising GOD for his Goodnes to us’. They saw God ‘in the Mount [Gen 22:14], Crushing his proud Enemies and the Enemies of his People’. Using Psalm 118:23—a staple of godly military providentialism—Mason said:

[God was seen] burning them up in the Fire of his Wrath [Ps 21:9], and dunging the Ground with their Flesh [Zeph 1:17]: It was the LORD’S Doings, and it is marvellous in our Eyes [Ps 118:23]! It is HE that hath made his Work wonderful, and therefore ought to be remembred [Ps 111:4].

After describing ongoing warfare with the remaining Pequot, he used Psalm 89:10 to summarised God’s involvement: ‘Thus did the Lord Scatter his Enemies with his strong Arm!’

Mason’s account ended doxologically:

Thus we may see, How the Face of GOD is set against them that do Evil, to cut off the Remembrance of them from the Earth [Ps 34:16]... Blessed be the LORD GOD of Israel... Let the whole Earth be filled with his Glory [Ps 72:18–19]! Thus the LORD was pleased to smite our Enemies in the hinder Parts, and to give us their Land for an Inheritance [Ps 78:55, 66]: Who remembred us in our low Estate, and redeemed us out of our Enemies Hands [Ps 136:23–24]: Let us therefore praise the LORD for his Goodness and his wonderful Works to the
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Piling Scripture on Scripture, the Pequot suffered death by Psalms.

Long after the massacre, Mason described the impact of a minister’s confident application of Scripture:

I still remember a Speech of Mr. HOOKER at our going aboard; THAT THEY SHOULD BE BREAD FOR US [Num 14:9]. And thus when the LORD turned the Captivity of his People, and turned the Wheel upon their Enemies; we were like Men in a Dream; then was our Mouth filled with Laughter, and our Tongues with Singing; thus we may say the LORD hath done great Things for us among the Heathen, whereof we are glad. Praise ye the LORD [Ps 126:1–3].

Firsthand descriptions of the war were almost euphoric and trancelike—‘like Men in a Dream’. Peter Hoffer remarks: ‘God, invisible to the Indians, sensed only through his providence by the New Englanders, had crushed their enemies’. Oliver Cromwell, it will be shown, seemed in a similar state before Naseby and after Dunbar.

Many descriptions of the killing of humans employed ‘sacramental’ language and even had a ‘eucharistic echo’, as Susan Juster notes. In William Bradford’s account, he described the slaughter as a ‘service’—a term with both sacred and secular connotations—that was ‘happily accomplished’. To those who fought, ‘the victory seemed a sweet sacrifice’. In 1651, John Owen used similar language to describe the destruction of Presbyterians and royalists after Dunbar and Worcester. As Juster notes, the godly condemned sacramental violence when performed by barbarous Catholics. They, however, employed similar rhetoric in some circumstances.

As argued at length in the appendix, the English viewed their actions at Mystic as the regrettable outcome of thwarted legal proceedings. The godly closely followed

248. Ibid., 20–21.
249. Ibid., 21–22.
250. Hoffer, Sensory Worlds, 90.
251. S. Juster, Sacred Violence in Early America (Philadelphia, 2016), 53–54; cf. 17–75.
252. Bradford, Of Plymouth Plantation II.XXVIII.
the procedure outlined in the 1629 Charter of Massachusetts Bay concerning international crime—a detail that has escaped historical notice. The charter stipulated how bloodguilt, if unremedied, could spread from perpetrator to all who harboured them.

5. A Slave Ship Named Desire
The Massacre at Mystic dealt a crushing blow to the Pequot tribe. Most were killed, enslaved or absorbed into other tribes. On 2 June 1637 Connecticut Colony ordered men ‘sett downe in the Pequoitt Countrey & River in place convenient to maynteine our right that God by Conquest hath given to us’. Daniel Patrick and Israel Stoughton, leaders of the mop-up expedition, believed God blessed their ongoing pursuit of those who spilt English blood.

Individuals were more likely to obtain mercy if they willingly submitted and had not shed English blood. When this happened, the godly tried to assess the levels of guilt. Sometimes the English claimed direct knowledge about when an individual shed blood. On one occasion, Roger Williams asserted, a prisoner’s violence ‘cries for Vengeance to heaven’. Later, he referred to the ongoing need to ‘cleanse the Land from bloud’—a phrase that seemed to refer to judicial prosecution.

Michael Fickes estimates that the English kept 319 Pequot for themselves and shipped a fraction of them out of New England. Roger Williams, Hugh Peter and John Endecott were among the many who requested prisoners. Williams called the captured
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Pequot ‘another miserable drove of Adams degenerate seede, and our brethren by nature’.263 This simultaneously subordinated the Pequot due to behaviour and asserted that they were equally human. Many ran away after being reduced to servitude. The English used law and force to retrieve them.264 The 1641 ‘Bodies of Liberties’ in Massachusetts legalised three types of slavery: captives taken in just war, foreigners who sold themselves, or foreigners sold to the English. This drive for codification, according to Margaret Ellen Newell, largely stemmed from a desire to ‘define the legal status of the hundreds of Pequot Indian captives’.265 Michael Guasco situates Pequot slavery in the context of the seventeenth century where the enslavement of Englishmen was, at least in the perception of many, ‘on the rise’. Although this happened to thousands due to war, crime could also reduce an Englishmen to slavery.266

Indian slavery quickly became entangled with the African slave trade. Winthrop’s journal for 12 Feb 1638 reads: ‘Mr. Peirce in the Salem ship, the Desire, returned from the West Indies after seven months. He had been at Providence [Island], and brought some cotton, and tobacco, and negroes’.267 It seems likely that the first African slave in Massachusetts was exchanged for Pequot captives.268 As noted by Karen Kupperman, the Pequot appear in the Providence Island ‘company records only once as “the Cannibal Negroes brought from New England”’.269

There were a few who urged self-criticism or restraint after Mystic. John Humfrey, former Deputy Governor of Massachusetts Bay, thanked God for victory. However, barring some unlikely miraculous seizure of all the Pequot, he feared a costly
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‘perpetual war’ and urged careful consideration of post-Mystic action. Roger Williams found himself in the awkward position of trying to restrain both the Indians and the English. Against the English, he warned of scratching the ‘great Itch’ to turn on the Narragansett. He also pressed the Narragansetts ‘to humane Consideracion of so much [Pequot] blood spilt’.272

Roger Williams urged Winthrop to allow other natives to incorporate the Pequot into their tribe. Otherwise, they might ‘go to the enemy or turn wild Irish themselves’.273 He frequently urged restraint towards the remaining Pequot: ‘Vindicta levis vita iucundior ipsa est’ (A light punishment is sweeter than life itself).274 Mercy reflected the character of God, ‘the Father of Mercies’.275 On 31 July he cautioned Winthrop against using mysterious Bible passages and Old Testament types to justify perpetual enslavement.276 If slavery was to be allowed, it was a temporary necessity that should aim at redemption.277 Earlier, on 15 July 1637, he thanked Winthrop for some level of restraint, though he ‘fear[ed] that some innocent blood cries at Connecticut’. His words are also helpful in understanding limits on inhabiting Israel’s narrative:

Many things have been spoken to prove the Lord’s perpetual war with Amalek extraordinary and mystical; but [2 Kings 14:5–6] is a bright light discovering the ordinary path wherein to walk and please him. If the Pequot were murderers (though pretending revenge for Sasacous his father’s death, which the Dutch affirmed was from Mr. Governor) yet not comparable to those treacherous servants that slew their lord and king, Joshua, King of Judah, and type of Jesus, yet the fathers only perish in their sin.

The English passed over a clear command—do not kill the child for the crimes of the
father—through inhabiting the ‘extraordinary and mystical’ Amalek narrative. When the Pequot killed Stone, mistaking him for a Dutchman, the English hunted the killers for years. The English, Williams feared, also shed ‘innocent blood’, and he prayed God would ‘wash away iniquity’.  

Massachusetts thanked ‘God for his great mercies in subdewing the Pecoits, bringing the soldiers in safety... & good news from Germany’.  

On 20 November, it was declared that ‘it hath pleased the Lord... to deliver into our hands, the Pecoits & their allies, & that thereby the lands & places which they possesed are by just title of conquest fallen unto us’. Massachusetts and Connecticut each laid claim to territory. Military leaders, soldiers, ministers and the newly-formed Harvard benefited from confiscated land.

The war officially ended on 21 September 1638 with the signing of the Treaty of Hartford. It endeavoured to create peace between the Narraganset and Mohegan who split over many issues, including the distribution of Pequot captives. The treaty officially confiscated Pequot land and outlawed their name (Exod 17:14; Deut 25:19). This work, cited above, praised Wequash for converting after witnessing godly violence. Following the ‘short trouble with the Pequits’ the land had peace. Now, ‘the name of the Pequits (as of Amaleck.) is blotted out from under heaven’. This streamlined and idealised the war, making it fit patterns in Scripture. Evangelical audiences consumed narratives like this. Such terminal narratives of Pequot
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decline, although enjoying popularity for centuries, did not accurately describe the tribe then or now.285

6. Conclusion
During the Pequot War, the English warmed up to killing and enslaving Algonquians. Once the threat abated, these practices cooled. Generally speaking, they made plans for peace with other tribes. In the words of J. Tremayne Copplestone, they did not entertain fantasies about the ‘root-and-branch extermination of the Indian tribes in general’.286 In 1640 John Winthrop reiterated the need for just and kind dealings. He concurred with Connecticut magistrates who ‘declared their dislike of such as would have the Indians rooted out as being of the cursed race of Ham’.287 Although later generations indulged this use of Scripture, the godly resisted—for biblical reasons.

Thomas Shepard in The Ten Virgins, argued that God sent ‘Pequot furies’ and ‘hornet[s]’ to wake up apathetic and hypocritical Christians. He feared another war since spiritual fervour cooled.288 In his estimation, the Pequot War and theological heresy (Antinomian/Free Grace Controversy) were a dual threat that God defeated at the same time.289 Over the decades, the Pequot War became the ideal war: It was decisive and created unity; it needed few soldiers and cost few lives; it was limited in duration and produced long-lasting peace.290 Rosy interpretations began early on. Shortly after the signing of the treaty of Hartford, Thomas Hooker preached a thanksgiving sermon on 1 Samuel 7:12. Colonists, like Abraham with a knife raised over his son, were desperate for divine intervention. The entire sermon related piety with prosperity. He


288Shepard, Works II:376, 378.


claimed the godly reformed ‘ourselves for before god lett us fall into the hands of our enemies’. They also tended to totalise the victory. An anonymous journal recorded how the ‘infant colonies entirely extirpated that fierce people’. The declaration from God seemed clear. In 1671, John Ogilby told a simple tale of total English victory over a recalcitrant and blasphemous enemy.

As will be discussed later, after the Pequot War, the English moved closer towards Algonquians, mostly by attempting to civilise and evangelise them. This, in turn, deeply influenced King Philip’s War and the providential interpretations of that event.

Coming out of the Pequot War, godly hegemony in New England entered broad daylight. They came through the struggle with their power unchallenged and their confidence in providence strengthened. The war, in the words of Shepard, was ‘divine slaughter by the hand of the English’. The time was nearing for godly compatriots in the British Isles to go and do likewise. The next three chapters recount their struggle into the light of ever-increasing power.
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3. Naseby (1645): ‘Non nobis Domine, non nobis’

1. Introduction

On 9 April 1655, John Evelyn visited Woolwich Dockyard along the Thames. He came to see the new first-rate three-decker 80-gun ship named Naseby. It was nearing the tenth anniversary of that famous victory. In a sense, all of Parliament’s providential victories since 1645 followed in its wake. When launched a few days later, Perfect proceedings of state-affaires recorded the attendance of persons ‘of other Nations, among which divers persons of honour’. Some spectators could easily have taken offence, for the ship prominently displayed a figurehead that epitomised the regime’s forward-looking confidence. It encapsulated both godly violence and military providentialism. Evelyn, a royalist diarist, remarked that an effigy of ‘the Usurper Oliver’ Cromwell adorned it. ‘In the Prow was Oliver on horseback trampling 6 nations under foote, a Scott, Irishman, Dutch, French, Spaniard & English as was easily made out by their several habits’. In addition to this, ‘A Fame held a laurell over his insulting head, & the word God with us’. Because God with them, enemies were under them.

After Cromwell’s death in September 1658 and the subsequent collapse of the protectorate in April 1659, the Naseby set sail for The Hague. Laden with royal cargo, it landed at Dover on 23 May 1660. It was renamed the Royal Charles. It was only a matter of time before someone adjusted Cromwell’s ‘insulting head’. In 1663, Samuel Pepys observed ‘joy’ over ‘building a gibbet for the hanging of [Cromwell’s] head’—though he seemed more concerned with the cost of replacing the figure, possibly with Neptune. The godly lost control of the battleship and of the providential interpretation of the battle it commemorated.

A similarly destructive attempt to reshape the understanding of Naseby occurred
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in Norwich Cathedral when a relative of Thomas Fairfax died in 1702. A monument in honour of Dean Fairfax contained ‘laudatory descriptions of his parliamentarian uncle and his role in the victory over the king at Naseby’. It was deemed unsuitable for public display. Naseby (Nasebiani) and godliness (piii) had to be chiselled out.\(^\text{299}\) In *Religious War and Religious Peace*, Wayne P. Te Brake notes the importance of ‘amnesia and amnesty. Forgiving and forgetting is a recurrent, though hardly universal, theme in the history of peacemaking’.\(^\text{300}\) This was true of much of Charles II’s approach to the previous two decades.

This chapter focuses on godly violence and military providentialism surrounding Naseby—an event that one historian considers the third ‘most important and decisive battle ever fought in England’.\(^\text{301}\) Why was the memory of Naseby so charged that it needed to be altered so drastically? It was the decisive event that made the downfall of the Stuart regime seem inevitable. Such an eventuality was unthinkable at the time of the Pequot War. Before that war, Charles I planned to bring Massachusetts Bay into political and religious subjection. These plans came to nothing, for he was soon occupied with the Bishop’s Wars with Scotland (1639–1640) and the Irish Rebellion (1641). To finance the wars against the Scots, Charles called Parliament twice. After the hasty dismissal of the first Short Parliament (April–May 1640)—coming on the heels of the Personal Rule (1629–1640)—members of the Long Parliament (called 3 Nov 1640) sought to secure their power and redress grievances before supplying funds to vigorously prosecute or end the war. Charles became increasingly aware that many in Parliament sympathised with the religious and constitutional cause of their northern neighbours.

Similarly, godly members of the clergy had many ties of sympathy with Scotland. A 12 July 1641 letter from English ministers to the Scottish General Assembly thanked God for ‘so miraculously prospering your late endeavours’. Like cargo in the ‘same [ship] bottome’, the just and holy causes in the two kingdoms ‘sink & sweem


\(^{300}\)Te Brake, *Religious War*, 127.
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together’. They wrote this over a year before the official outbreak of war in England. The much-debated short and long-term causes of this war are not discussed here. In documents dating from the Petition of Right (1628) until Charles fled London (1642), hundreds of claims were made against Charles and his government. Parliament employed a complex discourse of justice and holiness when defending the use of force against their sovereign.

After a failed attempt to arrest agitators in January 1642, Charles fled from London into the royalist stronghold of York. On 22 August 1642, he raised his standard at Nottingham and inauspiciously began his military campaign to reassert control. Later that year he turned Oxford into his wartime capital. Parliament was at war with the king and fighting ‘Pro Religione lege Rege et. Parliamento’—as a medal struck in 1642 by Parliament claimed. Early battles, like Edgehill (23 October 1642), were indecisive—though anything short of defeat was welcome news for many. In July 1643, the Westminster Assembly of Divines sat and welcomed a few delegates from Scotland. Parliament secured military cooperation with the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant in September 1643. At the time of the battle of Naseby in 1645, in the words of one Scottish delegate Robert Baillie, progress on church reformation was slow. They ‘fell in a Labyrinth of a Catalogue of sins for which from the Sacrament and ministers be deposed’. This Anglo-Scottish alliance secured some crucial victories, notably at Marston Moor (2 July 1644). The coalition quickly fell to infighting, particularly related to the war’s aims and methods. It was in this context that the New Model Army was formed (17 Feb 1645) and placed under the leadership of Thomas Fairfax. Religious differences among the godly began to show with the ascendancy of the Independents in martial and ecclesiastical affairs.
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2. The Battle of Naseby

To Fairfax’ frustration, the New Model was tied down in a protracted siege at Oxford until after Prince Rupert sacked Leicester (30–31 May 1645). The brutality horrified the godly, diverted Fairfax from the siege of Oxford and tarnished the King’s image. Fairfax moved his army into the Midlands. Although Oliver Cromwell should have been denied command under the conditions of the Self-Denying Ordinance, he was granted a temporary exemption. In the letter appointing Cromwell as ‘Lieut. Gen. of the Horse of this Army’, Fairfax said that although the enemy ‘make their Horse their Confidence [Ps 20:7], Ours shall be in God’. Cromwell, as noted by Andrew Hopper, would have appreciated this theological gloss. Riding with six hundred men, He joined the New Model, increasing its strength to ‘between 15,000 and 17,000’.

Cromwell’s conduct at Naseby contributed to his meteoric rise, and some increasingly looked at him as an indispensable instrument of God. Bulstrode Whitelocke described his ascendancy with language culled from the childhood narratives of Samuel and Jesus: ‘Cromwell began to increase in the favour of the people [1 Sam 2:26; Luke 2:52] and of the army, and to grow great, even to the envy of many’. Although Naseby is ‘the victory for which Cromwell is most remembered and credited’, Hopper has emphasised Fairfax’s indispensability. Additionally, ‘both generals had won reputations for piety, godly rhetoric and trust in providence.... Fairfax and Cromwell’s language of victory was almost indistinguishable’.

A major theme before and after Naseby was humility and self-abasement in light of a numerically superior army. At Naseby, the New Model was largely untried, controversial and fraught with internal division. Parliamentarians significantly outnumbered royalist in both horse and foot, though it is not clear when this information
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was known.312 Preaching after Naseby, Stephen Marshall recounted how the ‘Army [was] despised by our Enemies, and little lesse then despaired of by our Friends’.313

Parliament placed enormous weight on their chosen field word. At Naseby, it was ‘God our strength’ and the royalists chose ‘Queen Mary’—a phrase which did not explicitly give glory to God.314 The royalists stopped to pray before the battle.315 Parliament would have done so as well. An uncorroborated—though possibly true—story arose about Hugh Peter that illustrates the complex relationship between divine and human fighting. It was claimed that he preached to the army before Naseby and during the battle ‘rode from rank to rank with a Bible in one hand and a pistol in the other exhorting the men to do their duty’.316 The account seems in character with what is known of this chaplain and combatant.317

Naseby, as an event, was relatively straightforward. Commentators found a divinely simple complexity in the details. A claimed eyewitness said it was ‘as though Cromwell] had received direction from God himselfe, where to pitch the Battell’. He changed of positions ‘with so much cheerfull resolution and confidence, as though he had foreseen the victory’.318 After the battle, Cromwell claimed divine ‘assurance of victory’.319 The royalist began the attack around 10:00 and initially succeeded. Under Prince Rupert, the right horse pushed through Parliament’s lines towards their baggage train. Many later blamed him for this temporary absence from the main fight.

Austin Woolrych credits Cromwell’s ‘battle sense and the perfect discipline of

316 Although often quoted, the primary source remains elusive (e.g. Foard, *Naseby*, 245).
his regiments’. They delivered the ‘decisive stroke of the battle’. The royalists suffered heavy casualties and the bulk of their forces were taken captive. Some of Fairfax’s cavalry pursued Charles towards Leicester and mowed down those who fled. Foot soldiers captured the royal baggage train which contained personal correspondence. All of this was personally devastating and endangered the royalist cause.

‘The battle’, in the words of Ian Gentles, ‘had a wretched dénouement, for which Cromwell was not to blame’. A massacre followed on the heels of a relatively conventional battle. Parliamentary soldiers killed over one hundred women and mutilated many they identified as ‘whores’. Frank Tallett estimated that those killed or maimed numbered between three and four hundred. Facial mutilation was ‘a standard punishment for a whore’, writes Ann Hughes. Female casualties (killed or wounded) were close to the lower estimates for the number of Pequot in Mystic.

The godly seemed comfortable with this slaughter. As noted by Inga Volmer in her comparative work on massacres in the Three Kingdoms, ‘parliamentary soldiers killed more than a hundred non-English-speaking women without showing even the least bit of remorse afterwards’. Nearly a dozen newsbooks covered it and it did not feature as one of the ‘provoking sins’ to be repented of. The soldier, George Bishop, remarked of the women who survived that ‘every one [was] wounded’.

Prince Rupert... had brought into the field many Irish women, inhumane Whores, with Skeans or long Irish kniv[es] about them, to cut the throats of our wounded men, and of such prisoners as they pleased, (the wives of the bloody
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Rebels in *Ireland*...) to whom our Souldiers would grant no quarter, about a 100 of them were slain on the ground, and most of the rest of the whores, and Camp-sluts, that attended that wicked Army, were marked in their faces or noses with slashes and cuts, and some cut off; just rewards for such wicked strumpets.\(^{326}\)

Thomas More (a parliamentarian soldier who seems to have been temporarily absent from the army), thought this massacre should adorn a work dedicated to Oliver Cromwell’s newly-widowed wife. As a wife and woman, would she really want to think of her husband as present when ‘Irish Ladies pretty’ were ‘By Parlament souldiers stripp’d stark naked and kill’d’?\(^{327}\)

Mark Stoyle, in a 2008 article devoted to understanding what might have been ‘the single worst atrocity of the Civil War in England’, has furthered our understanding of the event. The ‘whore’ motif and claims that the women participated in killing in Ireland are evident in John Vicars’ work cited above. Stoyle’s article attempts to show how

pro-parliamentarian pamphlets had helped to pave the way for the atrocity by reinforcing the connection which already existed in many English minds between Irish- and Welshwomen on the one hand and the sinister practices of ‘throat-cutting’ and witchcraft on the other.\(^{328}\)

If he is correct, then parliamentarians may have viewed the women as violent foreign idolaters and feared them as supernatural warriors who, through witchcraft, were actual combatants.\(^{329}\)

In a comparative study of massacres in the English Civil War, Will Coster notes how, for parliamentarians and Covenanters, ‘it was victory that tended to lead to massacre’. He also suggests a growing intolerance towards the defeated—as will be further evidenced in the chapters on Drogheda and Dunbar. This intolerance was owing, in part, to the growing sense that the defeated remained stiff-necked under God’s providential dispensations and were guilty of a breach of trust. He links victorious
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massacre to the ‘experience [of] an acute elation and sense of release. This state is akin to drunkenness and is frequently the precursor to acts of extreme irrationality and violence’. In addition to killing these women, parliamentarian forces mowed down retreating soldiers. The historian and politician, John Rushworth, who was present, estimated three hundred were slain in retreat. Seeing the back of one’s enemy in a victorious chase is often cited as another factor that facilitates slaughter. For Rushworth, the manner of their death fit the nature of their guilt. The ‘Plunder of poore Leicestershire’ weighed down retreating royalists. Thus ‘God turned [plunder] to be one meanes of their ruine’. He used similar reasoning when describing the ‘100 slain’ women.

The royalists at Naseby employed many Irish fighters. In October of the previous year, Parliament condemned ‘every such Irishmen, or Papists born in Ireland’ found fighting on the seas, in England or Wales. Further, officers and commanders who failed to execute Irish prisoners ‘shall be reputed a Favourer of that bloody Rebellion of Ireland’. Guilt could spread to godly leaders. As Glenn Foard notes, the Irish were to the parliamentarians at Naseby what the Scots were to the royalists at Leicester. Both were considered illegitimate outside actors who allied with the unjust. It is not surprising, then, that both were denied quarter.

Fairfax sent captured Irishmen to London. Writing to the speaker of the Commons, William Lenthall, he said ‘I desire they may be proceeded against above, according to Ordinance of Parliament’. The ‘mere Irish Rebels’ were ‘committed to safe Custody, and sent to Newgate, or any other prison’. According to The weekly
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account, ‘thirteen’ men were found guilty of either deserting their post in Ireland by fighting in England or were ‘meer Irish’. These were to be given a ‘triall’ and ‘brought to justice’. The fate of these prisoners, according to Mark Stoyle, remains ‘unclear’. He thinks it ‘more likely’ that they ‘remained in prison or were shipped overseas’. Glenn Foard thinks imprisonment most likely; Inga Volmer that they ‘were ultimately spared’.

These scholars, however, overlooked later official documents. On 28 July, the Commons ordered ‘That the Committee for Irish Affairs do bring in an Ordinance for putting the Ordinance for hanging the Irish Rebels, and punishing Mutineers, in due Execution’. On 2 August, the Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament for Irish Affairs obliged: ‘The Irish who were sent up by Sir Thomas Fairfax from Naseby to be hanged’. In cold blood, nearly two months after Naseby, Parliament executed Irish prisoners.

Naseby was also notable for the English prisoners taken. The sheer number of surrenders crippled the royalist cause. The 19th of June was set aside as a day of thanksgiving. On the 21st the captured soldiers were paraded through the streets of London. The next day, ‘The Lord’s-day; great expressions’ came from ‘the pulpits touching the victory at Naseby’. According to Andrew Hopper, in the following year, ‘1,000 or more royalist soldiers join[ed] the New Model Army’. Over one hundred

took the Covenant and were sent on barges to Reading to be admitted into the New Model. All who refused to forsake armed royalism risked deportation overseas. About 800 volunteered for Ireland, but many spent the next year or
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Naseby featured the same elements as in the other case studies: execution, deportation, imprisonment and side-changing.

Naseby was a turning point for the parliamentarian cause and for the New Model—especially when viewed retrospectively. Less than three weeks after the fall of Leicester, the town was back in parliamentary hands. Hugh Peter notes how Parliament won two battles and took five garrisons in ‘sixe Weeks’ time. Naseby is often termed ‘decisive’. It marks the beginning of Charles’ downfall in the British Isles. It proved indicative of God’s favour for the parliamentarians and paradigmatic for future deliverances. After the battle, the pro-Parliament presses produced an abundance of first-hand accounts, letters, sermons, decrees, and treatises. After the defeat, *Mercurius Aulicus*, the important Oxford-published royalist newsbook, failed to publish for nine weeks.

3. Creating the Idea of ‘Naseby’

Naseby was an event and idea. As an event, it led to the downfall of Charles and the rise of parliamentarian hegemony. As an idea, many attached providential interpretations to the event. As with the other case studies, many contested the meaning of God’s communication through Naseby. There were three predominant reactions. Naseby confirmed parliamentarian beliefs about the righteousness of their cause as it became the prime example of God’s active role on their side. Presbyterians praised God for it, though they objected to the use of Naseby as justification for Independency or toleration. Royalists initially struggled to make sense of this crushing defeat, though they gladly detailed godly depravity at Naseby. The interpretation of Naseby changed after the Restoration and continued to change for centuries.

After Naseby, most accounts focused on human agency. They viewed these


actions through providential interpretive lenses.\textsuperscript{351} Joshua Sprigg wrote of Naseby: ‘He that shall not in this victory look beyond the instrument, will injuriously withhold from God his due’. He also said God’s ‘glory is to be seen in instruments’.\textsuperscript{352} Although one anonymous witness of Naseby barely mentioned God, the publisher foregrounded divine agency through the title: \textit{A more exact and perfect relation of the great victory (By Gods providence) obtained}. The clearest statement of discomfort over killing was in the least providential account:

I saw the field so bestrewed with Carcases of Horse and Men, as was most sad to behold, because Subjects under one government, but most happy in this, because they were most of them professed enemies of God, and the government of his Son.\textsuperscript{353}

Cromwell began one account by acknowledging providence. He then turned towards human agency and concluded: ‘Thus you see what the Lord hath wrought for us’. He downplayed human agency: ‘Can any creature ascribe anything to self? Now can we give all glory to God’. He also acknowledged God’s ‘servants’ whom he ‘was pleased to use’.\textsuperscript{354} The beginning of another letter detailed Cromwell’s obligation to ‘acquaint [the reader] with the good hand of God towards us and you’. He then briefly described human actions and closed with this assertion: ‘This is no other but the hand of God, to him alone be the glory, wherein none are to share with him’.\textsuperscript{355} For Fairfax, the victory showed the ‘abundant goodnesse of God to this army, and the whole Kingdome’. He
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desired that all honour be ‘given to God in a extraordinary day of thanksgiving’.  

Many described the victory as a mercy, honour, grace or gift for which thanksgiving was the appropriate response. The Committee of Both Kingdoms wanted to ‘Let God have all the praise’. The battle, fought on a Saturday, was celebrated by ‘divers preachers’ on the next day. This helped solidify the idea of Naseby in the minds of many. Thomas Atkins, mayor of London from 1644–1645, called for thanksgiving for God’s gift of victory that came in response to prayers. The Lords and Commons responded to the victory by calling for a day of public thanksgiving to God. Although Richard Vines and Stephen Marshall preached on 19 June 1645, only Marshall’s sermon is extant.

(a) Stephen Marshall and God’s Victory Through a Created People

Stephen Marshall was a well-known backer of the parliamentarian cause. Two of his more famous works justified the war: Meroz Cursed (1642) emphasised religious grounds for war and A plea for defensive arms (1643) emphasised justice and constitutional grounds. He, according to John Frederick Wilson in Pulpit in Parliament, was one of the ‘pillars of the puritan preaching to the Long Parliament’ and ‘without peer as preacher’ to that body. Given his importance, the nature of his audience and the unique occasion, he set the agenda for understanding and responding to Naseby.

Marshall called for the writing of a new providential history as a thanksgiving to

358. ‘The Committee of both kingdoms to Colonel Weldon’ (June 15 1645) NA SP 21/21 f.11.
359. Whitelocke, Memorials I:450.
360. T. Atkins, 15. June, 1645. It is desired that all the ministers in London (London, 1645).

71
God for his goodness through war. Parliament set about this task the next day. His text was Psalm 102:18: ‘This shall bee written for the Generation to come: and all the People which shall bee created, shall praise the Lord’. God delivered and the godly remembered. Since the outbreak of war, ‘remembrancers’ like John Vicars recorded and rehearsed God’s mercies, providing fuel for future praise.

On the 28th of May, a few weeks before Naseby, Joseph Caryl helped Parliament abase itself before God. He believed his fast sermon, preached before Naseby and published after, might have helped turn God from displeasure to delight. It did this by ‘healing our unbelief’. The political situation, however, worsened after Caryl’s sermon when the royalists stormed Leicester two days later. Marshall aptly described the mood. The victory at Naseby came ‘in a time when we had newly prayed and sought God, when the Honourable Houses had called the City and the Assembly of Divines to lie in tears and dust before God’. They would soon trade these ashes for beauty.

On the day of Naseby, Marshal contended, it seemed Parliament’s fortunes would further deteriorate. God brought the army low ‘that it might appeare (as hath been in the rest of our Victories) that the thing was wrought by God’. He continued: ‘God broke all our crutches we leaned upon, our Counsels, our Treasuries, our Armies; and never prospered us really, till he had deeply humbled, and made us to look to himself onely for help’. It was God’s ordinary way to work by contrary and near-miraculous means. Victory, however, presented new dangers. Caryl’s audience was tempted by defeat; Marshall’s by success. At some point during this day of celebration, news reached London of the regaining of Leicester. The reversal was complete, and Parliament was elevated higher for having been in the slough of despond.
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Weakness was a central theme running through comments on Naseby. The ideal combatant, as described in *The Souldiers Pocket Bible* recognised his weakness and dependency. They saw themselves as underdogs. Added to this, their New Model was untested. Weakness was not to be feared. It placed one in the ideal situation for God to act. As Blair Worden noted of Cromwell, to intentionally weaken oneself was tantamount to testing God. Intentional weakening, as evidenced in chapter five, proved fatal for the Covenanters at Dunbar. While praising weakness, Parliament did not passively wait for Yahweh’s salvation. They strained every resource to maximise battlefield advantage.

Throughout Marshall’s sermon, he downplayed the quiddity of Parliament. They were a people ‘created as out of nothing’ to be God’s possession. They were, *ex nihilo*, brought into being by God; they were also rescued ‘as from a dunghill’. A history of providential victories, patterned on Marshall’s sermon text, was to be written for ‘all the People which shall bee created’ (Ps 102:18). He peppered the sermon with themes of nonexistence prior to divine quickening. Through 1 Corinthians 1:27–29, he showed that Naseby was a moment of reversal and creation. He saw God ‘bring to nought things that are’ (royalists) through ‘things which are not’ (parliamentarians). If Parliament prove ungrateful, ‘it would aggravate their sin beyond all apprehensions, beyond all expressions’ and God would one day take account. Here Marshall seconded themes from Cromwell’s letter. Cromwell asserted:

> I can say this of Naesby, that when I saw the enemy drew up and march in gallant order towards us, and we a company of poore ignorant men [Acts 4:13] to seek how to order our battell.... I could not riding alone about my businesse but smile out to God in praises in assurance of victory, because God would by things that are not, bring to naught things that are [1 Cor 1:28], of which I had great assurance, and God did it.

The army, so weak, was regarded as nothing. The God who created them would also

---

sustain them.

Naseby was a gift to a created people, and this backgrounded human agency. Of this battle and others, Marshall said ‘there was never anything wherein there was lesse of man, and more of God’.\textsuperscript{375} He parsed the difference between the two agents elsewhere: ‘Very frequently by his own immediate hand, without the help of any other; he alone trode out the winepress of the wrath of God’. God ‘will not alwayes work Miracles’. He ordinarily works ‘miranda, marvailous things’, performing them through ‘improbable and unsuitable’ means.\textsuperscript{376}

Marshall found Naseby marvellous for four main reasons. Time was important because the royalist were proudly secure before an abject and humbled Parliament. Further, victory happened near the place of ‘outragious villanies’ like the sack of Leicester. The persons were significant since they were weak and despised.\textsuperscript{377} Finally, the manner of the victory undercut boasting.

Who could observe God’s works and not ‘cry out, This is the Lords doing, this is wonderfull in our eyes [Ps 118:23]: Non nobis Domine, non nobis, Not unto us Lord, but unto thy Name give the praise and glory?’ (Ps 115:1). In 1648, John Owen said that God rode through the heavens and fought at Naseby, to which he added ‘Non nobis, domine non nobis’.\textsuperscript{378} Psalm 115:1 was associated with the victory at Agincourt (1415) after Henry V’s troops sung it there (Henry V, 4.8). A 1649 work directly linked this verse, Agincourt and Parliament’s hegemony.\textsuperscript{379} Although the verse was used in other theological and martial contexts by parliamentarians and royalists, it seems to have become associated with Naseby. This might be because the verse follows closely on the heels of a description of exodus from Egypt. At least since the sixteenth century, English historians claimed Henry V commanded the ‘prelates and chaplains’ to sing ‘In exitu Israel de Egypto etc.’ (Ps 114:1) and then commanded all the people join in at
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‘Non nobis domine’ (Ps 115:1). It was a medieval call and response. This verse linked the exodus, Agincourt and the godly perception of conquering through weakness at Naseby. After the victory, Parliament honoured Fairfax with a valuable locket. One of three images depicted him charging into battle with ‘Non nobis’ overhead.

Image 3.1: The Fairfax Jewel, NT 1276598.1.

This object was dear to Fairfax, and it was likely depicted in many engravings of him. In his memoir, written later in life, he only covered the war’s early years. Some of his final words were intended to silence critics who claimed he insufficiently attributed victory to God. Fairfax chose Psalm 115:1 to silence detractors.
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(b) Piety as a Weapon

A major theme running through Naseby providentialism was the relationship between piety and victory. Many conceived of right worship as a real weapon. There was a multifaceted relationship between victory, prayer, fasting, repentance, righteous behaviour, thanksgiving and faith. Several of these were mentioned above in relation to Stephen Marshall.

First, the godly built prayer and fasting into the national calendar. One relation of Naseby considered the victory to be a ‘returne upon our Prayers and Fastings’. Another linked victory with ‘recommend[ing] our cause to Gods protection’. Nehemiah Wallington, the London diarist and wood turner, merged scriptural examples with his own experience of ‘how such a Fast and prayer prevailed with God [in] 1645’. He worried that Naseby inflated the pride of Parliament, but ‘God maketh godly men & godly Armies instruments of greatest works’. He later lamented widespread forgetfulness of this marvellous victory. The Church of England minister, Ralph Josselin, recorded the following in his diary: ‘Ju(n). 14: At my Lady Honywoods wee agreed to meet on Tuesday to seek God for our armyes and I went to prayer, dum [while], even while wee were in prayer our armyes were conquering’. Samuel Gibson, in a September fast sermon before the Commons, saw a developing pattern:

Surely there is hope for England and Scotland, wee have had and have so many praying dayes, and have so many praying men... and we have had comfortable experience of the good effects & events of our prayers, specially after our extraordinary Fasts. After that which was kept before the battell at Naseby, when the Gospel lay at stake, and we were in distresse and feare, we sought the Lord, and he heard us, and wee had a great deliverance, and a glorious victory.

When prayers were righteous, ‘destruction is furthered’. Ungodly prayers went
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unanswered. Because sin occasioned dire circumstances from the hand of God, ‘Repentance causeth God to repent’.  

Second, as seen in Marshall’s text, it was important that victory followed humility. Between William Jenkyn’s 9 April sermon and its subsequent publication after Naseby, he said that God himself preached two sermons

by the mouth of the sword, in the very bowels of this Kingdom; The one was a punishment upon self-seeking by our losse of [Leicester], the other a blessing upon seeking him by our winning [Naseby]; In the first hee taught us this lesson, seeking ourselves and not God ruines us. In the second, this; Seeking God and not our selves revives us.  

The object lessons of Leicester and Naseby clearly related piety and victory.

Third, many linked the ethical soldiers with successful endeavours. Rushworth drew attention to pious fighters in God’s just cause:

and thus hath the Lord gone along with this new moulded Army... there were in it so many pious men, men of integrity, hating vice, fighting not out of ambitiousnesse or by ends, but ayming at Gods glory and the preservation of Religion, & Liberty, and the destruction of the Enemy.  

From Naseby till the autumn of 1647, according to a ‘Loyal lover of peace and truth’, Fairfax and his ‘saints and Christian soldiers’ had (1) practiced the ‘Golden-Rule’; (2) refrained from all evil; (3) refrained from the appearance of evil and had (4) not committed violence or wronged any man.  

Similarly, in Anglia rediviva, the Independent minister Joshua Sprigg’s army chronicle, he linked God’s omniscience with victory at Naseby. It was ‘Through the mercifull disposition of the all-seeing GOD, (privy to the integrity of good mens hearts and actions) the victorious Beams of this Rising Sun brake forth so gloriously at Naseby field’. God, seeing combatants’ beliefs and behaviours, rewarded the righteous.
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Fourth, after God blessed the humbled and repentant righteous, continued victory depended on appropriate praise. One history detailed the relationship between praising hearts and pacified foes: ‘thankfulnesse for old good turnes, inviteth new’.

Although ordered by Parliament, thankfulness should be heartfelt. On the official day of thanksgiving, Ralph Josselin was grateful that God made his affections match the occasion.

Lastly, as faith enabled victory, victory undergirded faith. Cromwell’s Naseby letter closed with the following exhortation: ‘Believe and you shall be established’ (2 Chron 20:20). This verse was significant because God did all the fighting while humans only participated through faith (2 Chron 20:17–25). A year after Naseby, the army chaplain William Dell preached to Fairfax and his men on how faith grasped victory. His claims are worth quoting at length:

I can truly and particularly say... that Bristol (among other places) was conquered by faith more then by force; it was conquered in the hearts of the godly by faith, before ever they stretched forth a hand against it.... Through faith [Heb 11:33], one of them hath chased ten, and ten put an hundred to flight, and an hundred a thousand [Lev 26:8; Josh 23:10]. And this was performed in the very letter of it, at that famous and memorable battel at Naseby.

Faith was a force. Through it, Parliament triumphed with only one-tenth of the soldiers. His insistence that this was fulfilled ‘in the very letter of it’ was ironic since Parliament had a ‘considerable numerical advantage’ at Naseby. As evidenced by Cromwell and Dell, many who linked faith with victory loosened the tie with human agency.

(c) Inhabiting Miraculous Biblical Narratives

When God himself preached a sermon, humans had an obligation to listen and try to understand. In 1646 the MP and lay theologian, Edward Leigh, wrote a three-volume treatise on theology in which he devoted considerable space to the doctrine of

---


providence. After illustrating the works of God with examples ranging from Merlin to martyrs, he closed with a discussion of God’s works in his day.

Hee studies not the Scripture as hee should, which studies not providence as he should; wee should compare Gods promises and providence together.... Wee should make a spirituall use of all occurrents, look above the courage of a Commander, the cowardise of an enemie. How much of God hath been seen in many battles, at Keintton, Newbery, Marston-moare, Naseby.399

The study of God’s word was incomplete without examination of how he governed the world.

There was a sense among many that Naseby was miraculous, or at the least as close to a miracle as God allowed. For example, Colonel John Okey wrote in a letter after Naseby that ‘I humbly desire that Thanks may be given to Almighty God that did so miraculously deliver us’.400 The Independent minister, Cuthbert Sydenham, in a work on Anglo-Scottish relations after victory at Dunbar, called Naseby and other victories ‘almost a miracle of providence’.401 The chronicler, John Vicars, ‘almost said miracles’ when describing Naseby in Magnalia Dei Anglicana.402 Richard Vines, a Westminster divine, described God’s ‘miraculous hand’ in ‘such a chain of successes and victories’ in 1645.403

George Bishop, a soldier at Naseby, hoped for God-wrought things from the New Model, namely that God ‘will make it a Saviour for this Nation’. Naseby was like a resurrection from ‘our graves’ causing ‘dead hopes to live again’. Bishop told the wounded Major General Skippon that his injury was ‘a little cloud on this glorious day’. The Major General replied that the day was so wonderful that his wound could not ‘Ecclipse its glory’.404

It is not surprising that some of the most famous biblical miracles featured in
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many accounts of Naseby, as was already seen in Stephen Marshall’s thanksgiving sermon.⁴⁰⁵ The exodus and wilderness wandering loomed large in the minds of many who tried to make sense of the victory. A collection of hymns written in honour of ‘Naseby, and other great Victories of the Church’ connected Israel with England, Deborah with Parliament and Barack with soldiers and Fairfax (Judges 4–5). The inhabitants of Canaan ‘perish[ed]’ or were ‘Lead captive’ and so were royalists at Naseby. The poem closed with the theme of the godly as the ‘brightest beams’ of the rising sun.⁴⁰⁶

Another poem set Naseby apart as the great reversal when the mighty fell. R. P. framed the battle with Moses and Miriam’s victory song over Pharaoh (Exod 15:1–21). Up to that point, the wicked royalists triumphed. As Claudian said after reflecting on why the gods allow the wicked to prosper, ‘Tolluntur in altum ut lapsu graviore cadant’ (‘He is raised aloft that he may be hurled down in more headlong ruin’).⁴⁰⁷ Naseby was proof that ‘Johavah Jareth [sic]’ (‘The Lord will see or provide’). This name came from Genesis 22:14 after God’s dramatic last-minute substitute of an ensnared ram for a restrained son. Like Isaac, ‘How sad had our condition been’ if the Lord had not come through in the ‘nicke of time’? The name of this poem, ‘Berachah’ (‘blessing’), harkened back to God’s deliverance over Ammon, Moab and Seir in 2 Chronicles 20:26. As with so many other comments on Naseby, the battle was framed with Hebrew Bible victories where God alone fought for his people—victories where God’s people were explicitly commanded not to fight (Exod 14–15; 2 Chron 20).⁴⁰⁸

Likewise, Samuel Gibson closed his Naseby-invoking sermon with a call to ‘repent, and pray, and waite, and yee shall still see the salvation of God’ (Exod 14:13–14; 2 Chron 20:17). In both accounts, the righteous were observers of the battle—they only partook passively. This could be a hope for the future—something earnestly desired but not yet experienced by Parliament. However, a marginal note alerted the reader to Gibson’s belief that, ‘That very day [of this sermon] salvation was seen

---

⁴⁰⁵ Marshall, Record, 8–9.


wonderfully by Westchester’. If the reference was to the battle of Rowton Heath, then human agency was employed to secure victory. Gibson took a text that promised victory through the hand of God alone and applied it to a situation where fighting was all too human.

The parliamentary chaplain, John Shawe, said of early losses at Naseby and other battles that ‘we have gone most forward by going backward, gained most by our losses’. He commented on the manner in which they obtained these victories:

the work is done, not by might or by power, but Gods way, by Gods spirit, Zech. 4. 6. like Jericho’s wase [Josh 6], the way that Babylon [sic] must down, Revel. 14. 6, 7, 8. and Antichrist fall, 2 Thes. 2. 8. Ezra 5. 1, 2.

Through inhabiting Joshua’s conquest eschatologically, Shawe made sense of events in 1645.

William Dell, in a sermon preached before Fairfax, compared the movements of the New Model with the miraculous guidance of Israel out of Egypt and into the promised land (Exod 13:18–22; Num 14:14; 33:1–49).

I have seen more of the presence of God in that Army, then amongst any people that ever I conversed with in my life. There hath been a very sensible presence of God with us: we have seen his goings, and observed his very footsteps: for he hath dwelt amongus, and marched in the head of us, and counsel’d us, and led us, and hath gone along with us step by step, from Naseby to Leicester, and [to many other places].... And because God hath been in the midst of us, we have not been moved our selves; and our enemies have perished (not by our valour, and weapons, and strength) but at the rebuke of his countenance [Ps 80:16].

God had taken residence among the New Model Army, and this was their secret to success.

As evidenced in a tract by W. G., it was common to speak of God’s presence as visible from Naseby onwards. He approvingly built on the popular description of Essex and Fairfax as Moses and Joshua. The parliamentarians had as much epistemic warrant (‘the same visible testimony’) for believing in the God-given authority of Essex and
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Fairfax as the Israelites had for believing in Moses and Joshua. As the Red Sea miracle produced belief in God ‘and his servant Moses’ (Exod 14:29–31), so God made it that ‘all our hearts were convinced, that of a truth God was with’ the leaders of the New Model.412

Although the sermon cannot be detailed here (for it barely touches on Naseby), Peter Sterry’s The spirit convincing of sinne (1645) was remarkable for many reasons: it declared the inestimable value of every human soul in the three kingdoms, presented a stunning vision of national eschatological reconciliation and warned that Parliament’s leaders ‘may lose [their] soules’. It strikingly equalised all persons in the three kingdoms—be they God’s enemy or friend. At the same time he strongly bifurcated the godly from the ungodly, denigrated reason, advocated a radical (political) obedience to the leading of the Holy Spirit, hoped the Holy Spirit would proceed from Christ’s mouth and (metaphorically?) kill enemies, celebrated violence and declared that if a ‘State sin against the holy Ghost, it shall never be forgiven’ (Matt 12:32; Luke 12:10). It is unclear how all these convictions cohabitated in his mind. Drawing on Psalm 114’s mention of the exodus, Sterry’s Naseby mirrored the miraculous destruction of Israel’s enemies at the Red Sea.413

A central point in many Naseby comments was the fact that the miracles were perceived by the godly and the godless alike. John Lewis, a Welsh-born parliamentarian, polemicist and magistrate, said that marvel of Naseby ‘forced’ enemies ‘to acknowledge, that they do in legible characters read Digitus Dei’.414 With all these miracles of biblical proportion, one might wonder how royalists remained unconvinced. In 1651, George Wither published a poem celebrating God’s works from Naseby to Dunbar. The dedication to the commonwealth upbraided the obstinate who would not learn from ‘miracles’. Six times, he began with a variation of ‘They have seen’ followed by one or more exodus miracles. If all these acts of God did not produce belief, Wither doubted ‘my charmes will operate much upon them’. Miracles, just as spectacular as those performed through Moses, should have convinced enemies of error. They should have seen the pillar of fire and concluded God was against them, but like Pharaoh, their

---
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heart was calloused beyond remedy.\textsuperscript{415}

The above examples show Israel after Egypt. Some still located Israel in Egypt. Even with all of these remarkable providences, they were still in bondage. Hugh Peter preached before Parliament on 2 April 1646. He listed Naseby among other providences that he sometimes termed miraculous. Later in the sermon he told them ‘I believe you have seen most of the miracles, but are not yet over the red sea’.\textsuperscript{416}

For others, Parliament wandered in the wilderness. A year after the victory, a frustrated James Nalton preached before Parliament concerning God’s anger over sluggish reform. God had been ‘as a Pillar of a cloud by day, and a Pillar of fire by night’ (Exod 13:21). Even so, there was the likelihood that ‘Your carcases shall fall in the Wildernesse, and yee shall never see the Land of Canaan’ (Num 14:29). They had forgotten the mervailous things that God did for us [Neh 9:17; Ps 78:11–12, 32; 106:7, 13, 21] at Edgehill, at Newbery, at Marston-moore, at Nazeby; famous Nazeby, never to be forgotten while we have a tongue to speak the praises of our God, for THERE did God break the Arrows of the Bow, the shield and the sword, and the battell: Selah [Ps 76:3]. There did God so break the power and pride, and rage of the enemies, that he dealt with them as he dealt with Pharaoh.... Yet all these mercies, miracles of mercies, and glorious Victories have been made scarce nine dayes wonder. Nay worse then this, We have provoked him at the Sea, even at the red Sea (Ps 106:7).

All of these mercies, because ungraciously received, left Parliament in a ‘worse’ condition.\textsuperscript{417}

Sermons like this gave voice to the anxiety that Parliament was not responsibly stewarding the gift of Naseby. Cromwell, controversially, used Naseby to suggest toleration. The Commons omitted this suggestion (contained in the version published by the Lords).\textsuperscript{418} Many used Naseby to call for unity and continued reformation.\textsuperscript{419} Together no one could stand against them. Jeremiah Burroughs later cautioned that, among fellow travellers to Canaan, bitterness and division should not flow from God’s repeated
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mercy in war. Though God had granted many deliverances in the year since Naseby, ‘we are not yet in Canaan’. In 1654 Edward Lane referred to Naseby, Dunbar and Worcester as past graces that should (but regrettably did not) prompt righteousness in the present. During the protectorate, the imprisoned Fifth Monarchist, John Rogers, wrote that God’s favour at Naseby did not mean that the current regime could rest securely while sinning. Though Naseby was confirmation from God for Cromwell’s cause in 1645, the battle could no longer function in this way in 1657.

(d) Eschatology
By inhabiting the miraculous narratives of the Hebrew Bible, the godly made sense out of their present. Many also turned to the books of Daniel and Revelation. Over the 1640s, millenarian eschatological interpretations grew in frequency and intensity—particularly among Independents. This, in part, was owing to works by Thomas Brightman (1562–1607) and Joseph Mede (1586–1638) that rose in popularity in the 1640s. Similarly, John Cotton was an influential New England interpreter.

As Alison McQueen notes in *Political Realism in Apocalyptic Times*, ‘Most of those who preached before Parliament offered an apocalyptic interpretation of England’s recent political and religious unrest’. Even those like Thomas Hobbes, who challenged the destabilising use of eschatology, enlisted the apocalypse ‘in the service of sovereign power and civil peace. He fights apocalypse with apocalypse’. Naseby (and later Drogheda and Dunbar) further infused eschatological speculation with optimism.

The former parliamentary chaplain, John Trapp, in his 1647 exposition of Revelation, located Naseby within biblical prophecies. Revelation 14:19 reads: ‘And the Angel thrust in his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, & cast it into
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the great winepresse of the wrath of God’. Commenting on this, Trapp asserted:

Down go the Antichristians immediately, by the power and prowesse of the Christian armies, thus edged and eneagered by their Preachers. This we have seen fulfilled in our late wars to our great comfort, at Edge-hill and Nazeby-fight especially.... This wine-presse is called Armageddon.426

Trapp believed that preachers ‘edged and eneagered’ bands of armed saints in their eschatological battle with ‘Antichristians’. Further, ‘the power and prowesse of the Christian armies’ ‘fulfilled’ the words spoken about ‘the Angel’ in Revelation.

(e) Astrology, Prophecy and the Prodigious

There were also more controversial ways of arriving at beliefs about Naseby. In Providence in Early Modern England, Alexandra Walsham argued that there ‘were topics which hovered on the borderline of theological respectability and which Reformed ministers and laypeople approached with various degrees of cautious ambivalence’.427 At times, and with significant nuances, the godly might affirm beliefs in portents, prodigies, wonders, divine revelations and astrology. However, they often viewed such ‘occurrences’ as vestiges of Catholic superstition. During the British Civil Wars, such beliefs gained a hearing due to the breakdown of censorship and the stress and excitement of war.

On the 9th of June, a few days before Naseby, Bulstrode Whitelocke, a prominent lawyer, politician and diarist, recounted bumping into ‘my kind friend Mr. William Lily’. Lilly, an ascendant astrologer, previously aided Whitelocke when he was ill.428 Chancing upon Whitelocke that June, Lilly asked for news of the army. He then prognosticated: “If they do not engage before the 11th of this month, the parliament will have the greatest victory that they ever yet had:” and it proved accordingly’.429

In addition to this ad hoc prediction, Lilly published widely. Barry Denton notes how ‘The writings of William Lilly were a cult as well as occult, and his later
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predictions would be discussed by educated men and poor troopers alike’. In his 1645 almanack, *Anglicus, Peace or No Peace*, he suggested that ‘if we fight [in June], a victory steals upon us’ if they ‘totally unite’. This seemed confirmed by the New Model’s success at Naseby. A third conjunction seemed to set Lilly apart as a prophet of royalist doom. In response to a royalist astrological pamphlet, Lilly hastily published *The Starry Messenger*. He interpreted the ‘strange apparition of three suns seen in London’ as a testament to the fact that Charles’ downfall was imminent. He published this treatise on 14 June—the day of Naseby. Prediction of imminent victory mixed with the news of it and propelled Lilly to fame. It was a happy alignment of prognostication, print and parliamentary success. Other predictions about the return of Leicester and the downfall of Charles I added grist to the mill. Since the perception of witchcraft seemed important in the execution of women at Naseby, Barry Denton’s comment on Lilly gains added force: ‘It is strange that, at a time when poor people could be hung for witchcraft on the evidence of a jealous neighbour, the words of Lilly were regarded with respect as science’.

(f) Later Fighting

As the exodus anticipated the conquest, many came to view Naseby as a down payment for future blessings. According to I.W., Naseby and other victories were ‘acts of the Lord’ and ‘an earnest of further mercies’. One anonymous author took Naseby as the starting point for a providential reading of history stretching until 1651.
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providential mercies kept accumulating, as evidenced by Cromwell: ‘Thus you have Long-Sutton mercy added to Naesby mercy: And to see this, is not to see the face of God.’

After Naseby, the country drifted into uncharted and uncertain waters. This battle became a ballast. When John Owen preached on the deliverance of Essex, he compared it with the exodus. He said of Naseby:

Let former mercies be an Anchor of hope in time of present distresses. Where is the God of Marstone-Moore, and the God of Naseby, is an acceptable expostulation in a gloomy day.... God came from Naseby, and the holy one from the West: Selah [Hab 3:3].

He then referenced Psalm 18 at length and used the miracles of the divine warrior to sketch verbal images reminiscent of parliamentary battle flags.

Similarly, after the victory at Worcester in 1651, Thomas Speed preached a thanksgiving sermon at the College of Bristol and recounted the works of God:

If [enemies] ask us, Where is our God? we can answer them with joy and boldness, that our God is the living God... whose power brake them in pieces at Naseby field... whose strength made the weak strong, to stain the glory of their pride at Dunbar.... We have been delivered, not by humane power or policy, but by the alone arm of our God.

The entire war confirmed God’s presence with the godly.

With such a strong emphasis on divine agency, it is not surprising that many downplayed fighting after Naseby. Writing in 1650, William Beech, possibly an army chaplain, claimed: ‘No weapon formed against our Forces did ever prosper against us, since the fatall blow at Naseby, and our Armies are in a Prosperous condition ever since’. This minimised five years of frustration, disappointment and open warfare.

These examples show how parliamentarians made the past serviceable for the
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present and future. Providential interpretations built on and reinforced each other. Relevant deliverances could precede the civil wars. For example, Jeremiah Burroughs reached back to God’s deliverance from the Spanish Armada (1588), the gunpowder plot (1605) and Naseby to show that God had not abandoned England as happened to Germany. Continued victory confirmed past providences; past providences provided a lens for continued victory.

Those opposed to Charles I often reinterpreted Naseby. In a sympathetic providential history of Cromwell’s life written shortly after his death, Henry Fletcher, whom Cromwell made Serjeant-at-Law in 1653, emphasised the horror of war. Naseby was

sad to behold! and so much the more sad, when we consider that it was English bloud, shed by English hands: here Relations were forgotten, friendship relinquished; yea, he that perhaps but lately would have laid down his own, to preserve the life of his friend, doth now use all possible industry to destroy it.... Behold the effects of a Civil War!

Naseby-fight, though a glorious work of God, should be lamented.

4. Contesting the Idea of ‘Naseby’

(a) Presbyterian Response

Richard Baxter, the influential moderate Presbyterian, hesitantly joined the army as a chaplain after Naseby. With hindsight, his *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (written mid-1660s) criticised the providentialism among the more radical persons in Cromwell’s force. He claimed to have been alarmed early on by the ideas and aims of many within the army. He considered his initial refusal to join the army as one factor that allowed these ideas to flourish. In 1650, as Independent-Presbyterian tension neared breaking point, he reflected on Naseby and other battles. He longed for an eternal rest with no more bloodshed. Repeated deaths of so many dear persons fed his desire for ‘conquest


without the calamity’. While Baxter’s rhetoric was subdued, he also edited much of the military providentialism out of later editions of *The saints everlasting rest*. Military providentialism after Naseby proved controversial when some used victory to decide orthodoxy. Henry Burton’s Naseby argued for Independency. John Bastwick, a Presbyterian and Burton’s former friend, employed the exodus miracles against this interpretation—since it was God’s ‘sole glory and honour of casting the horse and rider into the sea’ (Exod 15:21). Both agreed that God communicated through Naseby. They disagreed on the interpretation of the event and the proper inferences to draw from it. Another debate over ecclesiology and the meaning of Naseby took place between Thomas Edwards (Presbyterian) and John Goodwin (Independent). Even a game of bowling, supposedly played on the day of thanksgiving for Naseby, became a controversial matter between the two.

(b) Royalist Response

News of royalist defeat at Naseby quickly spread through the British Isles, Europe and the colonies. The victory bolstered the colonies that tacitly supported Parliament. Royalist clergy began emphasising themes of ‘exile and captivity’. Charles I wrote the Earl of Ormond that the defeat ‘makes the Irishe assistance more necessary then before’. With robust and speedy assistance from Ireland, this would ‘make me in a far better condition before Winter then I haue beene at any tyme since this Rebellion began’. Although he authorised Ormond to offer minor concessions, he was not
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willing to violate his conscience and tolerate Catholicism.\footnote{455}{‘Charles I to the Earl of Ormond’ (31 July 1645) BL, Add MS 39672, ff.34–6.}

‘If I should at any time bee taken Prysoner’, he told Prince Charles, his son was ‘never to yeild to any condicons that are dishonourable, unsafe for your person, or derogatory to royall authourity’.\footnote{456}{‘Charles I to Prince Charles’ (23 June 1645) Bodl. Lib., MS Clarendon 91, f.21.} Charles then headed towards Wales in an effort to replenish his forces.\footnote{457}{‘Charles I to Edward Nicholas’ (c. early July 1645) BL, Add MSS 78264, f.85.} He wrote Prince Rupert at the end of July that ‘Godd will not suffer rebelles & traitors to prosper’. Although he and his friends could die, he hoped that ‘Godd may yet in my time avenge his owne cause’.\footnote{458}{‘Charles I to Prince Rupert’ (31 July 1645) BL, Add MS 18983, ff.15–6.}

Some details are known about royalists reaction abroad. According to a 14 July letter from the Venetian Ambassador in France, ‘news of the defeat of the king’ was sent to the queen and ‘toned down as much as possible’. He recounted widespread ‘fear’ and the belief of some that they ‘foresee an imminent union of all the Protestants’.\footnote{459}{‘Gio. Battista Nani, Venetian Ambassador in France, to the Doge and Senate’ (14 July 1645), CSP Venice XXVII:196–97.} Using words like ‘wept’, ‘disaster’, ‘extremely enraged’ and ‘pity’, Edward Walshingham recorded the reception of defeat on the continent.\footnote{460}{‘Edward Walsingham to George Lord Digby’ (6 Aug 1645), CSP Dom Charles I DX:48–49.}

Royalists in England were likewise shocked and enraged. As shown above, they initially struggled to make sense of Naseby, although many slowly found their voice. The Restoration further loosened their tongues. As the ship the \textit{Naseby} became the \textit{Royal Charles}, so they turned many biblical themes on the Puritans. Royalist proved equally adept at locating themselves in the Mosaic narrative.\footnote{461}{J. Coffey, \textit{Exodus and Liberation: Deliverance Politics from John Calvin to Martin Luther King Jr.} (Oxford, 2013), 57–61; Guibbory, \textit{Christian Identity}, 20.} Matthew Neufeld notes how they employed themes ‘of divine deliverance, national liberation, and political and spiritual redemption’. The Restoration continued a line of deliverances that included those granted to Israel and more recent ones in 1588 and 1605. Many royalists made a concerted effort to counter godly military providentialism. Richard Perrinchief, a Church of England minister, ‘interpreted the disaster at Naseby as God’s sign that he
was preparing for the king for translation “into another Kingdom”\textsuperscript{462} He said that Charles ‘grew greater in Honour by this Defeat’.\textsuperscript{463} The royalist historian, James Heath, claimed Cromwell was disingenuous in attributing victories like Naseby to God.\textsuperscript{464}

Many parliamentarians argued that the capture of the king’s correspondence, and the timing of it, was providential. Edward Symmons, another episcopalian clergyman, tried to undermine the belief that the capture of the king’s possessions at Naseby was ‘a Miracle and a Revelation’. The violence of the Civil War, and of Naseby, was a judgment from God on both sides for the execution of Strafford and Laud. Defeat at Naseby stemmed from Parliament’s corruption, not from their righteousness.\textsuperscript{465} One history even made the connection between Charles’ anti-Catholic policies and defeat at Naseby.\textsuperscript{466}

Edward Hyde, first earl of Clarendon, commented on Naseby in a \textit{History of the Rebellion}. He emphasised the gravity of the event and the gratuitous conduct of the parliamentarian. ‘King and the kingdom were lost’ there. Of the king’s captured correspondence, the parliamentarians ‘made that barbarous use as was agreeable to their natures’. He also highlighted the ‘barbarous cruelty’ of the godly who ‘in pursuit killed above one hundred women, whereof some were officers’ wives of quality’.\textsuperscript{467}

5. Conclusion

As an event, Naseby contributed to the downfall of Charles and the rise of parliamentarian hegemony. As an idea, the godly infused it with providential significance. Naseby confirmed parliamentarian beliefs about the righteousness of their
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cause. The battle—interpreted by many as a victory for Independency—exacerbated fault lines with Scottish Presbyterians. It contributed to the worsening relations that culminated in the battles of Dunbar (chapter five) and Worcester.

Parliamentarian views about the justice and holiness of their actions were complex. In discussions of Naseby, however, justice was rarely argued for. The victory itself became the confirmation. God authored the victory; human were his stylus. Their accounts told of gallant men and gracious miracles. Many put immense energy and creativity into formulating dynamic and richly textured beliefs about Naseby. Most linked acts of devotion with the destruction of adversaries. The biblical past, notably the exodus, wilderness and conquest, loomed large in their understanding of God’s work at Naseby. Eschatological texts were also important in locating their struggle within a providential trajectory. It was for these reasons that Restoration critics put so much effort into undermining the memory of Naseby.

The godly rehearsed their interpretations of God’s communication through Naseby. In the end, the narrative proved uncontrollable. The Naseby became the Royal Charles. The Royal Charles, captured by the Dutch in 1667 during an attack in the Medway, was turned into a tourist attraction in Holland—a sight that must have reminded English viewers of all that ship represented for the godly, the Restoration and Second Anglo-Dutch War.

While Parliament’s hegemony increased, few challenged the providential narrative. Splintering and infighting among the godly, and the Restoration, facilitated alternative military providentialisms. Although some cherished fond memories of Naseby,468 the Restoration forced many to reevaluate the role of providence. The loss of power had shorn them of many of their clear and confident beliefs about godly violence.

---

4. Drogheda (1649): ‘Christ begins to reign as a Man of Blood’

1. Introduction

It was 11 September 1649 and Nicholas Bernard, a Protestant minister and former chaplain to James Ussher, huddled with his congregation inside Drogheda. They bowed and prayed while Drogheda’s walls were pummelled and breached. As the fighting neared, one ‘Bullet shot through the Doore touched my hand’, Bernard later recounted. It was a time, he reminded his congregation, ‘when not only your goods, (according to the custome of Warre) were made a spoyl of, but your lives were in the like danger and mine in equall hazard’. Cromwell’s non-discriminating soldiers could have massacred them, ‘but by a speciall providence of God [they were] preserved’. He worked their salvation

when by violence [Cromwell’s soldiers] had broken in, (while we were all at prayers, commending our soules to God, and imploring his preservation of us) God was so pleased to asswage that present fury of the Souldiers, that none with me, (to the number of about twenty of you) received any further mischief, and immediately after, one (unthought of by me, whom I had not seen in eightene years before, who was Colonell in the Army) came and protected us fully, and I tooke him the rather as sent of God.469

Subjected to the indiscriminating vengeance of Protestants, Bernard’s congregation was saved by providence.

Although Drogheda has attracted the scholarly attention due a massacre of near-mythic infamy, none have provided a comprehensive assessment of the military providentialism surrounding this event. After detailing sermons preparing the godly for conquest, it focuses on the sack of Drogheda. The godly had a complex view about who they fought there. The guilt of the defenders of Drogheda, be they English royalists or Irish Catholics, was compounded by the belief that they refused to bend under the providential dispensations of the previous decade. The chapter then focuses on post-Drogheda sermons. These eschatologically infused messages argued that the godly needed to temporarily become comfortable with the prodigious shedding of blood— with one sermon even praising men ‘of blood’.

2. The Irish Rebellion of 1641

For reasons that cannot be explored here, Thomas Bartlett rightly notes how understanding Irish conflict requires three kingdoms, European and Atlantic perspectives.\textsuperscript{470} English beliefs about the Irish were just as complex as those they held about Native Americans. There were, however, many more occasions for positive and negative interaction over a longer period of time, dating at least to the papal approval of conquest given to Henry II in 1169.\textsuperscript{471} Tudor and Stuart successes and failures in Ireland, though not explored here, provide an important backdrop to the conflicts of the 1640s and 1650s.\textsuperscript{472} The English Reformation foregrounded religious differences. Centuries of accumulated injustice and prejudice led to hardened beliefs about the ‘other’.\textsuperscript{473}

In the 1640s and 1650s, no major armed groups in Ireland kept their hands clean. According to Frank Tallett, ‘[i]f England represented the low point on the barometer of violence, Ireland represented the highest’. Scotland ‘occupies a mid-point’.\textsuperscript{474} In the late 1630s and early 1640s, as recently highlighted by Joan Redmond, it looked as if the Ulster Scots might join their Scottish brethren by rebelling against Charles’ policies and administrators.\textsuperscript{475} The Irish, however, got there first. The still-contentious Irish Rebellion of 1641—and the initial response to it—accounts for much of the barbarity. Through the centuries, many wielded these events in ongoing political or religious battles. Interpretation is controversial, Ethan Shagan argued, because the ‘seventeenth century is alive in Ireland’ and only starting to pass ‘from memory to history’.\textsuperscript{476}

The Rebellion sparked escalating cycles of violence that resulted ‘in the death of
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over one-fifth of the Irish population’.\footnote{477} News of the indiscriminate massacre of Protestants travelled. Eyewitnesses claimed rebellious leaders, like Sir Phelim O’Neill, produced documents of royal sanction.\footnote{478} In the 1640s and 1650s, Protestant commissioners meticulously recorded and compiled stories of those fleeing persecution. ‘The depositions record the names of over 90,000 victims, assailants, bystanders and observers, and include references to every county, parish and barony in Ireland’. The depositions themselves have been another source of conflict throughout the centuries.\footnote{479} Eamon Darcy has detailed the rhetorical links between 1641 and narrations of the 1622 Virginia massacre—highlighting the common discourses used against Native Americans, Catholics and the ‘wild irish’.\footnote{480}

Surprised by the rebellion, as Nicholas Canny argues, the godly were already primed to view the attack in apocalyptic Foxean terms.\footnote{481} Their idea of peaceful Ireland compounded the sin of rebellion. However, ‘Ireland had actually been in a state of constant conflict for the previous hundred years’ .\footnote{482} Hugh Peter placed the body count from 1641 at ‘1000000’, John Milton at ‘154000 in the Province of Ulster’, Lucy Hutchinson at ‘200,000’ and—even a century later—Jonathan Edwards at ‘above 200,000’.\footnote{483} As Aiden Clarke has detailed, estimated deaths range from hundreds of thousands (17th century) to less than five thousand (argued recently). He concludes that there was ‘no general massacre’ of Protestants and the total number of deaths is, unfortunately, ‘unknowable’.\footnote{484} The parliamentarian conquest of Ireland was predicated,
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to a large extent, upon these massacres—and they believed that over a hundred thousand innocents died. Although not veridical, this belief matters. People generally act on what they believe to be true based on real-time information.485

Between 1641 and the parliamentarian conquest in 1649, the region saw shifting allegiances between many parties. Scholars normally use two groupings for Parliament’s opponents from Ireland: the Native Irish and Old English. Micheál Ó Siochru posits three: ‘a peace party, a clerical party and a loose grouping of non-aligned moderates’.486 Forming the Irish Catholic Confederation based in Kilkenny, they struggled, and in many ways succeeded, in self-governance between 1642 and 1649. Although they claimed loyalty, the Confederation had an uneasy relationship with the king and his representative James Butler (recently elevated as the 1st marquis of Ormond). A papal nuncio, Archbishop Giovanni Battista Rinuccini, endowed with money, authority and strong opinions, further complicated internal Irish politics (arrived 12 Oct 1645).487 Leaving three years later, this frustrated nuncio foresaw the surrender of Ireland to Parliament.488 Royalists and Confederates finally reached an agreement on 17 January 1649—two weeks before the execution of Charles I.489 What he failed to do in life, he accomplished in death—unifying much of Ireland against Parliament.

3. God’s Vengeance on Ireland’s Shores
The godly in Old and New England long desired to carry God’s vengeance to Ireland’s shores. Hugh Peter, in 1646, said ‘The wild Irish and the Indian doe not much differ, and therefore would be handled alike’.490 The Massachusetts clergyman, Nathaniel

486. M. Ó Siochru, Confederate Ireland: A constitutional and political analysis (Dublin: Four Courts, 2008), 18.
487. Ibid., 96–117.
489. Ó Siochru, Confederate Ireland, 201; cf. ‘Marquis of Ormond to Charles I’ (21 Jan 1649), CClSP I:465.
490. H. Peter, Mr. Peters last report of the English wars (London, 1646), 5.
Ward, closed *The Simple Cobler of Aggawam* (1647) with a screed against man-eating, devil-infatuated Irish Catholics ‘and such as shall take up Armes in their defense’. He invoked Meroz’ curse against those who shirked God’s call.491

Having taken a load off the king’s shoulders, the godly attended to Ireland. John Milton’s 1649 publications show the intertwined nature of justifying the regicide, supporting the new government and subduing the Irish. Published in mid-February, *The tenure of kings and magistrates*, defended tyrannicide by the original authority—the people.492 A *History of Britain* related spiritual declension with physical conquest.493 Around the time of the Wexford siege, Εἰκονοκλάστης rolled off the presses. Throughout the work, Milton associated Charles I with superstition and violence in Ireland.494 Between these works (in mid-May), Milton, at the behest of Parliament, published *Observations upon the Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels*.495 As summarised by Anne Fogarty, Milton’s

righteous anger is directed severally at Ormond, the recently executed English monarch, the “inhumane Rebels and Papist Ireland” and the “pretended Brethren”, the Scottish Presbyterians of Belfast. Even though all these groups and figures are differentiated, they also ironically melt into one another and are condemned with equal ferocity.496

This ‘melting’ of identities was also evident in writings about Drogheda.

(a) Conquest Sermons

Many understudied sermons evidence a spectrum of complex beliefs circulating in the months before the conquest. John Owen’s sermon, Οὐρανων ουρανια, *The shaking and

495.J. Milton, *Observations upon the Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels* (London, 1649) CWJM VI:187–249. This work was appended to the articles.
translating of heaven and earth (19 April 1649), was an earnestly-delivered, eschatological message about the ‘μετάθεσις’ (translation) of antichristian polities and the impending growth of godly rule.\(^{497}\) That same day in the Commons, John Warren preached a cautiously expectant eschatological sermon that also emphasised political translations.\(^{498}\) Henry Walker, a minister and publisher of the newsbook *Perfect Occurrences*, preached at White Hall in July. His sermon on Numbers 14:24 emphasised the need to follow the courageous and unpopular Spirit-led Caleb into Canaan. He closed by calling the godly to ‘go cheerfully to destroy Idolaters and Rebels’.\(^{499}\) In celebration of Rathmines in August, John Canne argued that unparalleled apocalyptic victory against Irish ‘Rebels, murderers, monsters, monstrous Monsters’ should be leveraged against Scottish Presbyterians.\(^{500}\) In May, John Maudit styled Parliament and the soldiers as faith-empowered martyr conquerors, and two weeks before Drogheda, William Cooper described the forces as apocalyptic avengers. These final two sermons will be considered in detail.

**(b) John Maudit and Martyred Conquerors**

On the 20th of May 1649, John Maudit preached an often-overlooked sermon on Hebrews 11:32–35. Then a fellow at Exeter College and senior proctor of Oxford, he delivered this sermon at the university before Thomas Fairfax (and possibly Cromwell), later dedicating it to them both. Faith was the theme; conquest the occasion: ‘be strong in the Faith, believe, believe, believe, all things are possible to him that believeth’.\(^{501}\) These ‘Hall of Faith’ verses record the lives of those who killed (Sampson, Jephthah, David) and were killed (Sampson, martyrs). God rewarded both.

Maudit collectively and simultaneously identified with the slaughterers and the slaughtered in Hebrews. There was a chronological shift from martyr to warrior. Because Protestants were martyred since 1641 (Heb 11:35), the godly could now act as

---


warriors (Heb 11:32–34). This passage, however, eschewed earthly kingdoms and taught forbearance. He put it in the service of building a terrestrial kingdom and ending persecutor’s lives. Maudit recognised the incongruity. His applicational inversion took a circuitous route—thereby making it suitable for soldiers. Through dozens of uses of totalising theological language (e.g. ‘Faith breaks through all’), he proclaimed a sloganised version of faith-activated promises. Maudit then applied universal principles to a particular situation—conquest. Even though the original audience of Hebrews passively suffered, faith laid hold of these truths and marched into battle with them. Additionally, in emphasising faith, he erased nearly all human agency.502

Maudit assumed the cause was holy. Through Scripture, he foregrounded the unprovoked nature of Protestant deaths. He told Cromwell, ‘Feare not your enemies, their owne guilt hath weakned them. You are sent over not to harme and oppresse the innocent, but to subdue and chastise the rebellious’. All the Irish seemed to fall under the latter category. The nature of the crime rendered unquestionable the righteousness of the cause. The godly, he believed were primed for victory by ‘seaven yeares prayers’. However, weak faith jeopardised entrance ‘into Canaan’.503 If victory followed, it was God’s gracious response to faithful leaders. If defeat ensued, the deadweight of England’s unbelievers drowned the godly.

(c) William Cooper and Apocalyptic Avengers

The Irish campaign was months in the making, and Protestant Dublin was one of the only remaining strongholds.504 Ormond laid siege to it between late June and early August. Ironically, only two years earlier, Ormond kept the parliamentary cause in Ireland alive by surrendering Dublin to Parliament instead of giving it into Catholic hands.505 At the time of Ormond’s siege, godly power in Ireland was weak. That changed with the victory at Rathmines. Parliament called for thanksgiving on the 29th of August.506 Thanksgiving for victory mingled with (often incredible) rumours of
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defeat.507

On that day of thanksgiving, William Cooper preached before the Commons. He had recently returned from The Hague where he was chaplain to Elizabeth, the exiled queen of Bohemia. He now ministered at St Olave’s Church, Southwark.508 In this thanksgiving sermon, כְּלִי בְּשָׁמַיִם, Jerusalem Favell to her Assailants, he employed providential, eschatological and Foxean lenses.509 Dublin’s fortitude was an ‘owning by heaven’ of Parliament’s cause. It confirmed an upward ascent into divine favour. Zechariah 12:2–5—a prophetic jubilation concerning a broken siege—was ‘Today... fulfilled to us’. God was a wall and a weapon, rendering them ‘invincible’. Fighting the City of Peace was self-immolation.510

From Revelation 19:17–19, he argued that birds feasting on carcasses pictured ‘militant saints’ fed by Christ ‘upon the spoiles of their enemies’ (cf. Num 14:9). It was God’s presence among his people that gave them ‘the strength of an Unicorn’ and let them, like a lion, ‘drink the blood of the slain’ (Num 23:21–23). As per Old Testament examples, wickedness towards the righteous invited matching divine judgement—often through human instruments. God, ‘will never let a wickednesse goe unpuished [sic]’.511

No grounds for mercy seemed forthcoming, from God or Cooper.

Who did Cooper believe the true enemies were? He explicitly named ‘Lord Ormond’—a man of Anglo-Norman stock whose family had long been representatives in Ireland.512 He was a stalwart defender of the Protestant Church of Ireland. This was Cooper’s prophetic and apocalyptic foil. He was not an Irish Catholic but an English Episcopalian. Of Irish Catholics—even murdering ones—he thought the godly should ‘not only civilize, but spiritualize their wild barbarisme’. Some had ‘cruelly pierced’ Christ himself by ‘murther[ing]... his Members’—though many murdered ‘ignorantly’.
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Although the ‘Plough of war and severity’ needed to uproot the ‘principals’, Cooper sketched a vision for ‘mercy towards the multitude ingenerall [sic]’. By leading them towards civility and piety, ‘your victory become[s] theirs’. 513 Commenting on this, Crawford Gribben said ‘Ireland’s sufferings should be redemptive’. 514

(d) Preparing for Conquest

The regicide problematised issues of authority. The newly-formed Commonwealth strengthened power by defining treason, limiting preaching and restricting print. 515 Some openly and defiantly ignored their orders. 516 Contemporary newsbooks detailed a variety of potential external threats (e.g. France and Holland) and internal threats (Levellers). 517 After ‘levelling the levellers’—to use Hardress Waller’s phrase—preparations for Ireland gained momentum. 518

Parliament asked Cromwell to lead the conquest. According to John Morrill, Cromwell was ‘deeply prejudiced. But there is a large gap between prejudice and a will to exterminate’. 519 Although he long desired retribution for Ireland, 520 he was uncertain God wanted him to be the instrument. The commander mattered less than the cause. He awaited divine directing. This could have exempted him from involvement in Ireland’s reduction. Doubting a personal divine call at this stage may have contributed to his later certitude that he was God’s instrument. By late March, he resolved to go. 521 He accepted
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a commission as Lord Lieutenant in mid-June—a position which also gave him governing authority.\textsuperscript{522}

Upon departing, Cromwell sensed four threats: ‘I had rather be overrun with a Cavalierish interest than a Scotch interest; I had rather be overrun with a Scotch interest, than an Irish interest’.\textsuperscript{523} Above all, he warned against division among the godly. The Irish were barbarous. Most—though still ‘as bad as Papists’—were ‘not of any religion’. ‘All the Papists and the King’s party—I cannot say all the Papists, but the greater party of them—are in a very strong combination against you’.\textsuperscript{524} Here he expressed remarkable views about the Irish and Catholics. For all his totalising language, he theoretically retained the ability to differentiate between enemies.

4. The Siege of Drogheda

Leaving London on 10 July, Cromwell headed towards Milford Haven on the Welsh coast. Those in and around London fasted on the 11th.\textsuperscript{525} Upon arriving in Dublin on 15 August, he described his mission as a restoration of ‘just liberty and property’ and retribution ‘against the barbarous and bloodthirsty Irish’.\textsuperscript{526} He morally reformed Dublin—lest God break forth in anger.\textsuperscript{527} On the 24th, Parliament declared that ‘English or Scotts’ enemies who formerly fought with Parliament would be treated—along with all others supporting Charles II—as ‘Traitors and Rebels’.\textsuperscript{528} That same day Cromwell ordered restraint towards civilians.\textsuperscript{529} He executed a few soldiers who broke these orders. This ensured that, outside of a few brutal sieges, there was ‘little random violence’.\textsuperscript{530} This restraint, as Ó Siochrú argues, was ‘prudent military practice,
motivated by genuine necessity’. Begun in moderation, his campaign would be remembered for massacre.

Drogheda, where the blood-letting began, was only taken in mid-July from Parliament by the vacillating Protestant Gaelic Irishman, Murrough O’Brien (Lord Inchiquin). Much of the garrison switched allegiance—making them ‘Traitors and Rebels’. As many troops tended to be less ideologically committed, side-changing was common. Ormond soon strengthened Drogheda ‘with 2,000 infantry’. He fortified the town in an attempt to slow Cromwell until winter wreaked havoc on his troops. Drogheda’s location made cooperation difficult for Parliament’s two strongholds in Dublin and Derry.

The commander in Drogheda was Sir Arthur Aston, a seasoned veteran of the Thirty Years War. A Catholic, he fought for the king and served as the governor of Oxford. Under his command, Protestants and Catholics alike defended its walls. Aston felt undersupplied. Defections worsened the situation. As Ormond staked much on Drogheda, Aston was not allowed to capitulate upon terms.

With winter approaching, Cromwell did not want a lengthy siege. Once
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underway, he wanted to continue striking while ‘the fear of God is upon them’. He prayed before marching towards Drogheda. The town was thirty miles up the coast from Dublin. On the 9th Cromwell ‘dischardged 3 greate peeses towards the towne’, and on the 10th he called for surrender, ‘to the end the effusion of blood may be prevented’. He demanded a return to ‘obedience’. Although Aston privately doubted success, he refused. Cromwell claimed this rejection absolved him from unjustified bloodshed.

The River Boyne divided Drogheda. Cromwell positioned his battery on the southeastern side near St. Mary’s. ‘The Enemies word was Ormond’, but the godly chose ‘Our Lord God’. According to A briefe relation, after unsuccessful attempts, ‘God was pleased to give a new spirit of Courage to our Men, and they fell on again, and entred it’. One letter claimed they succeeded ‘through the glorious power of God (which was wonderfully seen there)’. Cromwell, unsurprisingly, downplayed human agency. Although the divine was in the details, the loss of life still angered him.

It was set upon some of our hearts, That a great thing should be done, not by power or might, but by the Spirit of God [Zech 4:6]. And is it not so clear? That which caused your men to storm so courageously, it was the Spirit of God, who gave your men Courage, and took it away again; and gave the enemy courage, and took it away again; and gave your men courage again, and therewith this happy success. And therefore it is good that God alone have all the Glory.

If the assault on the town resembled the motion of a seesaw, God affected the highs and lows. As John Morrill notes, God’s gift of strength to the defenders that resulted in
parliamentarian deaths was ‘clearly linked to the refusal of quarter’.

After Parliament’s forces breached the walls, Aston, along with many of his best soldiers, unsuccessfully defended the heavily fortified tower at Millmount. Aston met a bloody end, bludgeoned with his wooden leg by soldiers who believed it contained gold. The sources agree that parliamentarians killed all Millmount’s defenders. They disagree on the details. A perfect diurnall contained an anonymous letter claiming defenders were ‘perswaded’ to move locations and ‘disarmed, and afterwards all slain’. It ‘praised’ God that ‘the pit which’ enemies ‘digged for us they fell into themselves’. Another letter said quarter ‘would not be accepted’. According to the anti-parliamentarian Mercurius elencticus, royalist soldiers were ‘perfidiously Murthered...
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one by one’.\footnote{555}{S. Sheppard (ed.), \textit{Mercurius elencticus} (8th–15th Oct 1649) Issue 24: 187.} Cromwell also commented on his commands: ‘[O]ur men getting up to them, were ordered by me to put them all to the sword. And indeed, being in the heat of action, I forbade them to spare any that were in arms in the town’.\footnote{556}{‘Oliver Cromwell to William Lenthall’ (17 Sept 1649), Abbott, \textit{Cromwell II}:126.} As one who consistently attributed actions to God’s will, he also took personal responsibility for controversial orders.

The speedy capture of the town south of the Boyne caught everyone by surprise. Before defenders pulled up the drawbridge, Parliament crossed and continued killing. Many fled to the steeple of St. Peter’s for refuge. Cromwell’s account highlighted self-damnation:

These being summoned to yield to mercy, refused, whereupon I ordered the steeple of St. Peter’s Church to be fired, where one of them was heard to say in the midst of the flames: God damn me, God confound me, I burn, I burn.\footnote{557}{Ibid.}

Colonel Hewson gave more detail:

but they refusing to come down, the steeple was fired, and then 50 of them got out at the top of the Church, but the enraged Souldiers put them all to the sword, and 30 of them were burnt in the fire, some of them cursing and crying out, God damn them, and cursed their soules as they were burning.\footnote{558}{R. Collings (ed.), \textit{The kingdoms weekly intelligencer} (2nd–9th Oct 1649) Issue 332: 1523.}

Flames danced upward as impious words, revealed in the inferno, descended. Whereas burning humans was God-glorifying, rash words while being burned proved damnable. They seem to have interpreted this conflagration as a proleptic foretaste of hellfire.

According to Cromwell, execution at church was theologically ‘remarkable’ for another reason:

the last Lord’s day before the storm, the Protestants were thrust out of the great Church called St. Peters, and they had public mass there: and in this very place near one thousand of them were put to the sword, fleeing thither for safety.\footnote{559}{‘Oliver Cromwell to William Lenthall’ (17 Sept 1649), Abbott, \textit{Cromwell II}:128.}
Within a week, God turned the tables on the ungodly. Where Catholics celebrated the Mass, the godly celebrated a mass killing.

While St. Peter’s went up in flames, ‘about 200’ soldiers in other towers ‘did yeeld to the Generals mercy, where most of them have their lives, and be sent to the Barbadoes’.  

Cromwell only estimated that ‘thirty of the whole number escaped with their lives’.  

He unabashedly recounted the fate of these garrisons: ‘From one of the said towers... they killed and wounded some of our men’. As a result, ‘When they submitted, their officers were knocked on the head, and every tenth man of the soldiers killed, and the rest shipped for the Barbadoes’. Cromwell then offered a now-famous justification:

I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgement of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbru’d their hands in so much innocent blood; and that it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future, which are the satisfactory grounds to such actions, which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret.

This comment fascinates scholars who are keen to note the chasm between explaining Cromwell actions and justifying them. These words raise more questions than can be definitively answered.

First, were harsh measures at Drogheda exceptional for siege warfare and did they in fact ‘prevent the effusion of blood”? Many have noted how Cromwell acted within the bounds of contemporary rules of warfare—though he showed more moderation in England and Scotland. Scholars, however, are divided on the effectiveness of harsh policies.
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Second, what did it mean for Cromwell to feel ‘remorse and regret’? In a previous letter, he called the executions a life-saving ‘bitterness’.\textsuperscript{566} John Gibney sees a Cromwell who ‘seems to have been disturbed by what he had witnessed. His oft-quoted justification... has the uneasy tone of a post-facto rationalization’.\textsuperscript{567} Ó Siochru finds ‘a man ill at ease with his conscience’.\textsuperscript{568}

Third, were these ‘barbarous wretches’ Irish, Irish Catholics, English, English Catholics, English Protestants or former adherents to the parliamentary cause? Back in 1642, Hugh Peter’s report from Ireland noted some futility of differentiating between persons: ‘An Irish Rebel and an English Cavallier in words and actions we found as unlike as an egge is to an egge’.\textsuperscript{569} In the immediate context, Cromwell seems to refer to soldiers in the towers who refused terms and needlessly ‘killed and wounded some of our men’. Deana Rankin rightly notes that Cromwell’s comment does not contain the words ‘Irish’ or ‘Ireland’.\textsuperscript{570} Many have argued that, if it was revenge for 1641, then vengeance was misplaced. His logic has been called ‘nonsensical’, theologically ‘questionable’, ‘not founded on fact’, ‘shot through with factual error’ and a ‘blatant mendacity’.\textsuperscript{571} Others think there was more to it. Both Derek Hirst and David Stevenson speak of the 1641 blood-guilt as stretching to cover all defending the garrison.\textsuperscript{572}

John Morrill has argued that the ire was knowingly directed, first and foremost,
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at English royalists whose guilt was compounded by ignoring previous providential strokes.\textsuperscript{573} The defenders, in this view, continued to shed innocent blood even after God declared against the king and his cause. Others, like Eamon Darcy, are still convinced that Cromwell had the Catholics of 1641 in mind.\textsuperscript{574} However, there is no reason to choose between Cromwell knowingly targeting English royalists and his sense of executing justice for 1641.\textsuperscript{575} Royalist guilt for renewing a providentially defeated cause was intensified because it was Irish Catholics they renewed that cause with. As argued about the Pequot War (see appendix), defending the guilty and obstructing justice made one complicit.

Reports differ on casualty estimates. According to Morrill,

\begin{quote}

evidence that civilians (other than priests and friars) were killed in cold blood is of a limited and inconclusive form…. The implication of both Cromwell and Peter is that about 700–800 civilians died and I see no reason to doubt that figure…. What is not clear is how many civilians… died in cold blood.\textsuperscript{576}
\end{quote}

The officially published \textit{Letters from Ireland}, mostly from Cromwell, said they slew ‘many Inhabitants’.\textsuperscript{577} Hugh Peter wrote a letter after ‘giving thanks’ in a Dublin church. He claimed ‘Three thousand five hundred fifty and two of the Enemies slaine’ and ‘none spared’.\textsuperscript{578} Colonel Hewson estimated ‘at least 3000 dead bodies’\textsuperscript{.\textsuperscript{579}} One particularly calloused account, though likely sensationalised, purported to give gory sexualised details of civilian slaughter.\textsuperscript{580}

Cromwell admitted they killed some some members of the clergy:

\begin{quote}

I believe all their friars were knocking on the head promiscuously but two; the one of which was Father Peter Taaff (Brother to the Lord Taaff), whom the
\end{quote}
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soldiers took the next day, and made an end of; the other was taken in the round
tower, under the repute of lieutenant, and when he understood that the officers in
that tower had no quarter, he confessed he was a friar, but that did not save
him. 581

Similarly, the royalist officer, Sir Edmund Verney, was killed in cold blood—reportedly
days after promised quarter. 582

Drogheda sparked a paper war with some welcoming and others denying
victory. 583 Royalists newsbooks furthered the idea of Cromwellian atrocity. 584
Authorities tried to suppress printed claims of a general massacre. 585 As noted in Ralph
Josselin’s diary, rumour spread, of the ‘putting the garrison, and some say the
inhabitants to the sword’. 586 Newsbook details were often fragmentary, inaccurate or
contradictory. 587 Parliament’s many enemies in Ireland and abroad wrote privately and
publicly of the barbarity directed against civilian and soldier alike. 588

As noted by John Morrill, Cromwell’s letters from Drogheda and Wexford,
although thick with providence, contained little biblical reflection. 589 Colonel Hewson
offers the most scripturally dense eyewitness account. His forces, led into the breach at
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Drogheda, suffered heavily. Many quote his letter for details on the battle. This, however, ignores most of what he wrote. Nearly every phrase in the lengthy introduction and conclusion was biblically saturated. It opened with a long-winded providential speech frame:

he hath made his arm bare [Isa 51:9; 52:10]... for truly we may say, the Lord is a Man of warre, the Lord is his name [Exod 14:3]: whatsoever he pleases, that he doth in heaven, in earth, and every great deep [Ps 135:6], that he is terrible out of his holy places [Ps 68:35], wounding Kings in his wrath [Ps 2:5; 110:5; cf. 149:6–9], and the mighty in his sore displeasure [Ps 2:5], saving his people with an out-stretched Arme from under the power of their oppressors [e.g. Exod 6:6], when he bowes the heavens and comes down [2 Sam 22:10; Ps 18:9], great mountains flye at his presence [Rev 16:20], a fire going before him, devouring his enemies [Ps 97:3]. Tremble, O earth, at the presence of the Lord [Ps 114:7].

You have heard how this fire hath devoured a mighty enemy encamped before this City [Isa 29:1–7]... but God came at a needfull time, scattered, and by his immediate hand [e.g. Ezek 20:34], destroyed and dispersed that huge Host.

This was Drogheda through spiritual eyes. Hewson then retold the conquest—emphasising the actions of men. He closed by returning to the spiritual perspective.

Let them then behold the face of God set against them [e.g. Jer 44:11], and the hand of God lifted up: for if they will not see, they shall see and be ashamed for their envy at the people [Isa 26:11], when the Lord by his power shall break them in pieces like a Potters vessell [Ps 2:9; Rev 2:27].

Hewson emphasised divine agency, sometimes working directly and at other times through weak instruments. The New Testament, except Revelation, was nowhere to be found as Drogheda’s defenders morphed into Israel’s enemies.

5. Responses to Drogheda

Many put Drogheda to theological use. The massacre made its way into lists of providential victories and eulogies on Cromwell. Even the Presbyterian William Prynne leveraged it against garrisons he thought were dishonouring to God and
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politically counterintuitive. Thomas Ball, a Church of England minister with sympathies for Presbyterian church government, thought Drogheda exemplified single-minded ministerial endurance.

One supporter of Parliament—claiming divine inspiration—believed Cromwell was too merciful. In a remarkably understudied letter written after Dunbar, William Hickman criticised Cromwell’s policies. The carrot was for the Scots; the stick for the Irish. Guilty Scots should be ‘bate[d]’ with ‘freedome and proffitt’. In contrast, ‘God hath marked out [the Irish] people for destruction’. They should be made to face their sins. By showing clemency, Cromwell risked contamination. The land should be ‘purged of blood’ by shedding ‘the blood of those that shed it’. This was the advice of one who marked godliness by ‘love, charity, humblenesse, tender compassion to all men, wishing unto them as to themselves’.

New England reacted positively to Cromwell’s campaign—likely viewing the defeated as Irish Catholics. Ministers thanked God for using Cromwell as ‘a glorious Instrument of his just vengeance upon those bloody monsters of mankinde’. People ‘have cryed in [God’s] eares for vengeance against the inhuman murtherers’. They were also thankful that Cromwell ‘ascribe[d] the glory to him alone... the Lord of Hoasts mighty in battel’. Cromwell tried to draw New Englanders to Ireland—a proposal they seriously considered. Although Roger Williams was thankful for the conquest, seeing it as a victory for tolerance and a judgement on violence, he knew English Protestants contributed to the conflict. This tempered his enthusiasm for the conquest.

(a) Catholic Response

In the wake of Drogheda, Wexford and other victories in 1649, the now-unified Catholic
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hierarchy met at Clonmacnoise in December. They declared ‘as a most certaine truth, that the Enemies resolution is, to extirpate the Catholique religion’. 597 Theirs was a just war against those fighting for religion.

The Clonmacnoise declaration infuriated Cromwell. In responding, he aimed to undeceive the masses. The English ‘lived Peaceably & honestly amongst you’ to the benefit of all—that is, until the clergy ‘broke this union’. This ‘unprovoked’ 1641 massacre, necessitated retribution:

*England* hath had experience of the blessing of God in prosecuting just and righteous causes.... And if ever men were engaged in a righteous cause in the World, this wil be scarce a second to it; we are come to aske an accompt of the innocent blood that hath been shed.

Those who join with Catholics—the ‘old English, new English, Scotch’—use the ‘figg leafe of pretence, that they fight for their King... when really they fight in protection of men of so much prodigious blood’. This was telling. Royalists in Ireland did not uphold the law; they obstructed justice. Protestants joined to the rebels ‘will never be able to assoyle themselves’. 598 As with the logic of expanding bloodguilt in the Pequot War, the only way to ‘assoyle’ oneself was to disassociate from perpetrators.

Shortly after the regicide, Parliament even appointed John Winter—a well-known Catholic—to offer limited toleration to Irish Catholics in exchange for support. 599 Now Cromwell offered limited toleration for ordinary Catholics while taking a harder line against rebellion-instigating clergy. It did not follow (except, he argued, in Catholic logic) that wrong beliefs merited execution. Those ‘massacred, destroyed or banished’ were ‘in armes’. He offered mercy to those who submit, exempting a few leaders as ‘examples of justice’. Cromwell argued that he could delight in showing mercy. However, if obstinacy remained, he freed himself of guilt and could ‘rejoyce to exercise utmost severity against them’. 600
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(b) Thanksgiving

The Commons welcomed news from Drogheda. On the 29th the Council of State at Whitehall ordered ministers to declare the victory. The triumph, as they framed it, was over ‘Irish Rebels and their Adherents’. Ministers in and around London called upon to praise and petition God, stirring ‘the people to give thanks for his goodness, in still owning and blessing the endeavors of this Commonwealth’.

The Commons ordered a letter to be written to Cromwell—approving of the results and method used at Drogheda: ‘the House doth approve of the Execution done at Drogheda, as an Act both of Justice to them, and Mercy to others, who may be warned by it’. A week later they published their grounds for thanksgiving. The Act is worth reproducing at length for its scriptural argumentation:

The great and wonderful Providences, wherein the Lord hath eminently gone forth in mercy towards this Nation, have been such, that howsoever many do shut their eyes [e.g. Isa 6:10; Matt 13:15], or murmur against them [e.g. Num 14:27]... Nevertheless, the Lord hath been pleased to publish to all the world [Exod 34:10], That it is the work of his own hand [Ps 44:3]: Nor hath his infinite goodness and favor been restrained to England only, but extended to Ireland, which he hath been pleased to remember in its low estate [Ps 136:23]; and when his People there were as dry bones, He hath not onely revived them in a way almost as miraculous as a Resurrection from the Dead [Ezek 37], but been pleased to raise both them and us to a high pitch of hope, That the Lord will go on to perfect his work in that Land, and make it likewise at last a quiet Habitation for his People [Isa 32:18; 33:20], and establish the power and purity of the Gospel there.... [The sack of Drogheda struck]... Terror into the hearts of the Enemy [e.g. Exod 15:16; 23:27], so as they have yielded up or deserted many other considerable Castles and Garisons, as Trym, Dundalk, Carlingford, the Newry, and other Places.

God’s vindication of the regicide was implied, as was the relationship between Drogheda and the legitimacy of the Commonwealth. They likened the near-miraculous change of fortunes in Ireland to Ezekiel’s vision of skeletal vivification. Victory in
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Ireland was nothing less than the expanding rule of God through the godly. God had special plans for Ireland as distinct—though not inseparable—from his plan for England. The Commons set apart 1 November as the day of thanksgiving—and a sermon on that day contained some unique theological claims.

(e) Peter Sterry and Godly Men of Blood

Parliament asked Peter Sterry to direct national thoughts towards God. Official word of Wexford’s sack arrived in the Commons on the 30th of October—right before this day of thanksgiving (1 November).605 Sterry, at this point, was no stranger to Parliament. In a 1645 sermon, he said the three kingdoms were drowning in a common pool of blood.606 Four years later, in The commings forth of Christ in the power of his death, he celebrated the seriousness with which they cauterised Erin’s wound.607 Although astounding in content, scholars of theology and war have almost entirely ignored this sermon. Sterry had already served as a Westminster Divine, parliamentary chaplain, and was now chaplain to the recently-formed Council of State. The sermon evidently pleased the Commons.608 It was remarkable for at least four killing-related features: justice, typology, union with Christ and eschatology.

Sterry laboured to shore up Parliament’s authority. David’s military actions were just—as he was a ‘Just Power’. He linked David and the conquest of Ireland while making a remarkable theological contribution to the debate over legitimate killing. By locating his audience (David) between Saul (Charles I) and the temple-building Solomon (future millennial republic), Sterry argued that it was permissible—and even godly—to be men of blood. Ireland also found a place in this typology as Saul’s son ‘Ishboseth’ who warred against God’s new anointed.609 Charles I may have been a man of blood’, but so, in a different way, was Cromwell and his fellow Puritan conquerors. Sterry cleverly played with regicidal logic.610 He celebrated and marked the
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boundaries of bloodshed and believed that Parliament would soon transition from man-slayer to temple-builder. Perhaps Sterry envisioned a transition from godly military leaders like Cromwell to godly statesmen like Henry Vane. Although warfare was a necessary activity, armies should not be confused with architects.

Scripture extolled David for his martial prowess. However, shedding blood could be blameworthy. ‘David’, after all, ‘was a Man of Blood’ who ‘was not suffered to build an House to the Lord, because he had shed much Blood’. He ‘was an Instrument, a Toole, a Weapon in the hand of his God.... Noble Patriots, This is your Copy’. Sterry was not content with David as his lethal exemplar—for there was a far greater man of blood. Christ was no stranger to killing, and Sterry blended biblical history with eschatological conquest to make the point. He focused on the slayer in Isaiah 63:1–6, not the sacrifice in the gospels: ‘Jesus Christ is now comming forth with his Garments dyed Red in the Blood of his Enemies.... This is the First Raign of Christ, after the similitude of David’. Christ killed enemies and cleansed saints. This was their ruler who ‘begins now to reign in the Power of his Death, as a Man of Blood’.

Sterry’s sermon dripped with assertions of unity with Christ, and this in three senses: proximity, relation, and co-agency. First, Christ was intimate with Parliament and her soldiers: ‘The Angel of the Lord encampeth round about those [sic] that fear him’. He explained this nearness with miraculous language culled from the exodus and conquest. God acted in four ways: as a wall (defense); as a consuming fire (offense); as a blazing light whereby Christians fight (provision); and as a calming light (comfort). God’s presence—and the lack thereof—was the decisive factor as he worked through ‘the Ministery of Angels more then Men’. It was the reason why ‘you have washt your Steps in Butter, while your Enemies have washt their Steps in their own Blood’.

Second, Christ in the Christian grounded the hope of conquest. Although the godly triumphed because of the divine proximity, victory should draw them even closer to ‘Jesus... the Conquerour’. He encouraged them to ‘Wind up, and wrap up all your Mercies into the Person of Jesus Christ’.
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Third, the godly were co-actors with Christ:

The Lord maketh us *One Spirit* with Himselfe... The surest way of Mastering Things is by being One with their *Principle*. The *Principle* of all things is the Lord. A Saint is *One Spirit* with the Lord, and so *One* with the Supreame *Principle* of things, thorow which he hath a Soveraigne Power over them.

He continued with a striking—though somewhat opaque—analogy:

The whole *Creation* is, a *Ship*. God is the *Pilot*. Jesus Christ is the *Helme*, by which God governes, and turns about the World. A Saint is *One Piece* with Christ in the *Helm*. He hath his Hand with the Father upon this Helme. Thus he rules in the World, sitting at the Helm of things in the *Lap* of his Father, and growing into One Helme, or Rudder with Christ by His Embraces. *All things are Yours, and You are Christs, and Christ is Gods*, 1 Cor. 3.

He described three persons—the Father, the Son and the Christian. Although the referents ‘he’ and ‘his’ were not always clear, the central point was. Christians were so closely united with Christ that when they steered the ship of creation, the divine acted through them and ensured the vessel arrived. The implications for godly politics were astounding.

Finally, Sterry exuded a palpable sense that the godly stood on the precipice of the direct reign of God. His belligerent Christ was transitioning to an amicable bridegroom. He thought the ‘late Providence of God in this *Island* and Ireland seem to give a *Rise* to the fulfilling of this part of the *Revelation*’. Following the prophecies of Daniel, 1652 looked promising.

Happy, and Blessed are you, that live to the Brinke of these Times.... Here is the *Faith* of the *Saints*, to see their Saviour raigning like *David*, in Blood. Here is the *Patience* of the Saints, to wait all this *Forty* yeers of His *First*, and *David-like* Raign; for His great, and last Appearing. Then shall he come like *Salomon*, the Prince of Peace, having changed His *Red Apparell* for the White Garments of Righteousnesse, and everlasting Joy.

Bloody were these peacemakers, for they were building God’s kingdom on earth. Violence in Ireland was not pointless—it was productive. Although the godly were men

---
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of blood, they would not always be. While the godly conquered, Christ was on campaign. Out slaughtering the wicked, he would soon return for the wedding feast.

(d) John Owen and Irish Amalekites

A few months after Cromwell, John Owen left for Ireland. He served, mostly in Dublin, as a chaplain.\(^{616}\) Wintering there, he composed *Of the death of Christ* and gave it a Cromwellian dedication.\(^{617}\) Upon returning, he preached *The stedfastness of promises* before Parliament on a day of humiliation held in February 1650. As Crawford Gribben notes, he ‘emphasized the need to find English spiritual solutions to Irish political problems’.\(^{618}\) Taking Abraham’s faith in God’s promises as paradigmatic (Rom 4:20), Owen urged Christians to believe God’s promises for Ireland despite all obstacles and against all reason. In fact, doubt *produced* obstacles. As when God destroyed without godly instruments (2 Chron 20:20), Owen told them to ‘Believe, and you shall be established’. Such belief started at the personal level before growing into national faith. He closed the sermon by pleading that they ‘stop not Success from *Ireland*, by Unbelief’.\(^{619}\)

England, he noted, was spiritually apathetic and divided—like two children fighting in the womb (Gen 25:22–23). Many gave up on God’s perpetual war with Ireland. Have they not considered that

\[
\text{the Lord hath sworn to have War with such Amalekites as are there, from Generation to Generation? Exod. 17. 15, 16. They have forgotten, That Ireland was the first of the Nations that laid waite for the bloud of Gods People desiring to enter into his rest; and therefore their latter end shall be, to perish for ever: Numb. 24. 20. Many are as angry as Jonah, not that Babylon is spared, but that it is not spared.}\]

Conquest should be accompanied by prayer and praise, not commiseration. As Jonah protested God’s mercy, England’s ungodly protested his vengeance.

---
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God’s wrath against Irish Amalekites was clear, but others were also guilty. He identified five odd bedfellows. As summarised by Martyn Cowan, they were

(1) the Scottish Covenanters in Ulster; (2) the Ormond party united in its desire to maintain prelacy and the Book of Common Prayer; (3) the Roman Catholic Irish Confederates; (4) the [Presbyterian] parliamentary cause in April 1648; and (5) the native Irish rebels.621

The ‘first’ act of this ‘hydra’ was to ‘cover the innocent Bloud of [16]41’, though God had promised such acts would be exposed and judged (Isa 26:21).622 Royalists and Presbyterians, who should have read providence, were not only guilty of renewing an ungodly war—they did so in a way that made them responsible for Irish bloodguilt. The stage was set for the conquest of Scotland.

As the godly felt providentially overruled in their desired mercy towards Wexford, Owen claimed a willingness that the Irish receive mercy and remain in the land. ‘But God’ wanted to remove the Irish and plant the English. The italics evidence two wills at play:

For my part, I see no further into the MYSTERY of these things, but that I could heartily rejoice, That Innocent blood being expiated, the Irish might enjoy Ireland so long as the Moon endureth, so that Jesus Christ might possesse the Irish. But God having sufferred those sworn Vassalls of the man of Sin, to break out into such wayes of Villany, as render them obnoxious unto Vengeance, upon such rules of Government amongst men, as he hath appointed: Is there therefore nothing to be done, but to give a Cup of Blood into their hands? Doubtless the way whereby God will bring the followers after the Beast to Condign Destruction, for all their Enmity to the Lord Jesus, will be, By suffering them to run into such practises against men, as shall righteously expose them to vengeance, according to acknowledged Principles among the Sons of Men.623

Owen said roughly the same thing twice: Although he might have other desires, God willed that the Irish commit wrath-provoking atrocities.

He surrounded this statement with appeals for gospel propagation. Earlier he asked, ‘How is it that Jesus Christ, is in Ireland only as a Lyon stayning all his garments
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with the bloud of his Enemies? and none to hold him out as a Lamb sprinkled with his own bloud to his friends?’ Later he said the God of ‘Battel’ should go on to receive the ‘Crown’ of Ireland. He wanted ‘the Preaching of the Gospel in Ireland’ to accompany this twofold mission (vengeance and rule). One could conclude, as Crawford Gribben seems to do, that Owen was promoting the English evangelisation of the Irish. I suggest he was promoting preaching to the English in Ireland. Feeding those already Christ’s ‘friends’.

The March 1650 ‘Act for the better Advancement of the Gospel and Learning in Ireland’ seems to confirm this. Focusing on Trinity College in Dublin as a training centre for ministers, the Act omitted mention of conversion, evangelisation, Catholicism, Catholics or even the Irish. It only mentions Ireland as a place. This stands in sharp contrast to the 1649 ‘Act for the promoting and propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ in New England’. That Act aimed at Algonquian conversion. Further, Owen seemed to believe he was overruled (‘But God’) in his desire that ‘Jesus Christ might possesse the Irish’. He advocated preaching in Dublin where the ‘Tears and Cryes of the Inhabitants’ appealed for ministerial ‘Supply’. Moving beyond Dublin, he wanted clergy in every English-controlled ‘walled town’, and argued that ministers were necessary for combating radical Protestant teachings.

(e) Thomas Waring and Righteous Extirpation

Shortly after Drogheda and Wexford, Thomas Waring published, ‘by special Authority’, an account of the 1641 and the initial Cromwellian conquest. He devoted great attention to Irish atrocities as recorded in the 1641 depositions. Papist leaders, according to Waring, planned a total war of annihilation—having decided ‘not to spare any of the English race, that were Protestants’. After wading through pages describing the
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innovative, calculated, inhumane and prolonged schadenfreude of the Irish, Waring turned to the actions of God and Parliament. In light of this catalogue of horrors, Cromwell’s killing seemed necessary, restrained and godly. According to Eamon Darcy, works like this ‘justified Cromwell’s actions’ for an English audience who were ‘both thrilled and shocked at news of Cromwell’s actions in Ireland’. 630

Waring used supernatural claims to support godly violence. He cautiously mentioned ‘Prophecy.... fatal meteors, signs, and wonders in the firmament, the water, earth and fire’. These forewarned of Irish destruction. Filled with fury, purged of patience, Waring advocated Irish extermination. Although mercy should be extended to the deserving few, bringing about ‘great distruction of them’—as seemingly ‘dictate[d]’ by ‘many strange victories’—would fall ‘short of Lex talionis’. The Irish proved ‘that there can be no safety in cohabitation with them’. 631 As explained in chapter six, many Englishmen reached this conclusion about Algonquians after King Philip’s War.

God, as he communicated through victory, required godly executioners. If the English showed apathy, mercy or moderation, an irate God would execute the executioners before installing new instruments. Because God ‘hateth shedding of innocent bloud’, he demanded the extirpation of the Irish. The ‘just and acceptable executions’ at Drogheda and Wexford were the firstfruits. This glorious cause was

the bravest pieces of Justice that ever was put into the hands of people. And therefore, we may warantly, and righteously endeavour the extirpation of them, who by their hellish designs, and accomplisht Parricides, have endeavoured, and highly attempted, to make us to be no more a people [Hos 1:9]. 632

Those who attacked a chosen people should expect a righteous response. Although not repeating the ‘man of blood’ theme in Sterry’s sermon, both readied the godly for their role as lethal instruments in the hands of an angry God.
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6. Conclusion

After Drogheda and Wexford, the parliamentary army was successful in most undertakings—offering generous terms to those who surrendered.\textsuperscript{633} Cromwell’s forces suffered from disease throughout the winter and high casualties at Clonmel the following May. At the end of the month, he left Ireland to begin the subjugation of Scotland. As Jane Ohlmeyer notes, by August 1652, the ‘parliamentarian army succeeded in uniting Ireland under one ruler, something the royalist, Scottish, and Confederate armies had failed to achieve over the previous nine years’.\textsuperscript{634} Such victory came at a high cost for the vanquished.

Parliament tried to assess the levels of guilt among those who took up arms.\textsuperscript{635} Over 30,000 Irishmen left to serve in European armies and ‘12,000 Irish were transported to the plantations of the West Indies, most of them to Barbadoes’.\textsuperscript{636} Many landed in New England.\textsuperscript{637} Although the precise figures concerning execution, exile, transplantation and transportation are endlessly debatable (and often politically controversial), there is little doubt that what happened was traumatic and unprecedented. Previously Catholics held 61 percent of the land. Some estimate that this fell to under ten percent after the conquest.\textsuperscript{638} Cromwell, however, was not the driving force behind most of the controversial parliamentary decisions and actions in Ireland—either before August 1649 or after May 1650.\textsuperscript{639} In fact, when asked to intervene, he frequently sided with those whose land Parliament tried to confiscate. At the Restoration, most who lost out under the godly were sorely disappointed.\textsuperscript{640} Like a
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turncoat, stability providentially secured during the Interregnum buttressed the Restoration regime.

The Gaelic poet, Dáibhí Ó Bruadair, aptly captured the mood in *Créacht to dháil mé* (1652)—‘A fateful wound hath made of me a hulk of sadness’. His providential reaction to the Cromwellian conquest placed the upheaval against an idyllic past. He felt conquerors ‘crushing them, their culture, and their cities’. This, he thought, was a consequence of Irish ‘vices’. 641

In 1652, John Cook called Ireland ‘a white paper’. In response, John Percivale said Ireland was pale because it ‘has lost much blood’. It was like a piece of paper because ‘it may be quickly set on fire with faction’. 642 There were several flare-ups in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, most notably the Williamite Wars (1689–91) and Irish Rebellion of 1798. Horrid conditions in Ireland gave rise to Jonathan Swift’s withering satire, *A Modest Proposal* (1729). The nineteenth and twentieth century saw The Great Famine (1845–52), Easter Rising (1916), Irish War of Independence (1919–21), Irish Civil War (1922–23) and The Troubles (1968–98). Many of these conflicts witnessed creative attempts at remembering, interpreting and forgetting the violence of the 1640s and 1650s.


5. Dunbar (1650): ‘An Achan in the Scots Army’

1. Introduction
To English Independents at the end of 1650, Scottish brothers in Christ became agents of Satan. Covenanters became Canaanites as bowels of compassion overflowed as bowls of wrath. Two vignettes from the armed march into Scotland illustrate this.

In early July 1650, Edward Whalley, Commissary-General in Parliament’s forces, marched north against the Scots. The soldiers, headed by Oliver Cromwell, were armed for a war they hoped to avert. Although Whalley was an Independent, he was close to many Presbyterians. On the 17th, while stopping at Morpeth, he sat down to write a dear friend, brother in Christ and Covenanter chaplain, Robert Douglas. They were now on opposite sides in a confrontation that increasingly seemed inevitable. Whalley recounted a decade of close-knit fellowship in the warmest terms and spoke of the ‘Bowells of Brotherly & Christian Love’. ‘God forbid’, he pleaded, ‘that diversitie of opinion should cause alienation of affection, where God loves, wee should love, where hee hath stamp’t his image, wee should place our affection’. Parliament’s other officers, he thought, shared this opinion. From Whalley’s perspective, religious differences—far from being the cause of the looming war—were as nothing compared with the weight of Christian fellowship. In all Whalley did, he aimed at ‘their good & our owne Safety’. It was the kirk that pulled ‘the right hand of fellowshippe’ when they joined themselves to a ‘Kinge against whome, & whose familie God hath manifested his high displeasure’. Instead of viewing the godly in England as brothers, the kirk called them ‘Sectaries’. Was this not ‘to doe the Devills worke’. 643

Whalley’s letter has been neglected by scholars, thought it contains similar themes to well-known printed letters from around the same time. In an effort to win the war before it came to blows, Cromwell and the army sent a series of documents into Scotland, and vice versa. 644 One was a ‘Declaration of the Army of England’ to the ‘Saints, and Partakers of the Faith of God’s Elect, in Scotland’. The language was firm,


but gentle and inclusive—using phrases like ‘with ourselves’, ‘tenderness’, ‘bretheren’, ‘bowels of love’ and ‘bowels full of love, yea, full of pity’. This, even though uttered in the midst of impending war, is another example of Puritan fellow feeling and brotherly dispositions so aptly described in Abram Van Engen’s *Sympathetic Puritans*.\(^{645}\) In light of intolerant Presbyterian political and spiritual aspirations, Parliament’s cause was ‘a just and necessary defence of ourselves’. The godly marched north with ‘the full assurance we have that our cause is just and righteous in the sight of God’. He feared that ‘we should not follow’ where God was ‘going before’.\(^{646}\)

Cromwell warned them in language similar to that used before Drogheda: ‘bring not therefore upon yourselves the blood of innocent men’. Whereas Cromwell told the Irish Catholic clergy ‘your covenant is with death and hell’, he forcefully suggested to the kirk that ‘There may be a Covenant made with death and hell’.\(^{647}\) Although hedged, it was a very pointed remark since the Covenant was the governing principle in all kirk decisions—and Cromwell himself signed it. He then asked them to read Isaiah 28:5–15. In the words of John Morrill, this was a ‘stinging rebuke... for the passage describes how Jewish priests drunk with strong wine, vomited over the altar of the Lord’.\(^{648}\) Cromwell implored them ‘in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken’.\(^{649}\) These examples from Whalley and Cromwell evidence the razor-thin line between brother in Christ and agent of Satan.

Several scholars rightly note the common belief that Covenanter enemies were ‘deluded “Brethren”’. This ‘view of the Scots’, according to Frank Tallett, accounts for much of the ‘relative absence of barbarism’ in that conflict.\(^{650}\) Although the ‘deluded “Brethren”’ theme is evident in many primary sources, it only accounts for the more positive end of the spectrum. It was the very act of fighting against ‘Brethren’ that facilitated demonisation. Like Cain and Abel, both offered sacrifices to God, and both thought God only accepted their offering.

---

In an article on eschatology and the invasion of Scotland, Crawford Gribben briefly notes a shift ‘from persuasion to denunciation’—particularly with reference to apocalyptic claims made about the Scots. Although Dunbar and its aftermath are barely mentioned, he rightly notes how English victory ‘justified the apocalyptic escalation of rhetoric’. 651 This escalating rhetoric—in its many varieties—is explored in this chapter. Before Dunbar, English Independents mainly considered their Presbyterian opponents to be misguided brethren. Afterwards, as will be argued, the rhetoric of Puritan destruction was eerily similar to that expressed against Native Americans during the Pequot War and King Philip’s War. There was an important, though temporary, negative shift in the perceptions. One could be both Covenant and Canaanite.

After detailing military providentialism before and during Dunbar, this chapter will examine theological reactions to the event. These sources reveal the overlooked role of the clergy in demonising Scottish Presbyterians. The chapter makes four contributions. First, it mainly picks up where other accounts of Dunbar leave off—after the smoke on the battlefield dispersed. This involves wading through neglected sermons and poems that celebrate and commemorate the event. The story of Scottish identity, as seen through the eyes of English Independents, gains an added layer of complexity. Second, in looking at these sources, it argues that English beliefs about their Scottish neighbours shifted dramatically after Dunbar. Third, it aims to deepen our understanding of how Scripture was used to demonise by looking at war against theological and national neighbours. Fourth, it argues that the response of Covenanters (in defeat) closely resembled those of New England Puritans (in pyrrhic victory) during King Philip’s War. This suggests that the sense of the loss of hegemony makes certain modes of interacting with Scripture seem attractive.

2. God’s Controversy with Scotland
In the early years of the British Civil Wars, the godly in England and Scotland had much in common. It was a hopeful—though tension-laden—relationship. Many scholars have detailed the long history of the causes and course of these wars and the role of the Covenanters therein. 652 Victory foregrounded competing visions of church and state and

652. On leading Covenanters, see J. Coffey, Politics, Religion and the British Revolutions: The Mind of Samuel Rutherford (Cambridge, 1997); L.C. Jackson, Riots, Revolutions, and the Scottish Covenanters: 126
the role of the Stuarts in any settlement. Parliamentary radicalisation and the trial and execution of the king (30 January 1649) further split the nations. They also feared a forced imposition of Presbyterian church polity in keeping with a narrower understanding of the Solemn League and Covenant (1643).

When news of Drogheda reached Charles II, then in Jersey, he was deeply troubled. However, ‘the Presbyterian faction here are not unchearful upon this important loss’, wrote Sir Edward Nicholas to Ormond, because Charles would now need a Scottish Presbyterian solution for his Three Kingdoms problem. If Drogheda made Charles lean on Scotland, Parliament set about breaking his staff.

With Ireland providentially subdued, Parliament planned a preemptive strike. This issue divided many in England. Parliament commissioned Thomas Fairfax to head the forces. He resigned. Having recently returned from Ireland, Cromwell assumed command. Through sermons, letter writing, holy conversation and private devotion, the godly prepared themselves and their nation for the next God-ordained task.

Henry Walker, a journalist and Independent-leaning preacher, delivered a message at Somerset House on the 27th of June—the day Cromwell assumed Fairfax’s power. In the dedication, he assured the soldiers that the cause was just. They faced an

---
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‘Ægyptian Kirk bondage’. In previous victory against the Scots in 1648, God led Cromwell to Edinburgh ‘by a pillar of Providence’. Although Cromwell and Fairfax were both godly, God now worked through them separately. Walker’s sermon drew on Genesis 13:14–15—the separation of Abraham (Cromwell) from Lot (Fairfax). The sermon emphasised God’s gift of Canaan (Scotland) to Abraham. God determined to cause the gospel, ‘to flourish’ after he poured out his ‘indignation’ and ‘fierce anger’ on the inhabitants.⁶⁶⁰ Although some of the godly once wished to inherit theology and practice from Scotland, now Scotland itself would be their inheritance.

(a) Following God to Scotland

R. Scott Spurlock has described the war as a fight between ‘The Covenant’ (Scotland) and ‘The Lord of Hosts’ (England).⁶⁶¹ Beyond being the rival ‘words’ at Dunbar, each phrase captured a variant on the relationship between divine action and human obligation. The primary difference was between remaining faithful to the covenant and moving with the Lord of Hosts. Whereas the Scots swore loyalty to a text, parliamentarians tried to faithfully follow the dynamic leading of the God of battles. Spurlock’s analysis is further confirmed by examples not given in his work. As claimed in John Canne’s sermon after Dunbar, they followed God’s leading through sea where there were ‘no lanes, no foot-paths, no print of wheels’. In contrast, the Kirk remained fixed to ‘the rotten post of the Covenant’.⁶⁶² John Goodwin likewise said that ‘No former covenant can hinder me from obedience to a present duty’.⁶⁶³ Similarly, after Worcester, John Owen preached: ‘I hope he hath taught us (though with thorns) to follow him sometimes like Abraham, not knowing whither we go’.⁶⁶⁴ Where parliamentarians applauded flexibility to the leading of God, the kirk saw wrath-occasioning apostasy. Both appealed to rival biblical models.

When Cromwell entered Scotland on 22 July, he found the region south of

⁶⁶⁰H. Walker, A sermon preached... on Thursday the 27 day of June 1650 (London, 1650), preface, 14, 22 (some erroneous numbering).
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⁶⁶³[J. Goodwin], Englands apology, for its late change (London, 1651), 33.
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Edinburgh largely stripped of human and natural resources. The long and frustrating campaign from mid-July to early September has been detailed elsewhere.\footnote{P. Reese, \textit{Cromwell's Masterstroke: The Battle of Dunbar, 1650} (Barnsley, 2006), 53–66.} Two points are important for understanding military providentialism. First, God withheld easy victory. Low supplies, demoralising skirmishes, disease and an enemy who refused to fight each had their toll.\footnote{Abbott, \textit{Cromwell II:299–301, 311–12.}} A direct assault on Edinburgh, in the words of one newsbook, ‘were to tempt Providence, and offend against all rules of Common Prudence’.\footnote{E. Husband, \textit{A briefe relation of some affaires} (20 Aug–10 Sept 1650) Issue 53:810.}

Second, Parliament emphasised small providential mercies.\footnote{J. Hodgson, ‘Memoirs’, in \textit{Original Memoirs written during the civil war: being the life of Sir Henry Slingsby, and the Memoirs of Capt. Hodgson} (Edinburgh, 1806), 136.} John Owen wrote a first-hand description of a victorious skirmish in which Presbyterian ministers were killed: ‘Their ministers told the people before our army came, that they should not need to strike one stroke, but stand still [Exod 14:14], and they should see sectaries destroyed’.\footnote{‘John Owen to John Lisle’ (1650), in P. Toon (ed.), \textit{The Correspondence of John Owen (1616–1683)} (London, 1970), 39.} Many supporters of Parliament referred to a cloud that passed over the moon allowing parliamentarian forces to escape.\footnote{Anon., ‘A Narrative of the Battell fought Septemb. 3 on Down Hills, near Dunbar’, in John Hall, \textit{Mercurius politicus} (12–19 Sept 1650) Issue 15:227; Parliament of England and Wales, \textit{An act for setting apart Tuesday the eighth of October next, for a day of publique thanks-giving} (London, 1650), 1004; ‘Oliver Cromwell to William Lenthall’ (4 Sept 1650), Abbott, \textit{Cromwell II:321–25};} John Canne framed the event startlingly, casting the Scots as depraved Sodomites groping in the dark:

\begin{quote}
But the Lord, who hath his preventing blessings of goodnesse, commanded the Moone not to give her light, over-shadowed her with his thick clouds, so that the Scots are here left, like the Sodomites, in darknesse, groping for our men, as they did for Lot's house [Gen 19].
\end{quote}

Despite this divine intervention, the Scots were as those ‘who said, \textit{I will not be convinced, though I am convinced}’.\footnote{Canne, \textit{Emanuel}, 13.} Obstinately refusing to acknowledge God’s hand, they would receive their due at Dunbar.
(b) Purging the Scottish Army

The battle of Dunbar was unique as it was between two largely undefeated Reformed armies. In order to understand parliamentary reactions to victory, it is important to understand the mental world of many in the kirk. If chaplain Robert Douglas’ 1644 diary is indicative of the wider Covenanter use of the Bible in war, then the troops were spiritually anemic—fed for months on a narrow slices of Scripture that related to Israelite warfare (11:1 from the Hebrew Bible). Most sermons dealt with one or more related themes: (1) destruction of God’s enemies; (2) punishment of God’s people; or (3) refuge and salvation in God.672 Before Dunbar, the kirk party dominated military affairs. According to the diarist John Nicoll, ministers were ‘prommessing, in Godis [sic] name, a victorie’.673 From this position of power, they purged the army.674

In purging, members of the kirk inhabited the Gideon (Judg 7) and Achan (Josh 7) narratives.675 From Gideon, they extracted the belief that God would fight through a weak—though divinely selected—army. From Achan, they learned that defeat could follow from one individual’s sin. A month before Dunbar, the influential divine, Samuel Rutherford wrote Colonel Gilbert Ker: ‘And oh what of God is in Gideon’s sword, when it is “The sword of the Lord!”.... Sir, I shall wish a clean army, so far as may be’.676 James Balfour wrote that ‘ministers in all places preched incessantly for this purging’ so as to prevent divine wrath.677 After defeat at Dunbar, parliamentarians turned Gideon against the Covenanters.678 Steadfast Covenanters could interpret defeat as a divine test
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that required faithfulness to prior convictions. Archibald Johnston, the co-author of the National Covenant and a chief purger, maintained the belief that a purified army was God’s will—even though this conviction brought years of marital strife with his wife who had opinions of her own. 679 Rutherford assured himself and Ker that it was not God’s plan to ‘save us’ by ‘Gideon’s three hundred’. 680 He would certainly have another way. He wrote in another letter: ‘I hope to lie down in the grave in the faith of the justness of our cause’. 681

3. The Battle of Dunbar

The Covenanter forces, having largely remained within Edinburgh, finally gave chase and trapped Cromwell outside Dunbar. In a tract by John Fenwicke, biblical topography mapped easily onto present circumstances. As Covenanter possessed Doon Hill, Parliament’s back was to the North Sea—like Israel before the Egyptians at the Red Sea. 684

The pitched battle Cromwell increasingly sought could only happen if the Covenanter came down from Doon Hill. Around mid-day on 2 September, with Cromwell looking on, they began their descent. 685 After a prayer meeting, he was said to have uttered these words: ‘They are coming down... the Lord hath delivered them into
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our hands’ (1 Sam 14:10).  

The Covenanters were confident that the following morning would bring a decisive victory. At this moment, is was later said, ‘the pride of the Scots Army’ was so high that ‘they quite forgot [Deut 8:14; Hos 13:6] an over-ruling Providence’. They haughtily discussed ‘what Conditions it was fit they should offer us, whether or no Quarter was to be allowed to any for their lives, and to whom onely, and upon what terms’. Verses that John Mason applied to the best-laid schemes of the Pequot, Oliver Cromwell used against the Covenanters: ‘the Lord was above them [Ps 2:4].... [W]e were in the Mount, and in the Mount the Lord would be seen [Gen 22:14]’. While Covenanters made post-victory plans, Cromwell and other leaders carefully watched. They noted how the landscape might be used to immobilise superior forces. 

By all accounts, the night before Dunbar was miserable. The weather was worse for the Covenanters due to their elevated position. Parliament seemed united in their plan of action. According to Cromwell, ‘it pleased the Lord to set’ an action plan on two hearts simultaneously. They noticed that, with Doon Hill to one side and Brock Burn to the other, a considerable portion of the Covenanter troops could be pinned down and rendered useless. Acting on this, they used the poor weather to conceal a major repositioning of troops and artillery. The plan, aptly phrased in one anonymous letter, was ‘by day breake to breake through this Israelitish condition’. The soldiers had resolved ‘to be Victors, or to dye as Martyrs’.

At some point, the two armies chose their battle words. Parliament chose ‘The Lord of Hosts’ and their enemies ‘The Covenant’. Commentators found in these words a
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strong connection between piety and victory. During the night, Captain John Hodgson was privy to an act of devotion between a soldier and his God.

I rid to hear him, and he was exceedingly carried on in [prayer]. I met with so much of God in it, as I was satisfied deliverance was at hand: And coming to my command, did encourage the poor weak soldiers, which did much affect them, which when it came to it, indeed, a little one was as David, and the house of David as the angel of the Lord [Zech 12:8].

Hodgson oversaw private devotion and inflected it into public confidence in the crucial hours before the fight.

Shortly before dawn, the clouds parted, revealing a full moon. This hastened confrontation. The Scots were caught off guard by repositioned and advancing troops. As Cromwell went from strength to strength, he thought enemies were ‘made by the Lord of Hosts as stubble to their swords’. Facing resistance, Parliament prevailed ‘merely with the courage the Lord was pleased to give’. Neighbour-stained steel did little to dampen praise. As the reserves poured in, led by Cromwell, they rendered useless large contingents of Covenanter troops. At last, the sun rose. According to Captain Hodgson, ‘the Scots [were] all in confusion: And, the sun appearing upon the sea, I heard Nol [Cromwell] say, “Now let God arise, and his enemies shall be scattered”’ (Ps 68:1). These chilling words from Cromwell’s lips had long been stamped on Charles I’s coins (Exurgat Deus Dissipentur Inimici). In hot pursuit, Hodgson continued,

the General [Cromwell] made a halt, and sung the hundred and seventeenth psalm [a short Psalm of praise]... the Scots ran, and were no more heard of that fight.... [A]fterwards, we returned to bless our God in tents, like Issachar, for the great salvation afforded to us that day [Deut 33:18].
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The sun arose on the soldiers at Dunbar as Parliament’s momentum towards daylight continued.

An anonymous letter from Leith, dated 9 September, said

It was God indeed that fought for us, that delivered Israel by a few that lappel [sic; lapped water like Gideon’s force?], that made the worme of Jacob as a threshing instrument with teeth [Isa 41:14–15], and gave into our hands those our enemies which were greater then we [e.g. Ps 18:17].

They were delivered from a ‘poore insulting, proud, and imperious enemy, such Gibeonites, who are fit onely to be hewers of Wood, and drawers of Water in all Nations’ (Josh 9:23). 701 Gibeonites, as was well known, were spared destruction on account of deceitfully-secured promises. God allowed them to live as perpetual slaves to Israel in their newly acquired land.

Cromwell claimed a ‘total rout’ in ‘less than an hour’s despute’. They killed three thousand, chased those who fled and captured ten thousand. Parliament suffered minimal losses. ‘Thus you have the prospect of one of the most signal mercies God hath done for England and His people.... It is easy to say, the Lord hath done this’. The soldiers recognised this and one could ‘see and hear our poor foot go up and down making their boast of God’. In a letter to Richard Mayor, Cromwell said ‘This is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes’ (Ps 118:23). 702 This verse provides a quintessential summary of Puritan beliefs about divine agency in war and fit the occasion of the death of any enemy of God—be they pagan or Presbyterian.

If the second-hand account from the royalist antiquary and biographer, John Aubrey, is to be believed, Cromwell’s mental state after Dunbar was similar to the Puritans after the Mystic Massacre: ‘One that I knew, that was at the Battle of Dunbar, told me that Oliver was carried on with a Divine Impulse; he did Laugh so excessively as if he had been drunk; his Eyes sparkled with Spirits’. 703 The godly in 1637 and 1650 had undertaken daunting campaigns after weeks of setbacks and minor defeats. The night before the assault, they both went without sleep and attacked at dawn. This may
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explain some of their elation. Whereas God made Covenanters as ‘stubble’ before Cromwell, he made the Pequot as ‘Bread’ for John Mason.

As the battle ended, the Bible opened. A third-hand account tells of the impromptu preaching of the Quaker controversialist James Nayler. Due to the terrifying gravitas of the message, one person became a Quaker. He found ‘more terror’ in Naylor’s message than in ‘the battle of Dunbar’. This account, as noted by Leo Damrosch, must be used carefully.

In the words of F. D. Dow, ‘The effect of Dunbar upon the alignment of political groupings within Scotland was immense’. As parliamentary victories continued, the kirk party fragmented. The Scots quickly learned that they were conquered by proselytising victors who were eager to spread unorthodox ideas about theology and politics. Through sermon and debate, high ranking officers and prominent ministers aimed to persuade. Scots were offered toleration—a largely unwelcomed gift. Exactly one year after Dunbar, Parliament defeated Scottish royalists at Worcester. This ‘crowning mercy’, as Cromwell termed it, elicited new praise that harkened back to God’s earlier work.

Few could be ambivalent about the outcome of Dunbar. The reactions of the vanquished cannot be detailed here. Unlike the wars with Native Americans, Scottish opponents of Parliament left ample written traces of their responses to defeat—enough to fill an entire chapter. In 1653, Edward Gee, a Church of England minister who
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supported Parliament and defended Presbyterianism, wrote a treatise on providence.\textsuperscript{710} He detailed nine interpretations of Dunbar and Worcester. He did not want to ‘be an Umpire of these discordant censures’. Instead, he offered a shrewd assessment of military providentialism, arguing that each side interpreted the battle ‘as the respective quarrel of each unto them hath led them’. The cause—as constructed by each group—influenced the interpretation of the event. As a rule, he argued, providential ‘construction follows opposition’.\textsuperscript{711} Scottish responses to Dunbar varied dramatically and ranged from the hardening of positions\textsuperscript{712} to conversion from Presbyterianism.\textsuperscript{713} Cromwell’s death on the anniversary of Dunbar and Worcester resurrected the struggle for the interpretation of those eminent victories. With hindsight, David Hume later summarised the response: ‘His partisans, as well as his enemies, were fond of remarking this event; and each of them endeavored, by forced inferences, to interpret it as a confirmation of their particular prejudices’.\textsuperscript{714} Forced inferences growing out of particular prejudices. This aptly describes godly providentialism at the time. Having provided a sketch of Dunbar as an event, this chapter will now consider sermonic and poetic efforts to turn it into an idea.

4. Sermonic Interpretations of Dunbar

News took days to reach London. In a letter to Cromwell, Sidrach Simpson—the Independent soon-to-be Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge—described London on the 6th of September. The streets were littered with those gloating over Cromwell’s dire situation.\textsuperscript{715} The next day the mood changed. Bulstrode Whitelock recounted: ‘about Charing Cross the messenger who came from Scotland came to my coach side,
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and said to me, “O my lord, God hath appeared gloriously [Exod 15:1] for us in Scotland; a glorious day, my lord, at Dunbar in Scotland!” Parliament ordered a preliminary thanksgiving for the 8th.

News of Scottish defeat spread. The astrologer, Elias Ashmole, looked up to heavens for confirmation. Sidrach Simpson looked down at the Bible and a book on biblical prophecy by Joseph Mede. He found evidence ‘The Lord is probably powring out his vial on the sun, that is, on kings’. Parliament, Henry Vane wrote, was energised by news of this ‘inexpressible deliverance’. Their lengthy official account was rich in historical and theological detail.

The widespread non-observance of this day of thanksgiving evidenced the fractured nature of English Protestantism. Disagreement spilled into print. In the years after Dunbar, many defended the justice of the invasion. Their rehashed arguments often served further political purposes—particularly regarding the controversial Oath of Engagement. John Goodwin’s anonymous Englands apology, for its late change, was one of many works that addressed submission to the Commonwealth and the cause of
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liberty. At Dunbar, when Parliament was at its lowest, God evidenced his favour by confounding the confident assertions of the kirk’s false prophets.\(^{724}\) As John Coffey notes, ‘For English Independents’ like Goodwin, ‘Dunbar was the final proof of God’s favour’.\(^{725}\)

(a) Thomas Brooks and the ‘devil incarnate’

Sermons and treatises played an important part in responding to victory and framing it for the nation. The Commons asked William Strong and Thomas Brooks, both Independent ministers, to preach at St Margaret’s on the day of thanksgiving.\(^{726}\) Although they were thanked and given permission to print, Strong’s text is not extant.\(^{727}\)

The title of Thomas Brooks’ sermon set the tone: *The hypocrite detected, anatomized, impeached, arraigned, and condemned*. His text was Isaiah 10:6: ‘I will send him against an hypocritcall nation; and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge to *take the spoil*, and to *take the prey*, and to *tread them down* like the mire of the streets’. Here, God judged wicked Assyria for being divinely used as an instrument of wrath against apostate Jerusalem. Neither party was righteous. It was likely for this reason that Brooks spent little time talking of the text in context. Instead he extracted two principles: (1) God vigorously judged hypocrisy; (2) God charged human instruments to ‘take’ and ‘tread’. The hypocrites, for Brooks’ present purposes, were found in Scotland. Although the ‘generality’ were well-known hypocrites, he claimed tender affection towards the few ‘that fear his Name in that Nation’.\(^{728}\)

Of all sinners, hypocrites were the vilest, ‘most dangerous’, most hardened against Christ, most effective aids of Satan, and ablest perverters of divine gifts. As such, Scripture compared them ‘to vipers, serpents, wolves, &c. which speaks them out to be the worst of men’. In the sub-class of hypocrites,
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is there any people on earth that are more infamous for this then the Scots.... Hypocrites fight against God with his own weapons, and dare heaven, and therefore God will cast them to hell.... [The] Hypocrite... outwardly appears to be a Saint, though inwardly he is a devil incarnate.729

Fighting against the godly at Dunbar was not simply wrong—it was damnable. Historians are quick to point out how Native Americans were associated with Satan, called ‘wolves’ and considered hell-bound.730 Brooks claims this for the generality of Scottish Presbyterians.

As marks of a hypocrite, the Scots were proud, vain, murderous, crafty, deceitful persons who were blind to providence, acted from ulterior motives and despised or envied those below or above them. Whereas vice occasioned vengeance at Dunbar, piety led to prosperity. Leaning on Augustine, he said: ‘If God give prosperity, praise him, and it shall be encreased; if adversitie, praise him, and it shall be removed, or at least sanctified’. The second half of the sermon detailed thirteen righteous responses to the mercy at Dunbar.731 When God let them ‘take the prey, and to tread them down’, the godly were to respond appropriately.

(b) John Canne and Presbyterian Whoredom

The printer, Independent minister and parliamentary chaplain, John Canne, entitled his authorised work on Dunbar Emanuel, or; God with us. Commonwealth coins prominently displayed ‘God with us’.732 The provenance of this work is unclear, and it may have originated as a sermon. Canne was at pains to argue that Dunbar had a revelatory power and he structured the sermon around ten ‘signs’ that the cause was just, righteous and preeminently owned by God. Following this, he responded to those who might rebut his providential interpretations.733

Canne believed the war was ‘proved sufficiently to be a Just Cause, even the Cause of GOD, both by the law of God, of Nature, and Nations’. He likened the Scots to
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Pharaoh (Exod 15:9) and Ben-hadad (1 Kings 20:5)—two powerful military leaders who hounded God’s people and threatened rapacious plunder.\(^{734}\) He drew on both insider and outsider texts. He accused the Scots of backsliding from a special relationship with God (insider) while employing texts that suggested they were always God’s opponents (outsider).

To God both parties appealed at Dunbar, and before God they went.\(^{735}\) He likened this trial by battle to the supernatural test for adultery as described in Numbers 5:11–31. Had the Scots obtained victory, they would have surely—though wrongly—presumed divine favour. Having lost, ‘Methinks they should feare, and be still, give glory to the God of heaven, and make confession to him’ (echo of Achan narrative in Joshua 7:19). Unsurprisingly, as Cato claimed the knowability of providence only until defeated, so the Presbyterians ‘with Cato... have changed their Opinion’ and see ‘nothing now but bare events’. Dismissing evidence, opponents were like those who said ‘I will not be convinced, though I am convinced’.\(^{736}\) Covenanters heard the heavens roar, but they would not break.

Canne branded Scottish ministers as false prophets. Given biblical comments on the issue (e.g. 1 Kings 22; Ezek 13), the gravity of Canne’s identification can hardly be overstated. Kirk ministers were ‘Prophecying the destruction of an Army, promising safety, and Victory to theirs’, but they proved to be false like Hananiah (Jer 28:1–3). Later he compared the Scottish ministers and Charles II to Balaam and Balak (Num 22–25:9)—an account where God quickly and clearly showed confident utterances of victory to be false. He also condemned the deceived. They were like ‘Indians’ snorting ‘the Herb Cohabba’—driven to their own destruction. The deluded Scots believed they, ‘As Gideon’, were pure when purged. They ‘did fully beleive [sic] there would be little need for them to Fight, but standing still [Exod 14:14] they should see their Enemies fall before them’ (Lev 26:7).\(^{737}\)

Covenanters, as one newsbook argued, had made ‘a Covenant with Death and
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For as Dagon fell when the Ark came neare it [1 Sam 5], so fell the Covenant (as another Dagon) at the presence of the Lord of Hosts. Since this great Victory, some of the Presbyterian Ministers here, have openly declared, that there was an Achan in the Scots Army [Josh 7], it is true, there was so indeed, but what was that Achan? Seing they tell us not, I shall doe it for them; the Cherem [e.g. Deut 7:1–5], or Cursed thing (I take it) was the Covenant; this should have beene destroyed, and therefore seing their Cause was the Covenant, and the Covenant Anathema, no marvaile they fell in the day of Battail.

He then gave seven reasons why the Covenant was accursed. Among them, it was like a wandering and doomed whore spreading her legs *to every one that passeth by* (Ezek 16:15). It also sowed discord and cost the lives of saints—thus associating it with *the marke of the beast* (Rev 13). Further, the Scottish cause was *evil* because it protected *a man of blood* (2 Sam 16:7–8)—the late Charles I. Even if the Covenant was originally of God, it should now be destroyed. It was like rotting ill-used manna (Exod 16:20) and had become idolatrous like the bronze serpent or Gideon’s ephod (Num 21:4–9; Judg 8:27; 2 Kings 18:4). These examples show the transmutation of divinely blessed persons or things. Only one monument of this accursed thing should be left—the captured battle flags that hung in Westminster.739

Further evidence of God’s designs came from fearful Covenanters themselves. God put *faintnesse into their hearts* (e.g. Lev 26:36) so that they were overcome. He argued that ‘When they heare, the sword of the Lord and of Gideon, all the host runs, flyes, cryes [Judg 7:20–22] woe unto us, who shall deliver us out of the hand of this mighty God?’ (1 Sam 4:8). The Covenanters acted like Israel’s miraculously frightened and defeated enemies—especially the Canaanites.740

In contrast, God’s presence protected his people. At the moment of greatest distress, ‘the Lord arose like a Gyant refreshed with wine, wounded the hairy scalp of his enemies, smote them upon the cheek-bone, and put them to a perpetual reproach’ (Ps 78:85–66). Parliament clutched victory because they kept ‘the law’ (Lev 26). God kept
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his covenantal promise to send thousands fleeing before a small army (Deut 32:30). The manner of their victory was like David over the Philistines or Israel over the ‘Midianites and the Amalekites’. This came in response to prayer—just like ‘Moses, David, Asa, Jehosaphat, Hezekiah, when they fought against their Enemies (who were more in number, and mightier then they)’. The Covenanters also prayed, but ‘their Prayer became sin, or an abomination’ (Prov 28:9).

For a final ‘sign’, Canne set Dunbar within the frame of other providential victories. The enemy stayed the same—though they changed garments. They went from [royal] Red to [Irish] Black, from Black to [Scottish] Blew.... But the Lord of Host, who had before delivered our Army... out of the Paw of the Lion, and the Beare (Royalists and Irish) [1 Sam 17:37] the same God, by weake means delivered us from that insulting Enemie [the Scottish Goliath], who had defied the Army of the living God [1 Sam 17:26].

This gave a remarkable unity to these wars in the three kingdoms.

In this sermon, Canne coupled identifiers like Pharaoh, Balaam, Dagon, Canaanites, Amalekites, Sodomites and whores with condemnatory terms like herem and anathema. This use of Scripture rivalled any other typological and theological mixture uttered on either side of the Atlantic. Those considered to be unjust and unholy opponents—be they pagan or Presbyterian—could be branded with the harshest of biblical language.

(c) Nathaniel Homes and the Slaughter of Benjaminitc Brethren

The Independent minister, Nathaniel Homes, preached the thanksgiving day sermon before the Lord Mayor of London, Thomas Foote. His text was the latter part of Psalm 149:9—a vengeful exultation over nations opposed to God. These words concerning binding kings (Charles I) and taking captives (Scots) were ‘fulfilled in our ears’. This ‘Honour’ of conquest ‘is לְךָ תַּשְׁדִּי to and for all his Saints’, and this was not ‘meereely spirituall, but mainly corporall’. He differentiated between setting up Christ’s kingdom, which ‘be spirituall’, and removing ‘impediments’ to that kingdom, which ‘must be by the Sword’. Saints (as saints) with swords, he thought, were not normative.
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They were forced to this stance by the impotent and irreverent Stuarts. ‘If Kings will not rule the Holy people well, the Holy people shall rule them well’.\textsuperscript{743} Special times called for a special relation between church and state.

Revelation clearly taught that the church fought spiritually and physically (5:9–10; 11:11–15). He believed the godly ‘to be at least under the sixth Seale, sixth Trumpet of that Seale, and under the end of the fourth Vial of that Trumpet, if not further; namely under the beginning of the fifth Vial’. For ‘eight yeares last past’, he had ‘foreseen by the Word of God, that 1650. or thereabouts, would be a time full of great and glorious wonders’. Events in England, Ireland, Scotland confirmed this.\textsuperscript{744}

Homes directed his eschatological ire towards lowland Scots, not ‘High-landers’ who were ‘Heathens’. Increased knowledge about God compounded lowlander sin. Over the decade, they came to ‘uphold the present Kings of the earth’, and thus to ‘uphold the upholders of Antichrist’. This is why ‘those that uphold such upholders, must fall’.\textsuperscript{745}

Homes repeatedly called his compatriots the ‘the wronged party’. With no arbitrator, both sides were forced to ‘try it out by the sword’ and await God’s verdict. Opponents ascribed victory at Dunbar ‘to the Devill’ or ‘Contingencie’; the godly ‘owne it as Gods Determination’. He gave five reasons why they knew it was divine mercy. Most importantly, he compared it to the miraculous fire from heaven that testified against the prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18). Whereas Elijah had a ‘Miracle above Nature’, Homes thought ‘our deliverance was in a marvell many wayes above Nature’.\textsuperscript{746} Although a slightly lesser act of God, it served the same epistemic function.

The justice of the war facilitated a lengthy comparison with one of the more sobering accounts in Israel’s history—the God-ordained slaughter of Benjaminite brethren (Judg 20). Listing eleven justice-related grounds for the defensive invasion of Scotland, he thought they had an even better cause than ‘the other Tribes of Israel warring against that of Benjamin’. He further compared:
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Israel asked counsel of God, several times (as did we): they were bid by Oracle several times to go, as we were by many clear impressions upon our Spirits, upon solemn daies of Humiliation, kept for that end, to know the minde of God. The ultimate event of the totall overthrow of the Army of the Benjamites, sealed it to the Israelites, that God was with them; as the same seal was given to us, in the totall rout of the Scotish Army.

Even Cromwell’s initial failure in Scotland conformed to Israel’s experience. Crucial to this comparison was the direct call of God to kill brethren as found in Judges 20. How did Parliament know they had a similar command? A side note emphasised ‘clear impressions’ given to ‘the Army, and of the Churches in London’ while fasting. The command remained the same; the process of perception differed.

Homes emphasised the duty of thanksgiving, knowing many in London were less enthused. Mourning for the death of enemies, he argued throughout, was sinful. Homes said ‘Non-praysing Saint[s]... are ἀσύςατα a contradiction in the adject’. However, it was controversial to rejoice over the death of anyone—especially ‘brethren’. This prompted further clarification: ‘we rejoice not at all, in the shedding of blood, precisely considered as shedding of blood; much less in the shedding of the blood of Brethren. But that the wronged English party... do rather Conquer, then are Conquered’. Their joy was a response to ongoing safety and the preservation of ‘Religion’ and ‘Liberty’.

(d) John Fenwicke and ‘the Lord Jesus his Battell-axe’
John Fenwicke also preached that day. He was the ‘Master of the Hospitall of Sherburn house neer Durham’ and served as a parliamentary officer. He dedicated the sermon ‘To the known God’, Parliament and ‘Englands Moses [Cromwell]... by & with whom the Lamb overcomes his enemies and makes way to his Kingdome. Revel. 17. 14’. He likened God’s actions in the three kingdoms to ‘that famous deliverance of his People at the Red Sea’. Before Dunbar, Covenanters boasted like Pharaoh over Israel. But God roused himself and rode ‘upon the Clouds... to help his soildiers that fight his Battells’ (Deut 33:26). He ‘put on his garments of vengeance [Isa 59:17] to avenge the quarrell
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of that broken Covenant’. Riding ‘his white horse’ (Rev 19:11–16) he went ‘conquering, and to conquer, that numerous Army by a handful of his saints’. The rider fought the beast of Revelation 19:17–21. All of this was ‘wonderfull’ and ‘[un]parallelled’. There were ‘no works like to thy works [Ps 86:8] now at Dunbar in Scotland’. In fact, ‘no people, since Israel’s time’ had been ‘so wonderfully saved by the Lord’.749 It was the clearest manifestation of national deliverance in millennia.

God destroyed enemies with his ‘everlasting arms’ (Deut 33:27). These arms were ‘Christ’s Souldiers’—Christians.750 In King Philip’s War, James Keith, writing on behalf of the town of Bridgewater, called prayer a ‘battle axe’.751 Here Fenwicke, inspired by Jeremiah 51, said that saints are ‘the Lord Jesus his Battell-axe’. God ‘gives them the word of command, Destroy, Destroy, as here in our text’. God then rewarded these martyr-conquerors who ‘overcome by the blood of the Lambe and word of his testimony, Revel. 12. 11’.752

Eschatological victory, bought with Christ’s blood, Christian blood and the blood of enemies, moved history towards its telos. This had international implications. God was doing ‘wonders every yeare greater and greater, for us in England’. God may use them ‘in the Nations about us, to pull down the Anti-Christian interest, and all the pillers of Satans kingdom’.753 It is not surprising that a few months after Dunbar, the Commonwealth sent a delegation to the Hague to pursue closer unity with that Protestant republic. It is even less surprising—given the godly propensity to fiercely fight with political and religious neighbours—that they were at war with the Dutch a year later.754

For Fenwicke, experienced and anticipated bloodshed had a divine purpose: providing a safe dwelling for ‘his Saints’ where they could rest from the ‘the Serpents seed’ (Gen 3:15). There was another seed to whom God made many promises. To
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Abraham he said: ‘thy Seed shall possess the Gates (that is, the Judgement seats, the symboll of Pompe and Power) of thine enemies [Gen 22:17], their Castles, fortified Cities, Forts, and Fortresses’. Their brethren, the Scots, were ‘first’ to fight the ‘Anti Christs Interest’. Now, like Jacob’s brother, they ‘sold their birthright’ (Gen 25:29–34). Although they formerly walked together, one brother strayed from the straight and narrow.

(e) John Owen and Human Sacrifice

John Owen was with Cromwell’s army as it marched towards Edinburgh, preaching two sermons that were published as The branch of the Lord, the beauty of Sion (1650). He delivered the first at Berwick before Dunbar; the other in Edinburgh after. He returned to England after the first, but his presence was again requested by Cromwell and he arrived after Dunbar. The dedication to Cromwell made it clear that true ‘Peace’ was rejected by Covenanters ‘to their hurt’. Although death and destruction occasioned these anti-Presbyterian sermons, they were remarkably positive: God was building a secure and pure temple, and believers were the living stones fitted around Christ the cornerstone. As Tai Liu has shown, since the start of these wars, the godly ‘were all designers of Zion, but there was no agreement among them as to what the Zion they wanted to build would be like’. Here the triumph of the Independent vision came at the expense of the Presbyterian one. Owen’s Dunbar was constructive, not destructive. Physical land briefly featured when he remarked that shaky titles ‘will in the end appeare to be theirs and only theirs, who are living stones of this House’. Towards the end, he thrust the central point at enemies: ‘In brief, sooner or later, temporally or eternally, he will avenge all the Injuries, and destroy all, the Enemies of his holy

756. Gribben, Owen, 119; cf. 120–23.
757. CJ (13 Sept. 1650) VI:468.
758. J. Owen, The branch of the Lord, the beauty of Sion (Edinburgh, 1650), preface.
759. Ibid., 1–43.
A year later, after Dunbar was seconded by victory at Worcester, Owen’s preaching adopted a harsher tone. The sermon was published as *The advantage of the kingdom of Christ, in the shaking of the kingdoms of the world* (1651). In the words of Gribben, it was a call ‘for a global revolution—which, he insisted, had been prophesied in Scripture’. In this eschatologically-infused sermon he emphasised that God confounded all human rationality—especially when avenging. God’s enemies came in three forms: ‘oppressing Babylonians’ ['falseworshippers and persecutors']... *Scoffing Edomites* [those ‘rejoycing at Zion’s distresse’]... *Lukewarm Laodiceans’* ['neutralists’].

God fought against those who fought God’s anointed—what Owen called the ‘Vengeance of the Temple’ (Isa 34:8; Jer 50:28; 51:11). This was a ‘key motif for understanding Owen’s interpretation of events as divine judgement’, according to Martyn Cowan, especially in war against the Irish and Scots. Divine judgement against royalists at Worcester confirmed the judgement against Covenanters at Dunbar. The Scots, however, were blind. They found evidence of divine favour ‘upon the least successe’, yet they refused to see the ‘marvelous appearance of God’ at Dunbar.

With the regicide, Dunbar and Worcester on his mind, Owen made a breathtaking application: He spoke of joy and human sacrifice in a way similar to William Bradford (Governor of Plymouth) after the Pequot War. Bradford’s brief comment is quoted in most works on Anglo-Algonquian relations. Owen’s comment remains unanalysed—though declared from the pulpit before Parliament. He laced Old Testament sacrifice with eschatological significance as he spoke of the death of Presbyterians and royalists.

That blood which is an acceptable sacrifice to the Lord, is the blood of the enemies of this designe of his [i.e. building a holy temple as described in *The branch of the Lord*]: the vengeance that is to be delighted in, is the *Vengeance of*
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the Temple: Heaven and all that is in it, is called to rejoice, when *Babylon is destroyed with violence and fury*, Rev. 18.20, 21. when those who would not have the King of Saints reign, are brought forth and slaine before his face: and in this, God makes distinguishing worke, and calls to rejoicing.... Thus the Saints are called to sing the *song of Moses the servant of God* [‘Temorall deliverance’], and the *song of the Lamb* [‘spirituall deliverance’].

Susan Juster has noted the irony involved the *sacramental* warfare language employed by the godly in New England. Although Owen’s mention of *blood sacrifice* is arresting, it must be remembered that he hated human sacrifice and wrote against it. His call to delight in the death of enemies, however, is startling. Two decades before Worcester, William Gouge wrote of the criteria for, and conduct in, godly warfare. He bluntly asserted that ‘*No true Christian can, or may delight in warre*’. Perhaps eschatology heightened Owen’s pleasure in constructive destruction and afforded him the opportunity to dabble in what, under normal circumstances, was proscribed.

**(f) John Cotton and Sober Thanksgiving**

Dunbar occasioned a thanksgiving sermon by the eminent New England minister, John Cotton. As Francis Bremer has noted, ministers there were more forthcoming in their support for Parliament’s actions in 1648–1650 after God granted approval. For Cotton, Dunbar was that confirmation. His sermon mingled gratitude with a robust defense of Pride’s Purge and the regicide.

Cotton focused on the unity that should follow from working towards the downfall of the beast. However, the godly fell to infighting. He noted some of the grounds for conflict and offered some solutions. With reference to theology, Cotton thought it ‘*Noe greate Difficulty, to provide for toleration of both*’. His sermon text, Revelation 15:3, was the song of Moses and the Lamb—the same as Owen above.
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Cotton, however, warned against exulting over enemies.

Sing praises of god for the greate Salvation he hath wrought [at Dunbar]: we have just cause to Bless god Not because any of the Scotts are Destroyed, it Becometh Not Brotherly Love & Brotherly Covenant.\textsuperscript{772}

The victory was gratuitous—in the original sense of the word. That did not mean the godly should rejoice over the vanquished. By Cotton’s standards, Owen seems to lack ‘Brotherly Love’. Although Cotton did not elaborate, the New Testament said harsh things against those lacking this love (e.g. John 13:35; 1 John 2:11; 4:12, 20).

The fate of those wounded or taken prisoner at Dunbar was controversial at the time, and space prohibits a meaningful discussion.\textsuperscript{773} One newsbook called prisoners ‘very beastly people’ who break commandments and acted as if ‘void of that light of nature, which is revealed to the Indians’.\textsuperscript{774} Imprisoned Covenanters shared one experience with imprisoned Indians—many were put on ships and sent across the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{775} According to David Dobson, ‘6,000 prisoners of war captured by Cromwell after the battles of Preston, Dunbar and Worcester [were] transported to the colonies as indentured servants’.\textsuperscript{776} On paper, Algonquian and Scottish prisoners received similar treatment. In practice, the outcome was very different. For Native Americans, limited servitude easily morphed into permanent and hereditary chattel slavery. For the Scots prisoners, some overseers endeavoured to treat them well and provide a pathway towards freedom. From New England, John Cotton wrote to Cromwell of the ‘The Scots, whom God delivered into your hands at Dunbarre’. He described their present care and their route to ‘liberty’.\textsuperscript{777} Additionally, Presbyterians in Scotland and New
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5. Poetic Interpretations of Dunbar

The English memorialised victory over the Scots in many ways. As in Scripture, material objects could keep fresh the memory of providences. For various reasons, Parliament chose not to commission paintings of decisive victories. They found other ways to, in the words of Daniel Pell, ‘keep alive’ God’s mercies. This included naming vessels after victories—notably the Naseby, Drogheda and Dunbar. The Dunbar Medal depicted Parliament on back with Cromwell, Dunbar and ‘THE LORD OF HOSTS’ on the obverse. In addition to treatises and sermons, the battle also occasioned many versified responses.

One publication compiled three Dunbar hymns delivered on the day of thanksgiving. In John Goodwin’s, he framed the conflict using Israel’s paradigmatic enemies. The struggle was between liberty-yearning Englishmen and ‘Task-masters [Exod 1:11] fierce & cruel’. Of Dunbar he said:

One chast man a thousand can pursue  
Ten thousand put to fight, [Deut 32:30]  
For God was in the midst of you  
And taught your hands to fight. [Ps 144:1]

It closed with an imprecation: ‘Thus let thy enemies O Lord... For ever let them perish’ (Ps 83:17). Also at Goodwin’s church, St Stephen Coleman Street, Mr. Appletree
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composed a hymn of dubious literary merit. Like Goodwin, it focused on both salvation and vengeance. At Dunbar, ‘As in the days of Sisera [Canaanite in Judges 4–5] / The Starrs for us did fight’. That same day, at St Mary Abchurch, ‘Mr. Powel’s Hymne’ focused on temporal and spiritual salvation.

Another poem by William Barton, that received an imprimatur from Joseph Caryl, matched anything written against Irish Catholics or Native Americans. The imprimatur is significant since Caryl was a former Westminster divine who would have known Scottish Presbyterians like Rutherford.

I have pursu’d our foes that fled,  
and also overta’ne,  
And till they were extinguished  
I did not turn again [Ps 18:37].  
They had not strength enough to rise,  
I wounded them so sore;  
Beneath my feet mine Enemies  
are faln in bloody gore [Ps 18:38]....  
Mine Enemies necks into my hand,  
are given me by thee,  
That I might root out of the Land  
all them that hated me [Ps 18:40]....  
As small as dust that’s blown about  
when boysterous winds do meet,  
I beat my foes, and cast them out  
as dirt into the street [Ps 18:42].

George Wither showed more restraint: ‘God look’t through the cloud [Exod 14:24] / And, then, the Lowly, trampled on the Proud’ (Isa 28:3).

6. Conclusion

After Dunbar, Independent ministers and military leaders projected an image of a confident people led by God into ever-increasing daylight. Formerly, Scottish
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Presbyterians were co-architects. Now, temporarily, they were obstacles. The godly used Scripture from Genesis to Revelation to tarr their theological and national neighbours as enemies of God. The vitriolic anti-Presbyterian rhetoric may be owing to a few factors: the emphasis on false prophecy, the belief that Presbyterian idolatry was coupled with a willful blindness towards God’s providential movements and the heightened sense that the violence itself was eschatologically pivotal. Perhaps the glorious future made demonisation more palatable.

Many have commented on how Native American ‘Canaanites’ lost their land to those who believed themselves to be chosen by God. ‘Canaanites’ could also be located north of the Tweed, not just in the swamps of New England. ‘Amalekites’ were not only unchristian warriors who practiced the skulking way of war. They could also be accomplished authors, ministers and politicians far removed from actual combat. Amalekites, after all, were Israelite kinsmen. The devil did more than indwell and influenced pagan sachems; former friends and allies also came under his sway. The next chapter recounts the morphing of godly theology under the pressure of sustained loss during King Philip’s War. Even in victory, hegemony declined and providentialism fragmented. New England theology in pyrrhic victory came to resemble that of the Covenanters in defeat at Dunbar.

6. Great Swamp Fight (1676): ‘Terrible things in righteousness’

1. Introduction

Algonquian Christians underwent two baptisms at the hands of English neighbours; the first in water and the second in fire. Water symbolically joined them with the English through identification with Christ. The subsequent fires of war consumed hopes of meaningful Christian fellowship.

In 1673, Thomas Shepard Jr. wrote to a minister in Scotland telling of the ‘success of the Gospel among the Indians’. They ‘celebrated’ the ordination of a native and communion ‘in the Indian Church’. It was a bilingual service full of long prayers ‘in the Indian tongue’ by one who preached on brotherly love from Hebrews 13:1. This fellowship was the fruit of John Eliot’s missionary work. He planted ‘civil governement’ among Algonquians in 1650.788 At the time when the godly established government among Algonquians, their coreligionists were undermining it among the Covenanters. Shepard appended correspondence from John Eliot to this 1673 letter sent across the Atlantic.789 Towards the end, Eliot wrote that ‘All the praying Indians have submitted themselves to the English government’. It was the western front of godly hegemony, and all seemed quiet. Accounts like this, though containing much truth, economically dispensed with less flattering details.

Algonquian Christians, like all who followed Christ, had a cross to bear—and that cross was their English coreligionists. Two years after Shepard’s letter, many English Christians treated Praying Indians as a fifth column. As Kristina Bross has shown, evidence of piety became symbols of perfidy; Praying Indians became ‘Preying Indians’.790 Positioned between warring factions, they identified with both and were trusted by neither. They were attacked by English soldiers and mobs, forced to leave their Bibles and interned on Deer Island in the dead of winter.791 Another baptism, this
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While the English disarmed, starved and quarantined Christian Indians on Deer Island, some went further and plotted their extirpation.\footnote{‘Deposition of Thomas Shepard Jr’ (12 March 1676), MAC, Military II:136b.} On the 6th of February 1676, a concerned citizen, Abram Hill, approached Thomas Shepard Jr. with a proposition: ‘will you go with us to Deare Island to destroy the Indians’? Thirty men were at the ready, awaiting the next time the moon hung full. Shepard had time to respond, for the full moon was nearly two weeks away. Although it seems doubtful Shepard would have killed, he may have been tempted by passivity. It would have been risky to criticise or confound the plot. To his everlasting credit, on the 15th, Shepard alerted authorities.\footnote{Gookin, \textit{Doings and Sufferings}, 494.} It took over a week to come forward. In 1673 he asked a Scottish minister to rejoice in Indian conversion; in 1676 Shepard was asked to partake in their destruction. The mental landscape of New England had shifted, and Algonquian and English alike found themselves in unfamiliar and unwelcoming territory.

\section*{2. Prelude to King Philip’s War}

The Pequot War paradoxically brought English and Algonquian communities closer. Natives had a spectrum of responses towards encroaching English neighbours. Against the backdrop of the wars in the British Isles, many in New England attached great meaning to Algonquian progress in piety and civility. Some tribes used civil and sacred
means to tighten relations. King Philip’s War drove the communities apart. It was so
devastating, in part, because of how intertwined their cultures had become. James Drake
has argued at length that King Philip’s War should be understood as a paternalistic civil
war between father (English) and son (Algonquian). ‘The decision to join or fight
against Philip’s forces hinged largely upon the extent to which an individual or group—
Indian or English—felt marginalized by the colonial political structure’. 798

Any war is traumatic, especially one of this scale, duration and intensity. The
staggering eight percent decline in the English adult male population paled in
comparison to the estimated sixty to eighty percent total decline of Algonquians in New
England. Both Algonquians and the godly lost power as a result of fighting. For the
English, the incomprehensibility of the war exacerbated the feelings of physical loss. In
this war, military providentialism fragmented as godly hegemony declined. They drifted
like a battered ship with competing captains and compasses, tossed to and fro by the
waves of providential entropy. Although the godly triumphed, victory was politically
and theologically pyrrhic. They fought as those resisting the encroaching darkness, not
as those pushing towards to a more glorious future. An official outsiders’ report from
Edward Randolph to King Charles II unflatteringly pinned the blame on the English for
caus[ing this costly war. 800 This report helped the monarch rein in these autonomous—
and now inept—colonies. 801 When the English crown subjected these colonies, the age
of godly hegemony closed.
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Many who lived through the conflict spoke as if war was inevitable. Although overtly providential, few on the eve of war shared this view. Relatively peaceful relations between Plymouth Colony and the Wampanoag existed from 1621 until 1675. Lesser conflicts throughout the half-century afforded opportunities for open war. Both sides worked to avoid and contain conflict. Although still distinctive, their societies were increasingly intertwined. Understanding how these cultures were ‘fused together’ is, in the words of James Drake, essential to understanding ‘how they subsequently came apart.’ Both groups lost their reliable ballasts with the passing of long-time leaders like William Bradford (d. 1657) and Massasoit (d. 1660 or 1661). Their successors were far less adept at careful and friendly relations.

Massasoit’s son, Wamsutta, succeeded his father as the leader of the loose confederation of Wampanoags. He died shortly after that. Some Englishmen saw God’s judgement in it. Others suspected foul play on the part of the English. Wampanoag power fell to Wamsutta’s brother, Metacom (hereafter called Philip). It was after Metacom that King Philip’s War derives its controversial name. Philip has been ‘[r]eviled, romanticized, ridiculed and revised by successive generations of commentators’.

Philip found himself leading in rapidly changing world. Official records show a rising number of Wampanoag in English courts. Sachems were increasingly the
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offended or offending party and this did not bode well for their shared future.812 Throughout the late 1660s and early 1670s, Plymouth accused Philip of wrongdoing—sometimes even of planning a rebellion.813 They bent him into submission under humiliating conditions in 1671.814 Many contemporaries believed Philip, at this point, began planning an uprising.815 Some modern historians also find evidence for such long-standing plots.816 Whether or not the English or Wampanoag prepared for war, one thing is clear: both sides were ill-prepared for the war that broke out.817 From the outset, it seemed to take both parties by surprise as peripheral actors drove much of the escalation.

3. Escalation
Deteriorating relations can be viewed from both Algonquian and English perspectives. Lisa Brooks, in her recent work on Weetamoo (a prominent female Wampanoag Sachem), emphasises native grievances:

Contrary to the narratives that highlighted the murder of [John] Sassamon as the origin point for the war, the issue stressed repeatedly by Wampanoag leaders [like Philip and Weetamoo] was the English threat to the survival of their homelands.818

From the English perspective, the suspicious death of Sassamon (a Christian Wampanoag) is commonly understood as the catalysing event that plunged the region into war.819 Sassamon had recently warned the English of an imminent strike. Shortly

815 Hubbard, Narrative, 11; cf. Bourne, Red King’s Rebellion, 102–03.
819 Anon., A Brief and True Narration of the Late Wars Risen in New-England (London, 1675), 4; BTR VI:192–93; Gookin, Doings and Sufferings, 440; Recs. Plymouth IV:25–26; Saltonstall, Present State, 3;
after that, his body was found frozen into a pond. The English suspected Philip. He willingly appeared for trial and was released due to insufficient evidence. An English and Algonquian jury did, however, convict and execute three Wampanoag. Although not ‘the first English trial of Indian-on-Indian murder’, as claimed by Daniel R. Mandell, it was the most controversial. Two days after the execution, John Richardson preached the annual artillery election sermon in Massachusetts. He told them to expect warfare:

In the Latter dayes, we are told there will be bloody times... from hence it will follow that we under the Gospel ought to be more expert and fitted for Battel, then those in former ages; For God you know then did immediatly and miraculously fight for his people.... But we in these dayes have no promise of such a miraculous & immediate assistance; God works now by men and meanes, not by miracles.

Positioned between the miraculous exodus and the eschaton, warfare required bloody hands.

Wampanoag provocations started small—with a show of arms and looting. However, Philip seems to have lost control of some subjects, particularly the younger ones. On the 14th of June, the Council urged Philip to scale down activities. Still, few anticipated open war. The 17–23rd of June witnessed a sharp escalation, culminating in the burning of houses at Swansea. Seeing natives pillaging, an English child aimed and fired. This was the first fatality. The use of lethal force seemed to
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puzzle Algonquians. When asked ‘why thay shot the indian’, the boy ‘saied it was no mater’.\textsuperscript{828} Given the death toll that followed, this understatement was staggering.

Weetamoo aired her grievances to Rhode Island’s Deputy Governor, John Easton, in May. Easton thought her reasonable and tried to get Plymouth to hear her side and work towards a peaceful resolution. As noted by Lisa Brooks, Easton’s letter provocatively warned Governor Josiah Winslow that the Pocassets could be ‘led “to do wrong” to the English out of their “fear” of having “wrong” done to them’. Weetamoo’s grievances failed to gain a hearing in Plymouth.\textsuperscript{829}

In mid-June, Easton also heard Philip’s grievances. He wrote an unflattering account of Plymouth’s leaders that downplayed Wampanoag aggression. Backgrounding claims of Wampanoag barbarity, he highlighted English self-destruction. He also recorded a list of Philip’s grievances: (1) the English, through the law, stripped natives of weapons and land; (2) they interfered in Indian-on-Indian cases—even when the crime occurred outside English jurisdiction; (3) converted subjects were unreliable and he feared his ‘indians should be Caled and forsed to be Christian indians’; (4) his grievances stretched back to the founding of Plymouth: ‘thay had bine the first in doing good to the English, and the English the first in doing rong’; (5) his brother, Wamsutta, was mistreated and died under suspicious circumstances; (6) Indian testimony did not matter in court unless it benefited the English; (7) the English took advantage of written land contracts; (8) there was a double standard when animals destroyed property; and (9) the sale of liquor impoverished his people and encouraged harmful behaviour.\textsuperscript{830} An account like Easton’s differed markedly from other reported Algonquian speech. One notable account made them sound brutish: ‘Umh, umh me no stawmerre fight Engis mon’.\textsuperscript{831} Easton, by contrast, showed an articulate and understandably irate Philip. Easton hoped these grievances could ‘be righted without war’.\textsuperscript{832}

The drums of war—on both sides—were beating. Those sympathetic with Philip

\textsuperscript{828} Easton, ‘Relacion’, 12.
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turned on human targets. Plymouth’s reaction was slow and disorganised. Massachusetts forces headed south in an attempt to broker peace. They arrived in time to see mutilated English corpses. This hardened their resolve and shifted their mission from arbitration to retribution. Supernatural omens increased fear.

4. Open War

As James Drake has argued, sides were not neatly drawn between English and Algonquian. In addition to native differences discussed above, each colony reacted to the outbreak of war differently. Rhode Island, accustomed to resisting the power of the other colonies, made defensive preparations but largely remained neutral. Connecticut took defensive measures, vigorously fought, employed and rewarded native fighters, and worked hard to maintain good relations with neighbouring tribes. Their colony was relatively ‘unscathed’. Massachusetts and Plymouth seemed more adept at pushing Algonquians away—often creating the situation they feared.

What follows is a brief account of significant events from the above-mentioned attack on Swansea (24 June 1675) until the death of Philip (12 August 1676). The English initially sought to contain Philip by surrounding and sweeping the peninsula of Mount Hope (Bristol, Rhode Island). A quick and decisive war (like their idealised remembrance of the Pequot War) slipped through their hands. Philip evaded their forces on the 29th of June, heading northwest from Narragansett Bay into central Massachusetts. He fled with Weetamoo, squaw Sachem of the Pocasset Wampanoag.

834. Hubbard, Narrative, 17–18; cf. Drake, King Philip’s War, 73; Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 42–46.
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Whereas Philip turned northwest, she eventually led a group of refugees south into Narragansett country. According to the English, the Narragansett now harboured those who might have shed English blood. As in the Pequot War, this grounded a preemptive strike against the Narragansett at the Great Swamp. Military providentialism, before and after this pyrrhic victory, is discussed later.

Asymmetrical tactics characterised the war. Both sides thought the other fought dirty and, in their own way, cowardly. Massachusetts insisted that Algonquians acted ‘contrary to the Practice of all Civil Nations’. However, the English came to adopt some of their tactics. As John Eliot wrote, ‘we are glad to learn the skulking way of war’. As with the Pequot War, the English frequently called Algonquian actions ‘murder’. Added to this was the crime of ‘rebellion’. Many sensationalised or fictionalised accounts of violence. It is clear that hundreds of English men, women and children were horrifically killed—often in their homes or working in the fields. The frequent claims of schadenfreude, torture, mutilation, and rape are less certain. One English account of torture inflicted by Algonquians condescendingly described the event—as if the English did not have their own forms of pious brutality. English warfare was punctuated by mob hysteria, vigilante justice and extrajudicial executions. Many were unable—or unwilling—to differentiate between friend and
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foe, treating all Algonquians as enemies. On rare occasions, the courts punished those charged with unjustly killing Algonquians.

The ‘Phillipian Fire’—as Roger Williams termed it—spread throughout the summer and fall of 1675 as more tribes took up arms. This disrupted Atlantic trade. Algonquians were largely victorious ‘[f]or the better part of nine months’. In June and July, the towns of Swansea, Rehoboth, Taunton, Middleborough and Dartmouth were attacked—all within Plymouth Colony. War spread into Massachusetts as the Nipmuck struck

---
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Mendon in mid-July and Brookfield in early August. Unknown belligerents attacked Lancaster in August—bringing the war closer to Boston. Fighters devastated Western Massachusetts in September and October when they attacked Deerfield, Springfield and Hatfield.\footnote{854} That winter Philip suffered a major setback when he failed to obtain an alliance with the Mohawk in New York.\footnote{855} After this time, he was only a nominal leader.\footnote{856}

A dissatisfied populace offered suggestions and critiqued the decisions of leaders. For example. Boston’s citizens requested Indian removal, an anonymous person advocated hawkish measures, Mary Pray plead for a preemptive strike and an intentionally anonymous self-styled ‘serv[ant] of God’ suggested that ‘doogs’ be used to find Indians and ‘tere them to peces’.\footnote{857}

As winter set in, much of the conflict abated. It was in this context that the English launched a preemptive strike against the formally-neutral Narragansett at the Great Swamp. This brought the powerful Narragansett into the war on Philip’s side.\footnote{858} By the end of March, Pawtuxet, Lancaster (where Mary Rowlandson was taken), Weymouth, Medfield, Groton, Northampton, Warwick, Longmeadow, Marlborough and Rehoboth were attacked. Most significantly, Providence Rhode Island was destroyed by the Narragansett on the 29th of March. Nathaniel Saltonstall said news of disaster steadily flowed in like the heartrending messages of ‘Jobs servants’.\footnote{859} April and May saw attacks on Bridgewater, Chelmsford, Marlborough, Sudbury, Hatfield, Halifax and Scituate. John Hull’s diary records ‘ten months’ of fighting with ‘noe victory’.\footnote{860} Towards the beginning of April, Canonchet—Sachem of the Narragansett who had
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become a prominent leader—was captured and killed.\textsuperscript{861} As the war swung in favour of the English, one chronicler called later attacks the ‘Rage of an Expiring Enemy’.\textsuperscript{862} Some English commanders ruthlessly chased, killed or captured the enemy—killing a disproportionate number of women and children.\textsuperscript{863} In June and July, the number of direct Indian attacks dropped as English victories increased. Colonial leaders assessed degrees of guilt among those in their custody and offered varying levels of ‘mercy’ to those associated, in some way, with Philip. A few Algonquin groups even switched sides and fought against Philip.\textsuperscript{864}

By August, Philip returned to where the war began, as if ‘by a divine Mandate’, wrote William Hubbard. God drove him to Mount Hope to act out the final scene of his life—‘there to receive the reward of his wickedness’. Mount Hope was ‘to become Mount-Misery unto him’.\textsuperscript{865} Captain Benjamin Church, along with English and Algonquin forces, pursued him. On the 12 of August, a Praying Indian shot him.\textsuperscript{866} Increase Mather said the godly ‘had prayed the bullet into Philips heart’.\textsuperscript{867} Like Agag, he was ‘hewed in pieces before the Lord’ (1 Sam 15:33). The people of God spiritually feasted on the ‘head of that Leviathan’ that God gave as ‘meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness’ (Ps 74:14).\textsuperscript{868} Like ‘rebellious Absalom’, according to Hubbard, he was pierced through the heart (2 Sam 18:14).\textsuperscript{869} The dehumanisation of Philip was nearly complete. His severed head arrived in Plymouth on a day of thanksgiving ‘soon after the publick worship was ended... soe that in the day of our praises our eyes saw the
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salvation of God’ (Exod 14:13). By October 1676, as Samuel Sewall wrote in his
diary, ‘Most Ring leaders in the late Massacre have themselves had blood to drink,
ending their lives by Bullets and Halters’. The war—although it raged for years in
Maine and occasionally in northern Massachusetts—was effectively over in southern
New England.

The scale of destruction was astounding. According to Armstrong Starkey, ‘of 90
New England towns, 52 had been attacked, with 25 pillaged and 17 destroyed’. The
war indirectly influenced many more towns. Further settlements in the New England’s
interior were halted decades. Colonists temporarily abandoned much of the interior.
The war is frequently (though somewhat problematically) described as the costliest war
per capita in American history. The hammer fell unevenly on the Algonquians.

As with the Pequot War, Algonquian enemies were killed in battle, executed,
sold into slavery or driven from the region. Of captured fighters, the English tried to
differentiate between principal leaders, heinous criminals, lesser confederate leaders and
soldiers. A series of letters between prominent ministers discussed using scriptural
precedent to determine if Philip’s son should be killed or enslaved for his father’s
sins. The English enslaved from early on in the war, shipping many out of the
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region.\textsuperscript{880} Some criticised how quickly the English resorted to slavery—especially when individuals were given promises upon surrender.\textsuperscript{881}

Decades before the war, William Ames said those ‘who wageth Warre in a doubtful cause, Dirst Sinneth’.\textsuperscript{882} Unlike the Pequot War, many expressed doubts about the justice of the war and decisions made in it. This flew in the face of repeated public and private assertions to the contrary. Doubts about justice were expressed by leaders and civilians; insiders and outsiders.\textsuperscript{883} For example, Massachusetts later admitted that, when deciding to aid Plymouth against the Wampanoag, ‘the justice of the warr’ was ‘by some then much questioned, & to each of us unknown’. The Wampanoag, they said, were also civil—even after the war broke out with Plymouth. Despite this, they felt ‘bound by covenant’ and this trumped ‘all the above said objections & consideractions’.\textsuperscript{884} Covenant covered a multitude of injustices.

5. Theology Under Pressure
This thesis has traced the rise and decline of godly hegemony. King Philip’s War occurred towards the end of transatlantic decline. The godly fought, not as those anticipating a brighter future but as those clinging to a glorious past. They struggled as those about to lose everything—facing an uncertain future without God’s favour. Ministers like James Fitch, William Hubbard and Increase Mather hoped for a war like the then-idealised Pequot War—which in turn resembled biblical wars.\textsuperscript{885} The sheer
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destruction of the war and its protracted nature—coupled with the feeling that the godly were not experiencing divine favour as in the early days—heightened their theological introspection and facilitated the morphing of beliefs.

The winter and spring of 1675–1676 may have been the most time stressful time for New England political Puritanism. As such, some of the theology was peculiar in both degree and kind. For the most part, the Puritans never understood King Philip’s War—precisely because they never understood their enemies.886 Like Covenanter after Dunbar, many lost confidence in their powers to comprehend providence. Prolonged disaster pressed godly theology to its limits—though not necessarily to its logical limits. They were a people eager to try something, almost anything, to avert God’s wrath. The form and content of this chapter differs slightly from the preceding ones. This is owing, in part, to nature of the sources. Mostly, it is due to epistemic fragmentation exacerbated by military desperation. An examination of military providentialism surrounding the Great Swamp Fight comes at the end of a discussion of the colonist’s fractured mental world.

(a) Preference for the Hebrew Bible

During King Philip’s War, the godly leaned almost entirely on the Hebrew Bible.887 In Mary Rowlandson’s captivity narrative, she barely interacted with the New Testament. She nowhere invoked Jesus, Christ, Savior, Messiah or Holy Spirit. She used the New Testament on five occasions: to recount conversion, admit guilt, accept judgement and plead for deliverance. She used the Hebrew Bible over fifty times (10:1 ratio). Nearly all her uses were related, in some way, to Deuteronomic blessings or curses. She argued for simultaneous guilt and innocence.888 Like Israel they were justly punished in accord with the covenant curses; like Job they were mysteriously afflicted though righteous. Adrien Weimer refers to something similar as the blending of ‘martyrdom themes’ with ‘jeremiad themes’.889 Rowlandson spent much of her captivity in the house of

887. Juster, Sacred Violence, 61, 74.
Weetamoo. After burying her child, Weetamoo grabbed Rowlandson’s Bible and cast it out. As noted by Lisa Brooks,

If [Weetamoo’s] house was the microcosm, this act enacted the repulsion of colonial ideology from Native space, ejecting not the English woman but the discourse that justified her divine claim to those lands and to jurisdiction within them. ⁸⁹⁰

Rowlandson interpreted this as evidence that native ‘insolency grew worse and worse’. ⁸⁹¹ Taking Weetamoo’s act as a rejection of her God, Rowlandson felt little need to reflect on the way the godly represented God before their Algonquian neighbours.

A similar reliance on the Hebrew Bible is evident in Increase Mather’s *An Earnest Exhortation To the Inhabitants of New England* (1676). He cited or alluded to the Bible on one hundred and sixteen occasions. Ninety-six were from the Hebrew Bible (roughly 5:1 ratio). He used the Hebrew Bible in four main ways: (1) to detail covenant blessings and curses; (2) enforce the covenant as in Jeremiah; (3) invoke examples of God’s judgement; and (4) stress the eschatological thrust of the prophetic message. ⁸⁹² The New Testament usually functioned as a confirmation of these Hebrew Bible themes.

Similarly, a public acknowledgement of sin, issued 17 September 1675, used language almost exclusively derived from the Hebrew Bible. It jumped between the remembrance of the exodus, frustration in the wilderness, failure in the promised land and the prosecution of Israel for covenant violation. ⁸⁹³ This declaration listed many war-provoking sins. Wronging the natives was not among them.

**(b) Understanding the Causes of War**

Confession can be good for the soul. It can also be disastrous for the war effort—especially when it leads protagonists away from understanding why they are fighting.

---

¹²⁶.


When searching for the cause of war, many oscillated between recognising collective judgement and plumbing the depths of their own recalcitrant heart.\(^{894}\) In language blending the sacrificial system and the crucifixion, The General Court of Plymouth Colony sought ‘Attonement & Reconciliation with [God] through Jesus Christ’.\(^{895}\) Although the use of ‘Attonement’ is unusual, as Harry S. Stout notes, the godly frequently made use of the themes of ‘works righteousness as long as they made it plain that their message concerned corporate and temporal blessings, not eternal salvation’.\(^{896}\)

Increase Mather was arguably foremost in trying to shape the military providentialism of King Philip’s War, notably in *The Day of Trouble is Near* (1674), *The Times of Men are in the Hands of God* (1675) and *An Earnest Exhortation* (1676).\(^{897}\) He came to believe he was God’s mouthpiece.\(^{898}\) Since the passing of much of the first generation, little restrained God’s anger.\(^{899}\) He connected ‘Provoking Sins’ with unfavourable events and promoted covenant renewal as the solution.\(^{900}\)

Mather believed that, when the people pleased God, a minuscule army would succeed as per Deuteronomic promises.\(^{901}\) His journal entry for 1 September 1675 mentioned defeat: ‘This day Amalek prevailed over Israel!’ Why did they prevail?

---
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Because ‘Moses’ hands were not held up, as they should have been!’ (Exod 17:8–16). 902

As with this biblical narrative, marginal actions determined success or failure. Ministers, magistrates and military leaders attacked defeat-occasioning sin through tightened moral regulation. 903 At the annual artillery election sermon in June 1676, Samuel Willard emphasised the soldier’s spiritual war for a pure heart. 904 Reforming sins, however, proved even more difficult than identifying them. 905 If the cause of war was spiritual, then turning completely to God was the solution. Most believed that one should rely on God alone while acting responsibly. 906 A few persons shunned secondary agency and relied totally on God’s protection. They were mauled to death. 907

The godly could not authoritatively identify provoking sins without, as John Kingsley noted, ‘a Profet’. 908 Israel, with no validated Joshua, sought an elusive Achan. 909 Fragmentation defined military providentialism. 910 For example, persons identified both tolerating and persecuting Quakers as causes of calamity. 911 Peter Folger gave a pro-Baptist interpretation. 912 Even Algonquian enemies turned godly providentialism against the godly—arguing that native success signalled divine approval. 913 In the words of David Silverman: ‘For all of their very real differences, both
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Indian and colonist in New England entered King Philip’s War with some reassurance that the spirits had already divined what was going to pass.  

(c) Pinpointing Sin

Algonquian fighters attacked, pillaged or destroyed a high percentage of English towns. The time and location of an attack mattered—as this was part of the divine communication. If one town was destroyed and another spared, were those spared better Christians? In an understudied farmer’s diary, Joseph Tompson focused on two questions: why, in light of God’s judgement, was his heart so cold; why was his family spared when others were not? The first problematised the second. William Hubbard believed some providential details were beyond human comprehension. Increase Mather puzzled over the peculiarities of war. In An Earnest Exhortation, he used Amos 5:19 to scold those who thought they could flee God’s wrath by relocating. In general, he claimed it was a ‘common calamity’, making it difficult to connect local sin with local attack.

When one town was attacked, neighbouring towns offered refuge. These offers prompted an astonishing set of letters. Noah Newman thought relocation was only wise if ‘we could leave our sins behind us, which I se little likelyhood of at present’. Writing independently, the towns of Rehoboth, Taunton and Bridgewater accepted God’s targeted judgement and declined offers to relocate. For example, Rehoboth said if
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they moved, ‘what will you do with our sins?.... Will not both yourselves and us be endangered thereby?’ They thought it was the sinful people, not the places, that mattered most.

(d) Understanding Enemies

The godly believed they could wrong Algonquians, thus jeopardizing their just cause. As the Council of Connecticut warned, ‘Let us walke wisely & warily that God may be with us’. God acted for the English because they were just—not vice versa. They believed violating their covenant with God occasioned the war. As a result many never understood why they fought. In other words, fixation on sin against God distracted them from sin against their Algonquian neighbours. John Eliot was one of the few who considered wrongs done to non-Christians. Catalogues of war-provoking sins were normally silent on their actions towards natives. A Letter from the Commissioners of the United Colonies reads:

\[\text{Wee have reason to owne the justice of God in all his wayes and to be deeply humbled under his hande; Yet on strictest inquiry wee cannot charge our people in any of the Colloneys to have deserved such carrages at their hands.}\]

Two things were clear: God had a right to be angry—Algonquians did not. The English frequently asserted, in unequivocal terms, that they gave no cause for offense—much less open war. English victims, with clean conscience towards their enemies, had the right to throw the first stone. As detailed above, these assertions of justice sat uneasily with the grave doubts of many.
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The English were wholly righteous towards Algonquians who did nothing right in and of themselves. When Algonquians were barbarous, this evidenced Satan’s influence; when they were civil, this evidenced God’s restraining work. Good deeds were not attributed to them, but to God. Algonquians were lesser characters in this drama of divine judgement. In the words of Jill Lepore, natives were God’s ‘translators’ who made sure the English understood the communication.

The English, in the words of Andrew R. Murphy and Elizabeth Hanson, believed they were ‘simultaneously the agents and recipients of divine violence’. This made for complex providentialism. Colonists viewed enemies as an Assyrian rod in God’s anger-filled hands. Algonquians were instruments. This pulled the gaze of the godly away from their enemy. One did not negotiate with a rod. One did not endeavour to understand why the rod attacked. One did not consider the rod to be fully rational. The rod was a tool; a weapon wielded by God. Algonquians were terrifyingly incomprehensible and irrational. There was widespread fear of the gaping maw of God’s heathen messengers. Algonquians were also relatively inconsequential. On three occasions, persons asserted that God could replace human enemies with animals or insects.

The Algonquian rod, however, had opinions. The grievances of Weetamoo and Philip, discussed earlier, evidenced rational beings who described English
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wrongdoing. As argued by Lepore, ‘If the English had examined Algonquian actions not as signs from God but as signs from Indians, they might have seen a great deal about Algonquian motives’. The preoccupation with hearing the divine voice and tracing the divine hand led here to inattention to the human voices and human agency. Whereas many documents downplayed the need to understand enemies, in practice the English often tried to negotiate and reduce Algonquian grounds for anger.

When victory finally came, military providentialism was equally contentious. There was little agreement on the cause of God’s mercy. For Rowlandson, it coincided with Christian humiliation and desperation. John Eliot and Daniel Gookin linked it with improved treatment of Praying Indians. Another author pinpointed a day of thanksgiving held on the 29th of June 1676. Increase Mather emphasised prayer, repentance and vow-renewal. Prayers for the enemy (e.g. Luke 6:28) were almost nonexistent; prayer for their destruction were too pervasive to catalogue. Supplications often mentioning Israel’s enemies. In Mather’s sermon on prayer, he said a prayer-guided bullet ‘dashed out [the] brains’ of a blasphemer in flagrante delicto—sending his cursed soul in a moment amongst the Devils’. Most significantly, the English fervently prayed for the death of Algonquian ‘Ring-leaders’ and even ‘prayed the bullet into Philips heart’.

6. The Great Swamp Fight

The proceeding summary set the context for the most controversial decision of the
war—the attack on the formally-neutral Narragansett (19 December 1675). This attack was the culmination of decades of underhanded attempts to control the Narragansett tribe and the English of Rhode Island. The offensive came at a time of fragmenting providentialism exacerbated by declining hegemony. From the early days of the war, the English feared the Narragansett would—and might already—be lured from neutrality by Philip. Uncas, Sachem of the Mohegan, sowed distrust against neighbouring tribes. He also did this in the Pequot War. This time he targeted the Narragansett. Roger Williams cautioned against taking these accusations at face value. The English accused the Narragansett of an act of hospitality, for they harboured civilian refugees from Philip. The godly feared that they also protected some who ‘have actually joined with our enemies’.

The colonies begged Roger Williams for assistance with the Narragansett. Although he doubted Narragansett sincerity, the tribe assured him of neutrality. In July 1675, agents from Connecticut and Massachusetts signed ‘Articles covenants and Agreements’ with Narragansett sachems. The English then spent months fruitlessly attempting to get the Narragansett to turn over Wampanoag refugees. The Narragansett sent ‘mixed signals’, and the Algonquian destruction of western Massachusetts might have pushed the English towards a preemptive strike. Was such a strike justified? William Hubbard considered asylum-granting to be a grave breach of faith; John Winthrop Jr. thought the English demand for refugee expulsion was unprecedented and perhaps unreasonable.
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A preemptive strike could be an experiment of faith. Mary Pray’s October 1675 letter called the Narragansett ‘fals trecherus imps’. The English, she proposed, could evidence trust in God by risking a military operation.\textsuperscript{952} For William Hubbard, although a wintertime assault was risky, ‘it was generally conceived to be most expedient for the Country, to cast themselves upon... providence’. Attacking was falling into the hands of God. Hubbard denied any legitimate ‘scruples’ concerning ‘the justness and necessity of the war’. For him, ‘the only question was, whether it were feasible and expedient in the winter’.\textsuperscript{953}

In light of the ‘generall (if not universall)’ plot ‘among the Indians’, the United Colonies determined that ‘god calls all the Colloneys’ to act.\textsuperscript{954} They raised one thousand English soldiers for a wintertime assault.\textsuperscript{955} Once assembled, this was the largest ground force employed in North America to date.\textsuperscript{956} Authorities promised some soldiers parcels of conquered land.\textsuperscript{957} The force was to march into Narragansett country, enforce the covenant, remove harboured enemies, receive compensation and take ‘cecuritie for their further fidelity’. If they resist, they were to ‘proceed against them as our enemies’.\textsuperscript{958} The English, however, skipped dialogue and went straight to destruction.\textsuperscript{959} The United Colonies placed Josiah Winslow over this force.\textsuperscript{960} His commission called this a ‘defensive warr’. He was given ‘full power’ to fight in accord with the ‘most approved rules of military discipline & lawes of war’.\textsuperscript{961} Rhode Island provided limited material support before and after the Great Swamp Fight.\textsuperscript{962} However,
many there distrusted the land-hungry United Colonies and, even more seriously, considered the attack to be unjust. 963

The colonies fasted on 2 December. 964 This, in the words of the Commissioners of the United Colonies, was to entreat God that the Narragansett expedition ‘may not be a day of provocation but of Atonement’ through Christ. 965 That fact that the English undertook this perilous assault was itself ‘a humbling providence’. 966 On the 17th, two days before the Swamp fight, Connecticut called for ‘a convention of the ministers’ who would ‘search for those evills amongst us which have stirred up the Lord’s anger’. The evils were to ‘be thrown out of our camp and hearts’. 967

The next day Roger Williams penned a letter showing his lack of trust in the Narragansett. He believed God hardened Indians against the English ‘as he did with the Canaanits’. Possibly due to the power of the Canaanite trope, he immediately implored mercy:

I fear the Event of the justest war: but if it please God to deliver them into our hands: I know you will Antiquum obtinere [Hold to the old way], and still Endeavour that our Sword make a difference an Parcere Subjectis, though We debellare superbos [To spare the conquered (though we) strike down the proud]. 968

That same day, John Winthrop Jr. prayed for guidance, protection and victory—all for ‘the glory’ of ‘the Lord of Hoasts’. 969
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In early December, English forces rendezvoused along the coast of Narragansett Bay for an inland expedition against the Narragansett.\footnote{\textit{Noah Newman to John Cotton Jr.} (16 Dec 1675), \textit{Cotton Jr. Corr.}, 120–21.} Massachusetts and Plymouth met at Smith’s Garrison (Wickford, Rhode Island). Minor skirmishes brought mixed results. Successes fueled hope of providential favour.\footnote{MAC, Military II:102a; \textit{Noah Newman to John Cotton Jr.} (16 Dec 1675), \textit{Cotton Jr. Corr.}, 120–21.} The English captured an Algonquian known as Indian Peter. In order ‘to save his Life’, he agreed to guide the English towards the ‘whole Body of the Narragansets’.\footnote{Saltonstall, \textit{Continuation}, 5.} On the 18th of December, they marched about nine miles south towards Bull’s Garrison (South Kingston, Rhode Island) where they met Connecticut forces.

The next morning, the combined Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, Pequot and Mohegan forces began the long march into Narragansett territory. In total, they
numbered ‘more than 1,150’. From ‘5 a Clock in the morning’ into the afternoon, they marched through the snow. The cold weather that wore on the soldiers made it possible for them to cross swamps. They arrived at the fort shortly before the Narragansett completed a defensive wall. The size of the fort surprised the English. Although they lacked a plan of attack, they had God. For Hubbard, ‘as [God] led Israel sometime by the Pillar of fire... so did he now direct our Forces’ to the weakest side of the fort.

Fighting quickly commenced. In the initial storm, colonial forces lost many leaders—disproportionately from Connecticut. Once inside, they met stern resistance from warriors who ‘fought stoutly’. According to one anonymous account, ‘Enemies began to fly; and ours had now a Carnage rather then a Fight, for every one had their fill of Blood’. It was God who strengthened, ‘prospered and encouraged the English’. This was a direct confrontation. ‘It did greatly rejoice our Men to see their Enemies, who had formerly sculked behind Shrubs and Trees, now to be engaged in a fair Field’.

It was the sabbath, and three ministers accompanied the expedition: ‘Mr. Dudley, Mr. Buckley and Mr. Samuel Nowell’. An anonymous participant said that although it was Sunday, our Men thought they could not serve God Better then to require Justice of the Indians for the Innocent Blood which had been [shed]... and we were cheerfully ready (as so many Sampsons) to forgo our own lives to be revenged of these Philistines [Judges 15:7].

Our ‘chiefest Joy was to see they were mortal, as hoping their Death will revive our
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Tranquillity’. Redemptive slaughter punctured sabbath rest.

The fighting continued throughout the afternoon and into the evening. They eventually resorted to slash-and-burn tactics that closely resembled the Pequot War. Given the perilous weather, firing the fort was controversial. They ‘fired about 500 Wigwams, (i. e. Indian Houses) and killed all that we met with of them, as well Squaws and Papooses, (i. e. Women and Children) as Sanups (i. e. Men.’. This anonymous chronicler translated terms, leaving no doubt about what he thought God did through the godly. So many women and children were slain, ‘the number of which we took no account of’.

Before, during and after the attack, the English blamed the Narragansett for provoking their destruction. Whereas the number of Algonquian casualties is uncertain, it is clear that most commentators approved of the act. William Hubbard seemed comfortable with the intentional targeting of civilians:

So as after much blood and many wounds dealt on both sides; the English seeing their advantage, began to fire the Wigwams, where was supposed to be many of the Enemies Women and Children destroyed, by the firing of at least five or six hundred of those smoaky Cells.

In his estimation, ‘none of them could tell’ how many ‘old men, women and children’ were burned, starved or froze to death. Increase Mather recorded:

There were hundreds of Wigwams (or Indian houses) within the Fort, which our Soldiers set on fire, in which men, women and Children (no man knoweth how many hundreds of them) were burnt to death.
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In total, he thought that ‘not less than a thousand Indian Souls perished at that time’.\textsuperscript{988} A few accounts, however, did not mention the civilian casualties.\textsuperscript{989} The English left the Narragansett dead on the ground without counting them.\textsuperscript{990} Like a pall, a few feet of snow soon blanketed their humanity. Although soldiers had to trudge over a dozen miles through a blizzard, the weather made Nathaniel Saltonstall happy. The snow that inconvenienced English soldiers imperilled Narragansett refugees.\textsuperscript{991} The English arrived safely at Smith’s Garrison unmolested—another ‘signal mer[cy]’.\textsuperscript{992}

The Great Swamp Fight, according to Eric Schultz and Michael Tougias, was the ‘single bloodiest day of King Philip’s War’.\textsuperscript{993} In a recent monograph, Jason Warren rightly describes the victory as ‘pyrrhic’.\textsuperscript{994} All recognised it was costly: ‘More than a quarter of the English soldiers were killed or wounded’.\textsuperscript{995} John Cotton Jr. referred to the victory as a providential ‘frowne’.\textsuperscript{996} Similar language was used by a humbled Joseph Thompson when he wrote in his diary of the slaughter of ‘so many of our Chosen men’ by the ‘uncircomcised’.\textsuperscript{997} Further, this preemptive strike pushed the Narragansett off the fence onto the side of Philip. If the English did not send more troops quickly, according to Thomas Danforth, they would likely find themselves worse off. He, along with other prominent leaders, prayed that God would crown full-scale  
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war with ‘tender mercies’ for ‘his Israel in our low estate’. The Swamp Fight—an act of faith—necessitated further bloody acts of faith.

Although elegiac descriptions of this fight abound, most still found grounds for praise. Officials in Massachusetts wrote to Connecticut of being humbled by so many deceased leaders who were ‘in the service of Christ’. Their comfort was in the fact that God used men ‘of our army’ as ‘executioners of his justice upon many of our barbarous & cruel enemies’. One chronicler said ‘we purchased our success at so dear a rate that we have small cause to rejoice at the victory’. He found comfort in the fact that the English were against ‘4000 fighting men’. Another account noted the ‘considerable loss’ of men but then thanked God for the ‘moderate’ weather in January. According to Increase Mather, the fact that the Army was not entirely ‘cut off at the Fort’ showed ‘that [God] hath no mind to destroy us’. He was, however, troubled. Although victorious, they also experienced the ‘solemn and humbling Rebukes of Providence’. God seemed to ‘withdraw’ and ‘take part with the enemy’. Although the victory was great, they were not yet ‘fit for deliverance’. According to George Shove, the fight was costly. The fact that so many Englishmen died showed that God was still angry: ‘the Lords hand is yet against us we are not prepared for mercye, pray pray, pray’.

Since June of 1675, the colonies observed regular fasts. On 23rd of February 1676, Connecticut observed its first day of thanksgiving. This was for the special mercy of God to us, in answering the prayers of his people (though by terrible things in righteousness,) in giving such an overthrow to the enemie at the Fort, in the first Narrogancett fight.

Hubbard found much to be thankful for. All the men served valiantly in their various
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capacities, ‘though all ought to say, not unto us, but unto thy Name, O Lord, &c’ (Ps 115:1). In a published sermon, Edward Bulkley believed the people should give thanks. He asked his audience to consider all the mercies given to them since being in the womb—and he inserted ‘mercy at the Swamp’ into this timeline. His central point was that, in each season of life, the Christian had a corresponding duty. ‘What are you then to acknowledge this day?’ Any who would ‘glorifie him’ must say that ‘This is the Lords doing, and it is wonderful in our Eyes!’ (Ps 118:23).

7. Conclusion

After a long and violent struggle, the godly won King Philip’s War—at least in the southern theatre. The war elsewhere required outside intervention. Godly narratives gave the impression that the war ended with the death of Philip. However, as highlighted by Lisa Brooks, conflict raged in northern New England until the American Revolution. It is important to remember—contrary to terminal narratives of decline and extinction—that Algonquian communities over the centuries found ways to resist, adapt to and survive the growth on non-native power. Many groups secured recognition, demanded autonomy and asserted rhetorical sovereignty over how their narratives are remembered.

As the Great Swamp Fight was pyrrhic, so was the whole war. In the words of Francis Jennings, it was ‘a fiasco for its victors’. The godly won the battle, won the war and lost the power. The acting president of Harvard, Urian Oakes, deliver the 1677 artillery sermon. In it, he reflected on the nature of their enemies:

We have seen that a despised & despicable Enemy, that is not acquainted with books of military Discipline, that observe no regular Order, that understand not the Souldier’s Postures, and Motions, and Firings, and Forms of Battel; that fight in a base, cowardly, contemptible way, have been able to rout, and put to
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flight, and destroy our valiant and good Souldiers.\textsuperscript{1011}

His message declared God’s providence over all events, and sometimes God worked in mysterious ways.

The war led to a general martial and financial decline for Algonquians and the English. New Englanders found themselves saddled with spiralling debt. Stephen Webb has argued that it took the colonies at least a century to return to pre-war levels of prosperity.\textsuperscript{1012} In the century after King Philip’s War, New England participated in many more conflicts involving Indians.\textsuperscript{1013} These wars, to some extent, were different. New England increasingly became the site of proxy wars between imperial European powers.

In addition to spiralling debt and frequent conflict, the godly also lost much of their sovereignty.\textsuperscript{1014} Since before the Pequot War, England wanted to curtail New England autonomy. In the wake of King Philip’s War, the godly were no longer able to resist. The crown revoked the charter of Massachusetts Bay in 1684.\textsuperscript{1015} From 1686 to 1689 the colonies formed part of the Dominion of New England.\textsuperscript{1016} James Drake refers to this as ‘the Anglicization of the New England colonies’.\textsuperscript{1017} In the words of James B. Bell, this ‘ushered in a decade of cataclysmic and irreversible change in the structure of Massachusetts society, in its politics, and in the nature of its religious community’.\textsuperscript{1018}

Before the war, many sensed political and religious decline. The war amplified these feelings.\textsuperscript{1019} In 1679, Nathaniel Morton wrote Increase Mather that many factors ‘minnestreth cause to the godly to feare that New England hath seen its best dayes’.\textsuperscript{1020}
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As noted by Cotton Mather in the mid-1680s: ‘The countrey is Distress’d in many points.... Wee are in great Hazard of losing our Colledge.... The Charters of our Colonies are in Extreeme Danger also to be lost’.\textsuperscript{1021} In 1690 he asked: ‘Why have we had War after War, made upon us by a Foolish Nation?’. He concluded that ‘It is Because our God is not among us’.\textsuperscript{1022}

Responding to Massachusetts’ loss of autonomy, Joshua Scottow turned to writing history. This Puritan merchant had lived through the Pequot War and King Philip’s War. In anger, Satan stirred up heathens and heretics against the first generation:

this Amaleck [the Pequot] fell upon our Rere in our Feeble Estate, Moses Hands being held up by Aaron and Hur, Joshua obtained a great Victory: Our Fathers Cryed unto God, who heard them, and they were Saved; this Pequod Amalecks Name (according to Gods Oath,) hath been ever since blotted out from under our Heaven [Exod 17:8–16].

That generation was ready for the ‘Dragons’ challenges. God was ready to bless, ‘but now the Sce[ne] of Affairs is turned... we are sold and scattered [a]mong the Heathen’. Scottow claimed to fear ‘our mortal wound, viz. the forget[ing] of our Fathers and of our God, we have dea[l]t falsely in our own and their Covenant’. The godly had experienced ‘the Light and white side of the Pillar, which attended us in this our Wilderness Pilgrimage’. Now, only ‘the black and dark side remains’.\textsuperscript{1023}

As already seen, the Pequot War became the ideal war.\textsuperscript{1024} As New England fortunes declined in the decades after King Philip’s War, many also streamlined and idealised war with Philip. For example, when Increase Mather wrote during King Philip’s War, it was in earlier warfare that ‘no Weapon that was formed against them [could] prosper’ (Isa 54:17).\textsuperscript{1025} In looking back on the Pequot War and King Philip’s War from 1689, ‘no Enemies could stand before them’ (Deut 7:24; 11:25).\textsuperscript{1026} The events
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did not change; it was Mather’s remembrance of them that changed against the backdrop of current problems.

The godly on both sides of the Atlantic had grounds for hope with the ascension of William and Mary and the fall of the Dominion of New England. New England, however, never recovered previous levels of political or religious autonomy. By the time the American Revolution restored power, New England had moved on from exclusive political Puritanism.
7. Conclusion: Military Providentialism and Godly Violence

1. Introduction
This study has explored two central themes related to Puritan warfare. I termed the first ‘godly violence’ and the second ‘military providentialism’. Godly violence was a way of thinking about the act of killing; military providentialism an interpretive practice in war. As such, godly violence was embedded within the larger category of military providentialism. Of the first, this was violence performed by ‘the godly’, believed to be godly and thought to involve God as an active participant. Military providentialism (before, during and after war) helped partisans differentiate godly from ungodly—and this pertained to persons, causes and actions.

Although not repeatedly mentioned in the case studies, they all had an organising central question: What did the godly say God did in war; and how did they claim to know? Each decisive victory occasioned hundreds—sometimes thousands—of uses of Scripture and theology. These interpretations, as it were, sprung radially from each event. Partisans in each conflict made dozens of claims about how they knew particulars about the will and agency of God. The chapters bear witness to the immense energy and creativity that went into their dynamic and richly textured beliefs.

Rather than explaining away the complexity by arguing for a monolithic way of thinking, this thesis argued that a complex understanding of godly violence and military providentialism helps the historian understand these claims and the situations in which they were made. This concluding chapter attempts to bring order to these case studies by looking at some habits of mind of those who lived through these conflicts. This underscores why providential interpretations were so controversial and complicated and usually did not result in any meaningful or long-lasting consensus. This chapter closes by pulling the five case studies together and drawing cross-conflict comparisons.

2. Reflections on Military Providentialism
The case studies provided a window into the formation of beliefs in conflict by focusing on both the product (beliefs about God) and the process (how those beliefs were formed and altered over time). I have called the formation and articulation of these beliefs ‘military providentialism’. Whereas in modern secular societies there is pressure against
venturing providential interpretations of war (see introduction), the opposite pressure existed in the seventeenth century. If one wanted to please God, one had a duty to attempt some form of a providential interpretation.†027 As John Maudit warned before the Irish campaign of 1649, this duty increased if one held ecclesiastical or civil authority.†028

As the case studies showed, there was great variation in what the godly said God did in warfare and how they claimed to know. What follows is an examination of some general mental habits of the godly in war that undergirded these divergent military providentialisms. The aim is not to simplify a complex thing (military providentialism). Rather, it highlights why military providentialism was complex, controversial and resistant to neat classification.

Towards the beginning of the Institutes, Calvin said ‘though the knowledge of God and the knowledge of ourselves are bound together by a mutual tie, due arrangement requires that we treat of the former in the first place’ †029 Following Calvin, these reflections on military providentialism consider the human interpreter before moving on to the divine communicator.

(a) Interpreting a Just Cause: Human Interpretation

Christians were not passive receptacles of events, sacred texts, or shared history. They were active agents who, consciously or unconsciously, filtered, ignored, weighed, adopted or dismissed evidence. This makes each person, battle and war somewhat unique. Doubtless, there were some who saw Scripture, theology and providence as something to be manipulated for political gain. As famously put by Erasmus in Praise of Folly (1511), some ‘fashion and refashion the Holy Scriptures at will, as if these were made of wax’.†030 Similarly, John Spencer, a fellow at Corpus Christi in Cambridge in 1663, criticised those who enlisted any prodigious event ‘to fight’ in their cause—likening prodigies to ‘mercenary souldiers’.†031
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Each case study has tried to show the genuine convictions undergirding competing providentialisms. Kevin Killeen offers a helpful way of thinking about the relationship between text and reader, particularly how persons using the same text arrive at different applications. ‘The verses were, in their way, a Rorschach test — the political psychology of the observer emerging in how they responded to the text’.1032 Something similar happens with providentialism in war. There was certainly a fashioning and refashioning of events (Erasmus), but there was also a very real sense in which these events brought out deep-seated beliefs in the observer (Killeen). The human interpretive element will be further explored below.

(i) Holding Providential Beliefs

Many differentiated between general and special providence,1033 though the divide was not as firm as that posited by later deists. God was believed to be active in all things, or, as Roger Williams asserted, ‘nihil sine Providentia’.1034 Among those who could affirm William’s assessment, there were numerous ways of holding or articulating this belief, particularly when they related to controversial matters.

First, providential claims varied in specificity.1035 For example, in keeping with James 1:17, a Christian believes all good gifts come from God. Since physical land, for example, was good, the Christian thanks God for it (less specific). In addition to this, one could argue that God called Christians into war with Native Americans so that he could judge the wicked and reward the righteous—with the resultant acquisition of land that thus prompts thanksgiving in keeping with James 1:17 (more specific). There were many intermediate stances between these two examples. The less specific variety, though still asserting that God governed all things and was involved in all events, gave little detail concerning why particular events happened to particular persons. Although
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1035. Michael Winship uses a similar distinction when he speaks of ‘practical applied providentialism’ (Seers of God, 37). Nicholas Guyatt distinguished between ‘personal’ and ‘national’ providentialism. Under national providentialism he includes ‘judicial’, ‘historical’ and ‘apocalyptic’ varieties (Providence, 5–6). Ian Gentles uses the phrase ‘Sophisticated providentialists’ (Gentles, Oliver Cromwell, 92–93).
both examples evidence a robust view of God’s activity in the world, there were several important differences: the degree of specificity related to the knowledge of God’s will; the circumstance of application; the use of providence as a guide for controversial decisions and the confident connection of beliefs, behaviours and outcomes. This accounts for some of the difference between the godly (often more specific) and the providentialism of their opponents (often less specific). It was often the providential ‘because’ and ‘therefore’ that proved intractably controversial: ‘Because we did X, God did Y. Therefore we should now do Z’.

Second, there were differences in the way providential claims were held and articulated. Loud and confident boasts of divine favour stood in contrast to tentative and provisional claims about providence.

Third, beneath similar rhetoric, there might be different realities. For example, all the enemies discussed herein—Scottish Presbyterian, English Episcopalian, Irish Catholic and Native American—were described as Israel’s enemies in the exodus and conquest. While the use of similar biblical identifiers is notable, this should not mask very real differences in how these beliefs were held and used against enemies.

(ii) Providential Decision-Making

The use of providence for decision-making was highly controversial for practical and doctrinal reasons. Practically, devout Christians could draw very different conclusions from the same event. This often depended on ancillary beliefs informing the interpretation process. Many also had doctrinal objections. Ministers, like John Calvin, Thomas Watson, John Warren and John Flavel, warned of dangers in using providence as a guide for actions.1036

Some of this caution concerning using providence as a guide for actions rested on a contrast between the subjectivity of providential interpretations (or interpretations of spiritual ‘impressions’) and the objectivity of God’s moral law which was to govern all human actions. As godly hegemony entered into broad daylight, many felt they were simply following the movements of God. They, as evidenced in the chapters on Drogheda and Dunbar, often felt carried along by providence as if their controversial

decisions involved little of man and much of God. To outsiders, their reading of events appeared all too human.

Irreconcilable providentialisms bore the marks of partisan interests. Whereas self-critique was ubiquitous in godly diaries, few expressed shame over the manipulation of providence. A rare exception was Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston. Although he clung to his beliefs that endangered the Scots’ cause at Dunbar, his diary offered one glimpse into how providentialism led him from God:

I thought I was following the call of Gods providence... the truth is I followed the call of providence when it agreed with my humour and pleased my idol and seemed to tend to honor and advantage.\textsuperscript{1037}

One wonders if he ever confessed this to his wife. For years he harboured bitterness towards her—and even considered using spiritually-edifying physical force (a ‘flappe’) to teach her to ‘rely wholly on’ God. Her error? In direct opposition to her husband, she thought the purges before Dunbar would weaken the army.\textsuperscript{1038}

\textbf{(iii) Providential Flexibility}

The godly interpreted events at different levels. Many of the above-mentioned beliefs encouraged the questioning of face-value interpretations. Things, providentially speaking, were not always as they seemed. In fact, if the Christian had more information, reality might differ drastically from outward appearances. A complex view of theology, time, geography and circumstances facilitated a reorientation of perspective.

\textit{Theological Reorientation}. Dozens of theological reorientations in Scripture added additional layers to providential plasticity, as examples restricted to Paul’s letters to the Corinthians show. These letters contain memorable statements that—regardless of context—changed the perspective on an event. For example, Stephen Marshall said of Naseby that God ‘delights by weak things to confound the mighty’ (1 Cor 1:27).\textsuperscript{1039} Similarly, Cromwell attributed his pre-Naseby cheer and confidence to a knowledge that
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‘God would by things that are not, bring to naught things that are, of which I had great assurance, and God did it’ (1 Cor 1:28). Many other verses from 1 and 2 Corinthians facilitate similar reorientations: ‘the wisedome of this world is foolishnesse with God’ (1 Cor 3:19); ‘let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall’ (1 Cor 10:12); ‘though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day’ (2 Cor 4:16); ‘our light affliction... worketh for us a farre more exceeding and eternall weight of glory’ (2 Cor 4:17); ‘we looke not at the things which are seene, but at the things which are not seene’ (2 Cor 4:18); ‘when I am weake, then am I strong’ (2 Cor 12:10); ‘my strength is made perfect in weaknes’ (2 Cor 12:9). An event that seemed promising—like an opponent’s claimed devotion to Christ—could be inverted through the use of 2 Corinthians 11:14: ‘Sathan himselfe is transformed into an Angel of light’. As the case studies demonstrate, these verses were commonly employed in godly warfare—though a martial use often sits awkwardly with the original context.

**Chronological Reorientation.** When searching for evidence of God’s disposition and will, one could turn to events that happened weeks, months, years or even centuries prior. As John Maudit explained for godly soldiers in 1649, faith laid hold of the belief that time was compressed into a divine present with the result that new causal relations were recognised between consequentially distant events. Providential interpretations could confirm past events, provide a lens for the present or chart a course for the future—sometimes simultaneously. For example, in *Englands apology, for its late change*, John Goodwin anonymously urged the godly to submit to God’s providences and invoked Naseby, the regicide and the conquest of Ireland as evidence. Dunbar declared God’s favour in continuity with a decade of victories; it also confirmed these prior victories were of God. All of these events, in the words of Goodwin, should ‘be a confirmation of each other’. This was a cumulative argument for providential favour that then added meaning to the individual parts.

Partisans were also urged to consider the effect of future (or eternal) judgement and reward. Something that could be taken as a benefit today might later be considered


1043. [Goodwin], *Englands apology*, 10.
a judgment; something undesired in the present may later be seen as a blessing.\textsuperscript{1044} ‘Religion’, Thomas Watson said, ‘is the true Philosophers stone, that turns every thing into Gold’. It was not simply that faith gilds the object of its gaze; providentially-sharpened eyes perceived everything as gilded by God for all who were in Christ.

The opposite was also true: ‘to them that are evill, good things work for hurt’.\textsuperscript{1045} An isolated event like military defeat might be taken as a declaration by God against a cause. However, the doctrine of divine judgements—whether a providential reversal, spectacular death or eternal damnation—allowed an interpreter to take the sting out of defeat. A loss might still be viewed as occasioned by the sin of the godly, but the real victory lay with those who—through Christ—ultimately triumphed over all enemies.

\textit{Geographic Reorientation}. One could also learn God’s will from events that took place in different regions, as already evidenced above in \textit{Englands apology}. The godly avidly read and disseminated news and were acutely aware of local, regional, national and international affairs.\textsuperscript{1046} The veracity of many reports is open to question, but it is certain that they looked to geographically distant events to understand the movements of providence and make local decisions.

The opposite was also true. Personal, familial and local factors might evidence God’s intentions for the entire nation. For example, the conversion of Native Americans could function ‘as confirmation that the civil wars, regicide, and Commonwealth government were blessed by God’, as Kristina Bross notes.\textsuperscript{1047} Similarly, Oliver Cromwell solicited advice from colonists during the Civil Wars and Interregnum. He wanted to understand God’s will for England through the transatlantic interpretations of prophecy and providence. John Cotton’s apocalyptic speculations may have influenced the Western Design.\textsuperscript{1048} Finally, it was a geographically distant defeat that checked Cromwell’s confident ability to clearly discern the \textit{digitus Dei}. He was epistemically
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humbled when years of sustained providential victories ended with a crushing defeat at Hispaniola.\footnote{1049}

*Incidental Reorientation.* A tiny detail related to the act of killing could upend an interpretation. This was why many strained to hear God’s every word and note. An account of the regicide provides a striking example. The official parliamentarian narrative claimed that Charles was guilty of blood and his guilt was providentially confirmed through sustained defeat. His trial and execution, allowed by God, followed. This massive narrative could be undermined by minor details. While on the scaffold, as was claimed in the blank spaces of an almanac that functioned as a diary for Isabella Twysden, ‘a flite of wild ducks’ flew over Charles. She seemed to consider the movement of these birds as relevant for the meaning of the execution below.\footnote{1050} As Katharine Gillespie recently noted, though the comment is significant, ‘the absence of commentary forces us to speculate’ on what the event meant to her.\footnote{1051} When the events of last decade seemed to cast Charles aside, these ‘wild ducks’ seemed to matter.

(b) Interpreting a Just Cause: Divine Communication

Having considered the complexity of providentialism by looking at the human interpreter, the divine communicator must now be examined. As William Gurnall wrote in his treatise on spiritual warfare, ‘Providence has a voice, if we had an eare; mercies should draw, afflictions drive’.\footnote{1052} Salvation (mercy) and judgment (punishment) were themes running throughout the text of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation; but salvation *through* judgment was also a major theme.\footnote{1053} Barbara Donagan notes how ‘The character of a providential event, as judgement or mercy, lay in the eye of the beholder’.\footnote{1054} Complex interpretations were deeply rooted in the manifold witness of Scripture. The seventeenth-century Christian could find biblical support for four main
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interpretations of mercies (like victory) and four main interpretations of judgments (like defeat).

Mercy. The faithful could believe their experienced mercy related, in some way, to their faithfulness. One could also experience mercy because of something an adversary or outsider did wrong. Finally, the reason why God dispensed mercy might be mysterious.

Judgement. Beliefs about judgement were similarly complex. The faithful could experience what felt like judgement, and this might be a consequence of faithfulness or a test of it. Similarly, God’s people could experience judgement—fatherly chastisement—when they strayed. Their negative experience could be the result of what an adversary or outsider did wrong. Finally, God might keep the relationship between beliefs, actions and judgment mysterious.

Although some categories were more frequently claimed than others, each had scriptural support. Which interpretive frame applied in a particular circumstance? Was defeat the result of sin, a test of faithfulness, intended to compound the guilt of the ungodly—or were God’s purposes unknowable? What follows is a more detailed examination of these types of divine communications.

(i) Evidence of a Just Cause

Justice and holiness were fundamental to godly violence and military providentialism. The two were linked, with justice usually taking sequential priority. Although partisans had similar habits of mind, there was little consensus about which cause was just and holy. How could one discern a truly just cause amidst the cacophony of competing claims? Did competing claims cancel each other out? How could one decide which
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beliefs were veridical?

The place of Scripture in informing beliefs and motivating actions must be underscored. Scripture, as suggested below, both inhibited and enabled conflict. It could settle disputes; it could also render them intractable. It might also compound the guilt of opponents who were seen as obstinate before God’s word. Debates over the clarity of Scripture were prominent: one person’s clear teaching—with no admixture of human taint—was all too human to another. Many used providence to break exegetical stalemates.

The verdict on competing claims to the righteous cause could be handed down by the *digitus Dei* and read through the careful interpretation of providence. Although providences could confirm that a cause accorded with Scripture, there was the danger they could be used to justify acts that were contrary to God’s will as revealed in Scripture.\(^{1063}\) Due to the variety of providential evidences (or indicators), it is not surprising that all five case studies show competing providentialisms. Interrelated evidences have been grouped below. These include *internal, group, oppositional, doctrinal, historical, supernatural* and *circumstantial* indicators.\(^{1064}\) Every italicised ‘indicator’ below played a role in the case studies of this thesis.

*Internal Evidence.* When endeavouring to hold right beliefs in conflict, individuals could appeal to internal evidences. The accuracy of these claims could not be verified by outsiders. For those who held them to be veridical, they were important accompaniments—particularly in making controversial claims or decisions. These evidences include beliefs about the *leading of God, conscience, feelings of rightness* or *feelings of confidence.* After circumstances confirmed one’s internal beliefs (e.g. confidence in victory confirmed by actual victory), the outcome could be used to persuade outsiders that unverifiable beliefs were from God. Cromwell’s letter after Naseby is good example.

*Group Evidence.* In addition to internal evidence, persons could derive beliefs about righteousness from the nature of the group. The perception that a group was *loving, unified* and doctrinally or behaviourally *pure* could function as a confirmation


\(^{1064}\) For an excellent account of many of these providential evidences in documents related to the Irish Rebellion, see Redmond, ‘Popular Religious Violence in Ireland’, 213–49.
that their cause was God’s. When members were persecuted or martyred, the cause was confirmed. Similarly, the conversion of opponents or the apostasy of members both provide evidence: conversion because God enlightens; apostasy because God foretold that many would prefer darkness. God confirmed the righteous side, for example, by the conversion of Wequash after Mystic and Alexander Jaffray after Dunbar.

**Oppositional Evidence.** One could also form beliefs by focusing on the ‘other’. The nature of the enemy spoke volumes about one’s own group. There were two important things to note about enemies: beliefs and behaviours. Unorthodox beliefs frequently manifest themselves though overt blasphemy. This defiant attitude towards God revealed the depths of wickedness and pride. These, however, were usually not a sufficient warrant for retributive violence through war. It was behaviour—the injustice and atrocities of the enemy—that warranted such a response. Thus, one could learn about God’s cause by looking at heinous actions that revealed warped beliefs. The chapter on Drogheda evidenced a complexly toxic revulsion at Catholics beliefs intensified by the perception of widespread Catholic atrocities. Similarly, the two chapters on Native Americans show a fixation with the perception of barbarism among Algonquians; a barbarism that was intimately linked with their status as theological outsiders.

**Doctrinal Evidence.** Scripture and theology, provided another avenue whereby participants could derive beliefs about the cause. There were many interrelated themes such as doctrine, correspondence with biblical patterns (typology and allegory), apocalyptic or eschatological beliefs, group covenant (with temporal blessings and curses) and scriptural imitation, mandates, or warfare promises. By looking to the text, participants drew conclusions about the world and the place of their conflict therein. Take, for example, the killing of Benjaminate brethren (Scottish Presbyterians) after Dunbar. Nathaniel Homes knew this was righteous because it was patterned on Scripture. Further, he claimed that God gave an equally-clear command as that described in Judges 20.

**Historical Evidence.** The distant or near past could also inform beliefs. Whether drawn from classical sources, church history and national or group myths, the past often illuminated the present. Through reflecting on the past, partisans often located their struggle in God’s larger historical plan of redemption. Similarly, individual conflicts were often nestled within the larger and longer story of the nation. Especially in the
heady days after the execution of Charles I, it was important to understand the campaigns against the Irish and Scottish within revised conceptions of English history. Similarly, King Philip’s War evidenced an anxious sense that New England was historically shifting from covenant blessings to covenant curses.

Supernatural Evidence. A more controversial type of claim related more directly to the supernatural—or to the questionable use of nature. These included claims of miracles, prodigies, apparitions, visions, prophecy, judicial astrology, magic and witchcraft. Although most of these were looked upon with suspicion, some of the case studies show a slide towards controversial supernatural claims. William Lilly’s predictions—seemingly confirmed by Naseby—are a good example.

Circumstantial Evidence. Circumstances could evidence the disposition and intentions of God. The event did not need to be large to be significant. In 1895, one historian called minor providences in the Pequot War the ‘alphabet of divine speech’.

These particular providences are often grouped into judgements and mercies. Prayer influenced or, ex post facto, helped interpret events. If one prayed for an outcome, and it came to pass, this was evidence that God heard the prayer—thus confirming one’s cause. Vows, though more controversial, occasionally came before or followed after particular events and function as an interpretive lens for it. The most common circumstantial appeals related to weather, plague, famine, disaster, freak accidents, near misses and coincidences or serendipity. From comets to cheese, the case studies show how the circumstances of war mattered. One could also look at the circumstance of the nation or military when victory or defeat came. Weakness or strength, want or plenty, destruction or protection were all relevant. Above all the outcome of battle—and the manner in which it came about—proved vital to military providentialism.

(ii) Providence and Human Agency

The godly routinely spoke of a causal-connection between sin, judgement and war. The generic theological principle was that sin lay at the root of all afflictions. Finding the specific sin was problematic. All—even the godly—were continually guilty of some
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shortcoming. As a result, when the they searched for wrath-occasioning sin in the camp, they were likely to find it. The godly rarely considered sin against enemies to be the cause of defeat.

Similarly many connected righteousness and success. After Dunbar, Thomas Brooks drew on Augustine and linked ‘praise’ with ‘prosperity’. As Harry S. Stout notes, the godly frequently made use of the themes of ‘works righteousness as long as they made it plain that their message concerned corporate and temporal blessings, not eternal salvation’.

The connection between spirituality and success was usually applied retroactively to describe events. However, as noted by Martin Dzelzainis in a discussion of Milton’s History of Britain, the theology could function proscriptively: From this ‘angle, however, it looks more like laying the scriptural foundations of an ideology of godly conquest and imperialism’. ‘Because we have done X, God has favoured us’ slides into ‘God has favoured us; therefore we must do Y’.

Full reliance on divine sovereignty and a recognition of spiritual causality were not to supplant human responsibility. In recognising the importance of human actors, the godly were to look to God. Richard Sibbes impressed upon his audience the duty to look beyond ‘the second causes’ until ‘God’s hand’ in judgement was seen. Richard Baxter said that ‘Who ever is the [chastising] instrument, the Affliction is from God’. Additionally, in each battle, multiple agents influenced events. Various biblical texts spoke of how multiple actors providentially furthered goals that were incongruous with their intentions (Gen 50:20; Hab 1:5–11; Acts 2:23; Rom 8:28). Events were not only influenced by God and righteous humans (dual causality)—Satan and those influenced by him also act for their own reasons (quad causality). Satan’s activity might
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masquerade as God’s since he disguised himself as an angel of light (2 Cor 11:14). The intentions of God and Satan were relatively straightforward. However, godly and ungodly human intentions—especially when they acted collectively—were far more complex. A soldier in the godly New Model Army could have base or noble motivations. Similarly the enemies of God fighting in Ireland might possess varying degrees of ungodly theology and practice. A single regiment might comprise those who fight for fear, money, duty, glory, or hatred of Protestantism—in addition to turncoats and conscripts.

(iii) Clear, Mixed and Mysterious Providences

All of the case studies illustrated examples of clear, mixed and mysterious providences. As argued in the introduction, the godly thought warfare provided unique opportunities to see God’s activity. It is not surprising, then, that confident statements often accompanied war. As with debates over the clarity of Scripture, exegetes of providence differed on what qualified as a clear divine communication. Where one saw God lay bare his arm, another saw only ‘bare events’. On a deeply-personal level, the godly experienced the tension between outwardly-ruinous circumstances and providential beliefs. That providences often pointed in opposite directions was not only interpretationally problematic—it was deeply orthodox. In Richard Sibbes’ *The Soul’s Conflict* (1635) that was finished on his deathbed, he said ‘Our life is nothing, but as it were a webbe woven with interminglings of wants and favours, crosses and blessings, standings and failings, combate and victory’. The normal Christian experience, according to Richard Baxter, was to ‘have Wine and Vinegar in the same Cup’. Thomas Watson wrote frequently of this mixing. In *A divine cordial* (1663) he likened providence to clock gears that work by moving in

---

opposite directions. In Αὐταρκεία, or, The art of divine contentment (1654) he referred to ‘chequer[ed]’ providences and said life was ‘like a game at Tennis; Providence bandies her golden balls, first to one, then to another’. The perception of mixed providences played an important role in all five case studies. God’s complex communications were difficult to understand and a great source of anxiety. This, however, was not grounds for jettisoning trust in providence.

As noted in Carl von Clausewitz’s posthumous classic On War (1832): ‘War is the realm of chance. No other human activity gives it greater scope’. Although the godly would have disagreed with his use of ‘chance’, they sensed similar upheavals in war. Prolonged conflict multiplied checkered providences. After Naseby, Stephen Marshall preached that, by looking into the book of divine providence people will see ‘how usually God made our losses to be our gaine, and did us most good by undoing us’. Unity, rooted in divine sovereignty, organised the chaos. God could, for example, mingle news of victory abroad with defeat at home. He could couple political success with the death of a revered political leader or sweeten the bitter cup of defeat with the sweet wine of near misses. It was God who did this, and this provided comfort.

Scripture contained many epistemically-humbling passages that facilitated the acceptance of limits on human comprehension (Deut 29:29; Job; Lam 1–5; Rom 11:33–34). In the words of Thomas Hobbes, an entire book of the Bible, Job, was devoted to the question of ‘why wicked men have often prospered in this world, and good men have been afflicted’. John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards, as discussed in the introduction, similarly warned Christians to take their cognitive limitations seriously.

Richard Sibbes found it difficult to assess a spiritual condition based on outward signs:

Sometimes God shines on wicked men in outward things, but he hides his face for peace of conscience; and sometimes God’s children have his face shining on
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their consciences, but he hides his face in respect of outward things. Sometimes he shines in neither or both.\textsuperscript{1084}

God, for reasons known to himself, could conceal the relationship between outward circumstances, righteousness and the knowledge of divine intentions.

Defeat pushed many questions of providential interpretation to the fore. Christopher Hill wrote of Thomas Harrison, a regicide who maintained the belief in righteousness on the scaffold, that ‘[j]ustification by success should logically mean condemnation by defeat’.\textsuperscript{1085} Similarly, in \textit{Religion and the Decline of Magic}, Keith Thomas highlighted the ‘self-confirming quality’ of providential thinking: ‘there is no way in which the theory once accepted could be faulted’.\textsuperscript{1086} The case studies, and this conclusion, nuance such assessments. They show how many possible logical strands could be pulled from biblical texts and woven into a providential outlook that was both sturdy and flexible. Most in the seventeenth century did not practice ‘crude providentialism’ where something positive clearly indicated divine favour and something negative disfavour.\textsuperscript{1087} Their providentialism was nuanced and fit a world of variegated health, weather, prosperity and success.

\section*{3. Reflections on Godly Violence}

As argued in the introduction, early modern just war thinking was far more ‘religious’ than many scholars acknowledge. Similarly, ‘holy war’ thinking usually made more robust appeals to justice than is often credited. Rather than pitting the theories against each other, each case study has revealed the interplay and overlap between justice and holiness in the minds of partisans. I have called this ‘godly violence’. Much more can be said about possible relations between justice, holiness and providence.

\textbf{(a) Does a Holy Cause Create the Just Cause?}

In her analysis of the English Civil Wars, Sarah Mortimer argued at length that ‘Parliamentarians had woven a thick web of religious, civil and natural duties; some
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royalists set out to disentangle the various strands’. If these strands were related, how did they relate? Below I sketch two broad, though somewhat overlapping, ways of speaking or writing about the relationship.

Sometimes partisans claimed Scripture or belief in God’s will constructed the reasons to participate in a particular conflict. Sometimes persons argued that participation in a particular conflict was compatible with or corresponded to Scripture or God’s will. In both of these, sacred texts and theology were, to borrow a phrase of John Morrill, ‘load-bearing’—although they differed in how they carried the load. The two approaches were not mutually exclusive. Some gave priority to holiness; some to justice. Others appear to equally emphasise both. Before offering further arguments, it is necessary to note three things that are not argued here. First, the question under consideration is not whether the cause was actually just or holy (by past or present standards) or whether the godly had good grounds to believe their cause was just or holy. Second, it is not claimed that perceived injustice came sequentially prior to perceived violations of what was sacred. It is argued that when the godly marched to war, it was beliefs about justice that allowed them to claim a holy cause. Third, I am sidestepping the issue of self-deception, deception and ulterior motives. In the words of Erasmus, ‘who is there who does not think his cause just?’ Although the human propensity to create or find a just cause must be underscored, it is not explored here.

First, partisans could speak of holiness as if it constructed the just cause. Here, the justice in the cause was, first and foremost, derived from the perceived holiness in it. The holy cause, in a sense, created the just cause. Sacred text and theology constructed the reasons for war. Generally speaking, arriving at a holy cause in the constructivist sense involved a simplistic application of Scripture or a supernatural divine command from God. Claims for a new divine command—though deemed possible by some—were usually considered unlikely.

The constructivist position was relatively rare, though when it is spotted it truly stands out. For example, in Sermon to the Princes (1524), Thomas Müntzer proclaimed

---


to magistrates that ‘the godless have no right to life except that which the elect decide to grant them’.\textsuperscript{1091} Although few charge headlong down this path with Müntzer, some Christian arguments for war—to borrow a phrase from James Turner Johnson—have the effect of ‘opening’ up to a more radical relation between holiness and warfare.\textsuperscript{1092} Heinrich Bullinger, in \textit{Sermonum Decades quinique} (1552), tucked a few constructivist-opening sentences into a larger discussion of justice.\textsuperscript{1093} William Gouge, as detailed earlier, argued that holiness \textit{corresponded} to justice. He does, however, have one line opening up the possibility of an offensive war for the ‘Maintenance of Truth, and purity of Religion’—and this exemplified by Joshua’s conquest (Josh 22:12) and foretold concerning the ‘\textit{Anti-Christ}’ (Dan 11:40; Rev 17:16).\textsuperscript{1094} Peter Sterry’s sermons after Naseby—and especially after Drogheda—provide openings for warfare in the constructivist sense. In part, this was due to his intense sense of eschatological fulfillment. More importantly, his doctrine of the radical unity with the Godhead seemed to imply that whatever the godly do, God did it through them.\textsuperscript{1095} Another example is the advice given by Emanuel Downing to John Winthrop on dealing with Algonquian Indians.

A warr with the Narraganset is verie considerable to this plantation, ffor I doubt whither it be not synne in us, having power in our hands, to suffer them to maynteyne the worship of the devill which their paw wavies often doe; [second], If upon a Just warre the Lord should deliver them into our hands, wee might easily have men woemen and children enough to exchange for Moores.... for I do not see how wee can thrive untill wee gett into a stock of slaves sufficient to doe all our buisines.\textsuperscript{1096}

Cold economic benefits flowed with cutting off ‘devill’ worship. He seemed eager for a ‘Just warre’ in order to gain slaves and avoid ‘synne[ful]’ toleration.

More commonly, however, participants thought in terms of \textit{compatibility}: the
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cause was holy because it was just. All truly holy causes were of necessity just. However, one knew the cause was holy because it was just. Therefore, godly violence was not a sin against the flesh—be the flesh in question their own or that of their enemy. Glenn Burgess, after examining the arguments for war given by Jeremiah Burroughes, Phillip Hunton, Charles Herle, William Bridge and Herbert Palmer, concludes that ‘whatever the Parliamentarian divines were doing, they were not defending directly the legitimacy of religious war’. Mark Bell and Matthew Muehlbauer have each made similar distinctions.

Compatibilists looked for permission or proscription in Scripture—and thus the text could inhibit or enable participation in war. The reasons for war needed to correspond with the sacred text. Holiness complemented justice and was not a substitute for it. As evidenced in the introduction, William Gouge, Oliver Cromwell, Samuel Nowell, Roger Williams and Hugo Grotius differed in how they related God and killing. Still, they should largely be considered compatibilists, as should John Calvin. To give just one example from his Sermons on Deuteronomy, he says ‘whenever [God] promiseth to bee with his people [in war]; his meaning is that their quarel must be just and reasonable’. In the just war, Christians were thankfully burdened by God—and by the ‘marke of our GOD’ in enemies—with higher restrictions on conduct. Enemies, too, were in the image and likeness of God.

A sense of victimisation—or protecting and avenging a victim—was central to the compatibilist construction of justice and holiness. According to James Sanderson, parliamentary resistance theorists ‘regarded themselves first and foremost as the actual or likely victims of a violent attack by the king and his supporters’. The subsequent ‘defensive’ war was considered ‘eminently compatible with scriptures’ and with theories of political power. As discussed later, doubting the compatibility of a particular war


1100. Ibid., 724–25. For a possible interpretation of Calvin’s changing warfare beliefs in later life, see Balserak, John Calvin.

1101. J. Sanderson, “But the people’s creatures”: The philosophical basis of the English Civil War (Manchester, 1989), 11, 25.
with Scripture—and overcoming that doubt through self-examination—could foster an immovable conviction that the cause was owned by God.

Partisans often spoke as if God owned the cause. But what kind of war did they think God would own? The argument here is that most would have appealed to justice at this point. Once one knew a cause was just, it was often accompanied by a ‘call from God’ to participate. The just cause, in a sense, created the divine calling. The articulation of a call from God should not be taken as evidence of a ‘crusader’ mentality. There were many types of divine calling—and God’s voice could tether the warrior to standards of justice or loose him from them.

Advocates of godly warfare, depending on audience, genre and situation, could describe their cause in many ways. They held justice and holiness in tension while erring on the side of compatibility. By looking at the splinter groups spawned during the British Civil Wars, we can see a little of what happened when these beliefs were pulled apart. The Levellers, for deeply religious reasons, emphasised natural rights held by humans as humans.1102 Any force or coercion must correspond to common standards of justice. In contrast, the Fifth Monarchists, argued that saints as saints had a right to rule. The power of the Spirit in the believer’s life dwarfed anything natural in mankind, thus constructing the saints’ right to rule.1103 The former added grace to nature; the latter was accused of building dominion on grace. Both of these groups grew out of Puritanism and emphasised one part of a logic that the godly tried to keep in tension. Leveller and Fifth Monarchist ideas had implications for when and why one could resort to violence—and persons could even support the same cause.

(b) Does Holiness Inhibit or Enable Violence?
In The Justification of Religious Violence, Steve Clarke argues that sacred justifications for war function similarly to secular ones, though ‘the religious are able to feed many more premises into those structures than the non-religious’. As such, the religious have


more beliefs about violence than the non-religious. These additional beliefs can encourage or limit war. Scripture and theology multiply reasons: They provide more reasons to demand justice and more to forgive; more reasons to submit and more to rebel; more reasons to unite and more to divide; more reasons to accept responsibility and more to deflect it; more reasons to preserve blood, and more to shed it; more reasons to separate from the world, and more to conquer it.

This roughly corresponds to two critiques of Christianity. Machiavelli lamented in *The Discourses* that through Christianity ‘the world were become effeminate and as if heaven were disarmed’ because people were not taught ‘that religion permits us to exalt and defend the fatherland’. Conversely, post-9/11 publishers turned out an astonishing number of books on the harm of religion—and much of this ire was directed at Christianity as inherently violent. In *Orthodoxy*, G. K. Chesterton noted similar contradictory accusations: ‘What could be the nature of the thing which one could abuse first because it would not fight, and second because it was always fighting?’ It is this tension that must be explored if we are to understand how seventeenth-century godly warriors—who thought themselves bound to higher standards than their opponents—were so profligate in shedding blood.

The godly placed a premium on the souls of enemies and friends. This could limit or encourage bloodshed. In a 1645 fast day sermon before Parliament, Peter Sterry said:

> ’Tis dreadfull to expresse; but I will speak it for your sakes. If God should please to put the choice into my hands; I had much rather, that all these three Kingdomes should be consum’d at once, in this very moment, with fire from heaven, by an outward destruction; then that any one the meanest, most miserable soule in them, should perish everlastingly.

The damnation of one soul eternally was of more consequence than the loss of everything temporal in the British Isles.

Claims like this must be taken seriously, as should the reality that the godly between 1636 and 1676 exerted enormous energy towards killing countless humans. They frequently showed a mundane disregard for civilian or soldier through warfare, impressment, imprisonment, mutilation, pillage, destructions of homes and crops, forced relocation, land confiscation, stripping civilians of clothing, slavery, forced transatlantic relocation and the ritualised display of the dead. How does this square with Sterry’s rousing declaration of the inestimable value of every single human life? Valuing life could facilitate the wanton destruction of life when the godly saw themselves as defending justice and avenging illegitimate killing. It must be remembered that this 1645 sermon was part of the war effort. By 1649, Sterry encouraged Parliament to become temporarily comfortable with their role as men ‘of blood’ because they were following in the bloodletting footsteps of David and Jesus.\textsuperscript{1108}

Perhaps a 1650 medal commemorating the conquest of Ireland aptly describes godly thoughts about their prodigious bloodshed. The front depicted Henry Ireton and read ‘QVID TIBI RETRIVAM’ (‘What shall I render to thee?’ from Psalm 116:12). On the reverse, a battle raged in the background. In the foreground, a soldier scales rocks to set fire to a thatched cottage. The medal itself highlights the attack on civilians. In Latin it reads: ‘IVSTITIA NECESSITAS Q. IVBET’. ‘Justice and necessity’—fuelled by a deep sense of victimisation—‘commanded it’.\textsuperscript{1109} Necessity and providence, after all, were related theological concepts. One commentator suggests the medal was an ‘attempt to apologize’.\textsuperscript{1110} If so, they mingled apology with praise. Viewing both sides together provides a window into how the godly dealt with the more lethal moments in their history.

Godliness, the godly frequently argued, was meant to improve society. In 1663, Thomas Watson noted how Christianity should influence behaviour: It ‘doth not take away civility, but refine it’.\textsuperscript{1111} This, ideally, was also true in warfare. James Turner Johnson and Matthew Muehlbauer have argued separately that many religiously

\textsuperscript{1108} Sterry, \textit{Spirit}.
\textsuperscript{1109} T. Simon and J. Lilburn, Medal (1650), BM M.7322. There was thanksgiving in 1651 when victory cost few Irish lives, ‘especially Women and Children’ (BL Egerton MS 1761 ff.62–63).
\textsuperscript{1110} E. Hawkins, et al. (eds), \textit{Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland} (London, 1885) I:387.
motivated warriors had increased grounds to act with justice and show restraint.\(^{1112}\) As godly treatises on war indicate, adding ‘holiness’ to ‘justice’, instead of inciting unrestrained violence, was intended to present yet another limitation on war. Warriors could not keep a clean heart with dirty hands. Desiring that a combatant be ‘holy’—while opening up the possibility of unrestrained violence—might be intended as a limitation on conduct. For the great majority of the godly who did not believe in pacifism, the alternative to a holy warrior was not a just warrior—it was an *unholy* warrior.\(^{1113}\) Thus there is the possibility that a ‘holy warrior’, to use a problematic phrase, had more restraining criteria than those unencumbered by religious obligations.\(^{1114}\)

This duty of conformity to higher standards of justice set by God, were those standards met, could have a paradoxical effect. Stricter criteria could lead to an increased belief in the righteousness of the cause—heightened because one entertained doubt. To borrow another phrase from John Morrill, I am suggesting that there might have been a *coiled spring effect*\(^{1115}\) where religion and Scripture helped the godly absorb injustice and limit wartime conduct *up to a point*. The tipping point would have differed from person to person. For some, after that point was crossed, all the patience, mercy and forgiveness wound into the coil was released on enemies. Full force went into prosecuting the war with increased vigour and decreased mercy. For example, Oliver Cromwell may have been so convinced of the righteousness of killing Charles I because self-scrutiny led him to resist such a conclusion for so long. When the coil was wound up, it bore the marks of mercy and restraint. When it was released, the built up energy was put in the service of unrelenting justice. Paradoxically, the righteous warrior might be so lethal because of increased self-restraint and self-examination.\(^{1116}\)


\(^{1116}\) See also A.P. Fiske and T.S. Rai, *Virtuous Violence: Hurting and Killing to Create, Sustain, End and Honor Social Relationships* (Cambridge, 2015), 4–5, 155, 159.
(c) Does the Use of Theology Evidence a ‘Crusading’ Mentality?

Many who articulated beliefs about holiness in warfare used categories that derive from general principles in Christian theology. When generic theology was applied to war, it sounds like ‘crusading’ ideology. This may evidence the morphing of theology as described by the sociologist, David Martin. When the church and state united in violence, the meaning behind Christian logic, symbolism and metaphor was redeployed. ‘The symbolic logic of Christianity [was] transformed under social pressure’.1117

A few examples will suffice. Because all evil is associated with Satan, it was natural for the godly to say that evil performed by enemies was satanic. Because all Christians should continually pursue holiness, this applied no less to the soldier. Because all endeavours should be undertaken with the aid of God and to the glory of God, so must warfare. Because all of life was infused with transcendent meaning, this conflict must also have meaning. Because all Christians go to heaven after death, those Christian who die in battle will go to heaven.

Concerning this last claim, the argument is that salvation awaits the Christian after death though they die in battle.1118 This is to be differentiated from those who believe one merits salvation because they died in battle. Although the Puritan and the Crusader may use similar language and texts, this does not necessarily imply that they had the same view of the relationship between warfare and salvation. Similar distinctions could be made with reference to the other generic principles above.

Spiritual warfare was a significant lens through which the godly viewed physical warfare. Christians, while on the earth, form part of what has been called the Church Militant. According to William Ames, ‘The Church militant’ has only begun to partake of communion with Christ ‘and so doth wrestle as yet with enemies in the field of this World’.1119 Spiritual warfare went from being distinct from—though not necessarily incompatible with—actual warfare1120 to being something that supported and encouraged war while infusing it with transcendent meaning. The context and content of theological utterances could facilitate this martialisation of spiritual warfare: when
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ministers preached on political or martial occasions\textsuperscript{1121} or encouraged magistrates to execute justice,\textsuperscript{1122} when a magistrate held spiritual power\textsuperscript{1123} or when ministers donned political or martial roles.\textsuperscript{1124} All four of these were integral to godly violence in these case studies.

\textbf{(d) Are Sources Imbalanced?}

Concerning ‘godly violence’, an important question remains: to what extent can sources evidence the totality of a person’s motivations and grounds for war? In what follows I will argue that most sources on war were imbalanced, incomplete or shorthand. They were often occasional works, tailored for a specific time and audience. They rarely reflect the totality of why an individual or group supported a cause. If this is correct, then in an imbalanced appeal to the justice of the cause there were likely many unarticulated beliefs about the holiness of it. Similarly, in a text that majored on the holiness of a cause, the justness of it was likely assumed.

Some sermons gave scant attention to why the minister thought the cause conformed to standards of justice. Their biblical allusions and intertextual use of Scripture provide a window into how justice and holiness related. For example, in 1649, John Maudit preached before the conquest of Ireland. The bulk of the text explained how conquest accorded with Scripture and God’s will. He barely mentioned justice. However, due to the long history of England and Ireland, a simple mention of the past—‘cruell massacres’ in Ireland—tied the holy cause to ideas about justice. He gave other subtle clues. Civilians killed in Ireland were as ‘righteous Abel’ (Matt 23:35). When he styled Cromwell as Abraham, he picked the account where the patriarch took up arms to rescue Lot—a victim of kidnapping (Gen 14).\textsuperscript{1125} Both underscore the unprovoked nature of Protestant deaths.
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Genre and audience influenced the types of arguments put forward. When preaching to the choir, partisans aimed to motivate or reassure those who were largely sympathetic. In contrast, works written for a more sceptical audience sought to convince—emphasising the rationale behind controversial assertions that a cause was just and holy. This is evidenced by pairing two works by Stephen Marshall. The titles demonstrate the types of arguments contained therein: *Meroz Cursed* (1642) majored on holiness and *A plea for defensive arms* (1643) majored on justice. Juxtaposing these, Glenn Burgess rightly notes that ‘Marshall had a markedly bifocal vision of England’s war of religion’.

Perhaps the best example of imbalance was Parliament’s *The souldiers pocket Bible* (1643)—intended to ‘supply the want of the whole Bible’. It barely mentioned the New Testament and entirely omitted Christ. Although advocating just actions in war (*jus in bello*), it nowhere claimed the war itself was just (*jus ad bellum*). This lacuna may be owing to the fact that the godly soldier, in theory, settled questions of justice before setting foot on the battlefield. Once there, he only needed to remember it was God’s cause and that God would not abandon him in life or death. In the camp or on the fields, the iconography of battle flags also reinforced beliefs. A high proportion of these flags directly appealed to either justice or holiness—and often to both.

4. Cross-Conflict Comparison
The five case studies support many cross-conflict comparisons. Many of these have never been made across all the groups considered in this thesis. They concern *ad bellum*, *in bello* and *post bellum* beliefs and actions, and are arranged accordingly.

*Ad bellum.* First, in each conflict, the Puritans had a deep and abiding sense of victimisation. They acted on this sense in various ways. The national and religious identity of the perpetrator seemed to influence how they formed, nurtured, articulated and debated beliefs. A few, like Roger Williams, were acutely aware of the ease with

1127. Anon., *The souldiers pocket Bible*. Essex’s laws, briefly detailed man’s duty to God. They only dealt with *in bello*, not *ad bellum* (R. Devereux, *Laues and ordainances of warre* [London, 1642]).
which victims could victimise. Although he cautiously and critically supported the
godly in all five wars, he emphasised both justice and mercy.

Second, partisans in each study intermingled discourses of justice and holiness. In contrast to the others, commentators on Naseby rarely discussed justice. This lacuna was likely owing to years arguing the point. When victory came, it functioned as divine confirmation.

Third, each case study, except Naseby (for reasons similar to those above), evidenced efforts to de-escalate the conflict. Some attempted mediation, and mediators could be armed—as in the early stages of the Pequot War. Similarly, one could interpret Cromwell’s demand for surrender at Drogheda as a preference to end the struggle through words.

Fourth, the godly sometimes forgave offences, lived with difference and overlooked theological error. At certain points, it seemed easier for them to tolerate Native Americans—who they associated with Satan—than those who advocated Presbyterian church government. Native Americans might have been considered so far outside the Christian fold that, in some circumstances, this lessened the drive towards coercion.

_In bello._ First, in each case study the defeated were blamed for their own downfall. These claims could take the form of generic providential assertions about the ruinous effects of sin or be more targeted—as in writings against slain and mutilated women at Naseby. Wide was the gate that led to destruction, and the many entering it were guilty of diverse sins. These sins varied, from abducting colonial children to adherence to an accursed covenant.

Second, each study, with the exception of Dunbar, witnessed intentional attacks on non-combatants. With the emphasis on murder in discourses of war in New England and Ireland, bloodguilt easily spread to civilians.

Third, firsthand descriptions of fighting could be almost euphoric and trancelike. John Mason’s comments at Mystic and Cromwell’s state after Dunbar evidence this. Circumstances—successive defeats, stiff odds, sleepless active nights and an early morning assault—may have influenced this.

Fourth, all the case studies illustrate martial or theological side-changing. Wequash after Mystic and Alexander Jaffray after Dunbar are notable examples. Wequash, in particular, was the ideal outsider. He exemplified the effect the godly
thought godly violence should have on their opponents. Far more combatants simply switched political allegiance or fought for whichever side was ascendant.

Fifth, in each study, the godly viewed opponents as a mixture of alike and ‘other’. Both views, as is seldom noted, can support violence. In *Virtuous Violence*, Alan Page Fiske and Tage Shakti Rai argue that in most cases of killing ‘perpetrators are not morally disengaged; they are morally engaged. Victims are not dehumanized; they are humanized’.1129 The godly often spoke of enemies as alike when holding them to a common standard and ‘other’ when prosecuting violations.

Sixth, each study also showed the dehumanisation and demonisation of enemies. The rhetoric employed against Covenanters after Dunbar was similar to that uttered against Native Americans. Without bifurcating too strongly between the two discourses, Algonquians tended to be dehumanised and enemies in the British Isles tended to be demonised.

Seventh, there were similarities in the scriptural rhetoric used against enemies. Dunbar shows how the godly could denounce Scottish Presbyterians as Pharaoh, Balaam, Dagon, Canaanites, Amalekites, Sodomites and whores and condemn them with terms like herem and anathema. Similarly, the concept of delight and human sacrifice surfaced in war with the Pequot and the Scots. Those considered to be unjust and unholy opponents—be they pagan or Presbyterian—could be branded with the harshest of biblical language. This similar rhetoric should not mask real differences in how the godly treated enemies.

Eighth, dozens of comparisons could be made concerning Scripture or theology. For example, the godly showed a strong preference for the warlike portions of the Hebrew Bible, the Gospels rarely feature in comments on war. Spiritual warfare verses were frequently used to justify or describe physical warfare.

Ninth, while flagellating themselves as war-provoking sinners, the godly rarely considered sin against their enemy as a cause of God’s anger. Catalogues of war-provoking sins were usually silent on their actions towards enemies—be they women at Naseby, Irish civilians or Wampanoag surrenders.

Tenth, beliefs about human agency were central to military providentialism. The godly repeatedly used texts that shunned human agency for the purposes of urging
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people into war. They declared ‘The Lord shall fight for you’, but in practice, they did not ‘hold [their] peace’ (Exod 14:14). The Scots used verses like this to justify purging. The godly ridiculed them for providential presumption. In the stressful incomprehensibility of King Philip’s War, a few colonists—similar to the Scots—shunned human agency. Their bodies became object lessons showing the danger of testing providence. In several ways, New England theology in pyrrhic victory resembled that of the Covenanters in defeat at Dunbar. This suggests that the sense of the loss of hegemony makes certain modes of interacting with scripture seem attractive.

Eleventh, in all the case studies, the godly insisted that their killing was God’s doing. However, Naseby was remarkable for the degree to which the godly insisted that God alone acted. Fighting against one’s sovereign was far more controversial than opposing Native Americans, Scottish Presbyterians or Irish Catholics. The desire to avoid the charge of rebellion, coupled with the surprising reversal of fortunes at Naseby, might have led to heightened claims that Parliament did nothing and God did everything.

Twelfth, even though many believed miracles had ceased, the miraculous formed an important part of commentary on warfare. Miracles were important in two ways: the use of scriptural miracles to describe godly warfare and the more direct claim that God acted miraculously in their war. Concerning the former, they often altered or internalised biblical miracles (particularly those related to the exodus and conquest) when applying them to their seventeenth-century context. Additionally, some claimed that God performed miracles in godly warfare. Naseby, perhaps for reasons described above, stands out in this respect.

Finally, eschatology differed across the conflicts. It was insignificant in the Pequot War, marginal after Naseby and prominent in Drogheda and Dunbar. The ever-present eschatology of King Philip’s War was shorn of optimism and confidence.

Post bellum. First, after each conflict, enemies were subjected to varying degrees of punishment. Several of the case studies—on both sides of the Atlantic—recount the ritual mutilation and display of the dead. This happened to Native Americans and English royalists after Drogheda. In some case studies, some enemies eventually reentered society on an equal footing; other persons and groups were subjugated in perpetuity.

Second, in some of the case studies, the sins of parents more directly impacted
the fate of their children. In New England, there was widespread confiscation of property, loss of power, loss of freedom and even talk of executing the children of Algonquian leaders. The defeated in the British Isles only experienced some of this.

Third, many prisoners of war were shipped—in opposite directions—into the Atlantic. On paper, Algonquian terms of servitude were often similar to their counterpart in the British Isles. As the Dunbar prisoners illustrate, actual condition of servitude differed. The Scots prisoners who were transported overseas often had support networks and sympathetic overseers committed to their eventual release. Native American servitude was harsher to begin with and it eventually morphed into permanent and hereditary chattel slavery.

Fourth, the loss of land, and the claims used to justify confiscation, merits more attention. The godly gained political power over large tracts of territory in the British Isles and the Americas. Property also exchanged hands on a personal level—sometimes only temporarily due to shifting power. Land taken from Native Americans and the Irish, generally speaking, never returned to the original owner. This was far less common in England and Scotland.

Fifth, in all the case studies, many enemies eventually offered varying degrees of acceptance of, or submission to, their conquerors. Persons as unalike as Archibald Johnston and Thomas Hobbes found ways to justify some form of submission to the Commonwealth. Similarly, Native Americans found various ways to coexist with conquerors and survive subjugation.

Sixth, each case study briefly discussed the providential trajectory of the conflict. Beliefs about these decisive victories were variously confirmed, expanded, contested and at times dismantled. There seems to have been a relationship between the duration of hegemony and the viability of providential interpretations. Naseby was dramatically reinterpreted after 1660. Godly victories over the Irish and Scots became English victories after the Restoration. Interpretations of the Pequot War and King Philip’s War grew even as they morphed—nourished by the American Revolution, Manifest Destiny, messianic interventionism, scientific racism and determinism and economic or political dominance.

Finally, there are many differences in how these conflicts were remembered over the centuries. Some of them have largely transitioned from memory to history. The two categories are not mutually exclusive but ‘mutually constructive’, as argued by
Christina M. DeLucia. ‘Memory can prod history into confrontations with uncomfortable chapters of the past’. The conflicts in New England and Ireland are still controversial, as The National Day of Mourning and the Belfast murals attest.

5. Conclusion: The Twilight of Godly Hegemony

This thesis has told the story of godly violence and military providentialism in the Puritan Atlantic world by looking at case studies that span the rise and fall of godly hegemony. The godly first gained power in colonial New England. In the mid-1630s they temporarily warmed up to killing Native Americans and believed God was with them every step of the way. At the time of the Pequot War, Puritan hegemony in England was largely unthinkable. In a little over a decade, the godly in England defeated and executed their king. They went on to subjugate Ireland and Scotland before turning their forces on enemies outside the British Isles. However, they lost power after the regime crumbled. By the time of King Philip’s War, hegemony in the British Isles was a memory. Even though the godly won the war against Philip, the pyrrhic victory contributed to the fragmentation of providence and the loss of political autonomy.

The story of Puritan hegemony differs from that of Puritan theology—the latter enjoying a much larger and longer influence. Michael J. McClymond and Gerald R. McDermott summarise Jonathan Edwards’ view of history:

> We dwellers in the midst of history, however, suffer from our limited perspective. We cannot declare definitively whether the present darkness is a prelude to deeper darkness or the presage of a new dawn, whether the present light will shine ever brighter or be extinguished all over again.

Even in the loss of hegemony and the waning of religious affections, there were grounds for hope. ‘For biblically inspired thinkers such as Edwards’, according to McClymond and McDermott, ‘the paradigm case of darkness changed into light lay in the story of Good Friday and Easter’. These five case studies were framed around dawn, day and dusk. Military providentialism was influenced by the perception that the godly were entering the light

1130. C.M. DeLucia, Memory Lands: King Philip’s War and the Place of Violence in the Northeast (New Haven, 2018), 12.

(Mystic, Naseby), passing into unparalleled brightness (Drogheda, Dunbar) or grasping at former glory (Great Swamp Fight).

In 1676 Increase Mather wrote in fear of the ‘great darkness’ after God’s removal of the godly ‘stars’ of the first generation.\textsuperscript{1132} In the same year Philip Walker composed these lines:

\begin{verbatim}
[so] has owr Light ffrom Sixtene hundrd twenty
[th]rough gods permitanc shind gloriously & plenty
[wha]ts er the cas shes now [eclip]st we see\textsuperscript{1133}
\end{verbatim}

Weakened through King Philip’s War, Charles II finally removed the lampstand of godly hegemony. He succeeded where his father failed.

The introductory chapter cited George Wither’s poem written in the early stages of First English Civil War. He sensed both darkness and light:

\begin{verbatim}
Ah me! why was I borne
So late? or why soone?
To see so bright, so cleare a Morne,
So black an Afternoone?\textsuperscript{1134}
\end{verbatim}

For Wither, blazing—albeit temporary—sunshine lay in the future.

This poem was particularly relevant for the godly in the wake of King Philip’s War as they gazed on a tired sun. In a 1679 letter between Nathaniel Morton and Increase Mather, Morton found comfort in Wither’s experience:

\begin{verbatim}
[A]nd although wee must not discontentedly now in any wise controle the providence of God as to say why is it that the former dayes were better then these; yett wee may in an humble and bewailing way, say, Why is it soe? and in some sort comply with our Englis[h] Poett, George Withers; (saith hee) Alas that I was borne soe late, or else soe soone; to see soe cleare, so bright a morne, soe darke an afternoone. Notwithstanding I humbly conceive it good for us, in all the darkest dispensations of God towards us, to have one eye (as it were) ffixed in the Justice of God, soe the other on the Mercye of God towards us.\textsuperscript{1135}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{1132} Mather, \textit{Earnest Exhortation}, 10.
\textsuperscript{1133} Walker, ‘\textit{Capitan Perse’}, 85.
\textsuperscript{1134} Wither, \textit{Campo-musae}, 18.
\textsuperscript{1135} ‘Nathaniel Morton to Increase Mather’ (8 Aug 1679), \textit{Coll. MHS} ser. 4 VIII:594–96. Italics added.
For Morton, it was a hope-filled loss of power. His belief in providence helped him come to terms with the merciful judgements of God as the curtain closed on the age of Puritan hegemony.
Appendix

The Pequot War and the 1629 Charter of Massachusetts Bay\textsuperscript{1136}

How is it that a group of devout Christians who were committed, as they frequently asserted, to the good of the Indians came to view the slaughter of hundreds of men, women and children as just, necessary and God-pleasing? Matthew Muehlbauer argues at length that the godly in colonial New England remained within the just war tradition. The main exception, he claims, came on the day of the Mystic Massacre when they reverted to ‘explicit holy war arguments’\textsuperscript{1137}. Elevated rhetoric accompanied loosened restraints. However, the following discussion will argue that there was a deeper logic of ‘justice’ that has not been explored by historians. More specifically, it will explain in greater detail how this holy violence fit into beliefs about justice. The war, from the English perspective, grew out of a thwarted legal proceeding. They related crime and war in a way that opened up the possibility of identifying civilians as culpable.

Guilt could spread from perpetrator to others who involved themselves in the crime. This was fundamental to English criminal law. The Barnard’s Inn lawyer, John Wilkinson, published a collection of laws on murder (and other crimes) in 1638—the year the Pequot War ended. He said of ‘poysoning’ and ‘other cases of wilfull murder’ that the ‘offenders therein, their ayders, abettors, procurers, and counsellers shall suffer death’\textsuperscript{1138}. As official English charters and patents made clear, this logic of expanding guilt could be applied internationally.

In the many explanations of this conflict, none—to my knowledge—have related the Pequot War to Massachusetts Bay’s foundational document. The 1629 Charter of Massachusetts Bay detailed the logic of expanding guilt and the legal response to it. This same logic was also in the Letters Patent to Sir Humphrey Gilbert (1578), the Charter to Sir Walter Raleigh (1584), The First Charter of Virginia (1606) and The Charter of New England (1620). It is also evident in the Charter of Connecticut (1662) and the Charter of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation (1663). These legal
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1138. J. Wilkinson, \textit{A treatise collected out of the statutes of this kingdome... concerning the office and authorities of coroners and sherifes} (London, 1638), 10.
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documents set basic parameters for English conduct.\textsuperscript{1139} As recently noted by James Muldoon, a central purpose of English charters was ‘to regulate relations among the developing European overseas empires’.\textsuperscript{1140} Unredressed crime could spark international crises. Charters aimed to prevent this by describing when subjects became outlaws.

The 1629 charter detailed what to do when an English subject transgressed national or international law. There was a normal procedure for redressing grievances. If this was thwarted, the Charter ‘declare[d] to all [amicable] Christian Kings, Princes and States’ when they could lawfully invade land occupied by English subjects and execute justice on criminals and all who assisted or harboured them. If someone from Massachusetts Bay committed an international crime, other colonists could become guilty if they thwarted justice or harboured the offending Englishmen. If this happened, the English king would

\begin{quote}
[1] put the said Person or Persons out of our Allegiance and Protecon, [2] and that it shalbe lawfull and free for all [amicable Christian] Princes to prosecute with Hostilitie, the said [formerly English] Offendors, [3] and every of them, their and every of their Procurers, Ayders, Abettors, and Comforters in that Behalf.\textsuperscript{1141}
\end{quote}

The foreign prince could ‘prosecute with Hostilitie’ the criminal and all who involved themselves in the crime. This detailed precisely how guilt spread. Crucial for the Pequot War, this logic could be turned outward—showing what the English had a right to do if a foreign power thwarted justice.

In 1641 John Cotton published \textit{An abstract of the lawes of New England}. At this point, he had been writing on New England law for the better part of a decade. He reproduced this Charter stipulation, making it clear that New Englanders expected reciprocity. The 1629 charter stipulation came into force ‘if any Person or Persons... of the said [Massachusetts Bay] Company or Plantacon’ committed an international crime. Cotton affirmed this original warning while also applying it in cases where ‘people of another Nation have done any important wrong, to any of ours’. Cotton transformed a
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warning to Massachusetts Bay into a warrant for demanding justice of outsiders. He did this by citing Matthew 7:12 (the golden rule): ‘Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should doe to you, doe ye even so to them’. This flipped the logic of expanding guilt, applying it to foreign enemies. Do unto others, in a sense, became demand of others. All the warfare laws of Deuteronomy 20 then came into effect.\footnote{1142}

Cotton’s reasoning in Gods promise to his plantation (1630) is also important. He eschewed direct imitation of Israel while allowing that God would condone conquest under certain circumstances. Just war, in a sense, activated Hebrew Bible warfare precedents:

Indeed no Nation is to drive out another without speciall Commission from heaven, such as the Israelites had, unless the Natives do unjustly wrong them, and will not recompence the wrongs done in peaceable sort, & then they may right themselves by lawfull war, and subdue the Countrey unto themselves.

An Israel-like conquest was ‘not imitable’ without a miraculous ‘speciall Commission’. Without this unlikely divine communication, the godly could only conquer in cases of unremedied injustice—the exact circumstances of the Pequot War.\footnote{1143}

In March 1638, the General Court at Hartford outlawed the private use of force against Indians except in special circumstances. Barring this, colonists were to follow procedures and ‘complaine to some magistrate’ who had the power, if necessary, ‘to send force to apprehend or take’ the Indian to court.\footnote{1144} Similarly, Connecticut’s Code of Laws (1650) stated how the English were to notify tribes in writing when natives acted criminally. Failure to turn over the criminal could result in collective guilt.\footnote{1145}

Ronald Karr rightly notes that Indians beyond the jurisdiction of Massachusetts Bay ‘came to be treated as if they were sovereign principalities’.\footnote{1146} The Pequot were a sovereign nation with some murdering citizens. Pequot civilians were complicit in harbouring them. In response, godly warriors became more than soldiers—they were

1144.  \emph{Recs. Conn.} I:14.  
1145.  \emph{Recs. Conn.} I:532–33.  
1146.  Karr, ‘Pequot War’, 894.}
martialised magistrates. As the chaplain, John Wilson, said of those marching against the ‘murthering’ Pequot: ‘every common Souldier among you is now installed a Magistrate’.

Magistrates in the guise of soldiers enforced harsh justice. Jason W. Warren rightly recognises that Mystic evidences a failure to recognise the ‘adversary as a legitimate military entity’. This, in part, was why the English interpreted every Pequot act of self-defence as an additional crime.

The emphasis on murder is evident in the language used by Mason, Vincent, Underhill, Bradford, Winthrop and Gardiner. Opponents were usually called ‘Indian’ or ‘Pequot’. They were also described as enemies (45x), murderer/homicide (34x), blood/y (13x), proud (13x), barbarous/ian (13x), savage/s (9x in Vincent), warlike (7x), insolent (6x), evil/wicked (6x), treachery/ous (4x), cruel (4x), plotters (4x). ‘Enemy’ was the preferred martial term—mostly used in one source (26x in Mason). However, this term tells little about the actions of ‘enemies’. Murder or homicide was the chief descriptive term—and the laws for murder differed from laws concerning warfare against a legitimate foe. Additionally, letters and official records continually described English retribution as occasioned by murder. In their minds it was murder, harbouring murders and the armed defence of murders that altered Pequot status from foreigner to enemy. Resistance redistributed guilt.

Discourse about Pequot murderers started with the death of Stone. Judging by a journal entry before the war and the acquittal of Sequin after, it seems likely that the charges would have been lessened or dropped if there was a trial. Given Stone’s serial ungodliness and illegal activities, few would be willing to defend his actions towards natives. The Pequot likely thought they atoned for accidental English deaths through the payment of wampum. However, the English were unable or unwilling to view the event from within an indigenous legal framework. The intent of the Endecott raid, according

1147. Gorges, America painted to the life, 112–13, cf.117 (erroneous numbering).

1148. Warren, Connecticut Unscathed, 23. ‘Rebel’, however, was not a major conceptual category.

1149. The term ‘murder’ or ‘homicide’ is usually used. Occasionally, I consider it a claim of murder when they mention unjust slaying (particularly of noncombatants). Jeering, laughing and boasting fall under ‘proud’. Under ‘treacherous’ I include terrible and troublesome.

to Winthrop’s journal, was ‘not make war upon them, but to do justice’.\textsuperscript{1151} Winthrop would come to advocate open war—but he was not there yet. After the Pequot attacked civilians at Wethersfield (23 April 1637), trial became unnecessary and war became justice.

Much multidisciplinary scholarship argues that viewing someone similar—another human—as an ‘other’ facilitates violence. This is often true. As is less often noted, the opposite can also be the case. Violence can stem from viewing an ‘other’ as too similar to oneself; from assuming they share one’s values and process of redressing violations. In Vincent’s work on the Pequot War, he wrote that native ‘sons of Adam’ had ‘the same Maker, the same matter, the same mould. Only Art and Grace have given us that perfection, which yet they want, but may perhaps be as capable thereof as we’.\textsuperscript{1152} This follows in a long English tradition of viewing Indians as fully human and stamped with God’s image.\textsuperscript{1153} Commenting on Vincent’s words, James Drake says ‘it was precisely because they could be viewed as equals, in a sense—equals simply in need of correction and “civilization”—that the Indians could be held to the rules of war’.\textsuperscript{1154} The godly seemed to view the Pequot both ways—as alike (when expecting common standards) and ‘other’ (when prosecuting violations). The combination of these views proved fertile ground for confusion and conflict.
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3. The benefits and blessings of it. 4. The condition. 5. The properties of it (London, 1646).

Bullinger, Heinrich, Fiftie godlie and learned sermons diuided into fiue decades, conteyning the chiefe and principall pointes of Christian religion, written in three seuerall tomes or sections, by Henrie Bullinger minister of the churche of Tigure in Swicerlande. Whereunto is adioyned a triple or three-folde table verie fruitefull and necessarie (London, 1577).

Bunyan, John, The holy war, made by Shaddai upon Diabolus, for the regaining of the metropils of the world, or, The losing and taking again of the town of Mansoul by John Bunyan (London, 1682).

Burroughs, Jeremiah, The glorious name of God, The Lord of Hosts opened in two sermons, at Michaels Cornhill, London, vindicating the Commission from this Lord of Hosts, to subjects, in some case, to take up arms (London, 1643).

——— An exposition with practical observations continued upon the eleventh, twelfth, & thirteenth chapters of the prophesy of Hosea being first delivered in several lectures at Michaels Cornhil, London (London, 1651).

——— Irenicum, to the lovers of truth and peace heart-divisions opened in the causes and evils of them: with cautions that we may not be hurt by them, and endeavours to heal them / by Jeremiah Burroughes (London, 1653).

Burton, Henry, Vindiciae veritatis: truth vindicated against calumny. In a briefe answer to Dr. Bastwicks two late books, entituled, Independency not Gods ordinance, with the second part, styled the postscript, &c. / By Henry Burton, one of his quondam-fellow-sufferers (London, 1645).

Calvin, Jean, The sermons of M. Iohn Caluin vpon the fifth booke of Moses called Deuteronomie faithfully gathered word for word as he preached them in open pulpet; together with a preface of the ministers of the Church of Geneua, and an admonishment made by the deacons there. Translated out of French by Arthur Golding (London, 1583).

Canne, John, The improvement of mercy: or a short treatise, shewing how, and in what manner, our rulers and all well-affected to the present government should make a right and profitable use of the late great victory in Ireland. August 2. 1649 (London, 1649).

——— Emanuel, or, God with us. Wherein is set forth Englands late great victory over the Scots armie, in a battle at Dunbar, Septemb. 3. 1650. And by many particulars of Gods acting and appearing then for us, it is certaine (and so much is clearly proved) that our armies marching into Scotland, and the wars undertaken and prosecuted against that nation, to be upon grounds of justice and necessity (London, 1650).

Caryl, Joseph, The arraignment of unbelief, as the grand cause of our nationall non-establishment: cleared in a sermon to the Honourable House of Commons in Parliament, at Margarets Westminster, upon the 28th. of May, 1645. being the day of their publike fast (London, 1645).

——— A sermon pressing to, and directing in, that great duty of praising God. Preached to the Parliament at Westminster, Octob: 8. 1656. Being the day of
their solemn thanksgiving to God for that late successe given to some part of the fleet of this Common-wealth against the Spanish fleet in its return from the West Indies (London, 1657).

Charles I, Εἰκὼν Ἐστίν The porvtraictyre of His sacred Maiestie in his solitudes and sufferings. Together with His Maiesties praiers delivered to Doctor Juxon immediately before his death. Also His Majesties reasons, against the pretended jurisdiction of the high court of justice, which he intended to deliver in writing on Monday January 22, 1648 (1649).
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Cooper, William, Εἰκὼν τῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ Jerusalem fallall to her assailants. Discovered in a sermon before the Honorable House of commons August 29, 1649.... At Margarets Westminster, upon their solemn day of thanksgiving for that signall victory over the Lord Ormond, in routing his whole army, and raising the seige of Dublin in Ireland (London, 1649).

Cotton, John, Gods promise to his plantation as it was delivered in a sermon, by John Cotton, B.D. and preacher of Gods word in Boston (London, 1630).

——— God’s mercie mixed with His iustice, or, His peoples deliverance in times of danger. Laid open in severall sermons. / By that learned and judicious divine, and faithfull minister of Jesus Christ John Cotton (London, 1641).

——— An abstract or the lawes of New England as they are nowe established (London, 1641).
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Devereux, Robert, *Lawes and ordinances of warre established for the better conduct of the army / by His Excellency the Earle of Essex* (London, 1642).
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Edwards, Thomas, *The third part of Gangraena. Or, A new and higher discovery of the errors, heresies, blasphemies, and insolent proceedings of the sectaries of these times; with some animadversions by way of confutation upon many of the errors and heresies named* (London, 1646).


Fenwicke, John, *England’s deliverer the Lord of Hosts her strong God, none like to Him set forth in His excellencies and glorious appearances for our deliverance, in some exercises upn the thanksgiving for that late memorable victory at Dunbar in Scotland, Sept. 23, 1650, upon the dying words of Moses, Deut. 33. 26. &c.* (Newcastle, 1651).
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Gearing, William, *The eye and wheel of providence, or, A treatise proving that there is a divine providence* (London, 1662).
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‘Gentleman in Northampton’, *A more exact and perfect relation of the great victory (by Gods providence) obtained by the Parliaments forces under command of Sir Tho. Fairfax in Naisby field, on Saturday 14. June 1645* (London, 1645).

Gibson, Samuel, *The ruine of the authors and fomentors of civill varres. As it was deliver’d in a sermon before the Honourable House of Commons in Margarets-
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Goodwin, John, Cretensis: or A briefe answer to an ulcerous treatise, lately published by Mr Thomas Edvards, intituled Gangraena: calculated for the meridian of such passages in the said treatise, which relate to Mr. John Goodwin; but may without any sensible error indifferently serve for the whole tract (London, 1646).

——— Englands apology, for its late change: or, A sober persvssive, of all disaffected or dissenting persons, to a seasonable engagement, for the settlement of this common-wealth. Drawne from the workings of providence. The state of affaires. The danger of division (London, 1651).

Gouge, William, Gods three arrowes plague, famine, sword, in three treatises. I. A plaister for the plague. II. Dearth's death. III. The Churches conquest over the sword (London, 1631).
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Gurnall, William, The Christian in compleat armour. Or, A treatise of the saints war against the Devil, wherein a discovery is made of that grand enemy of God and his people, in his policies, power, seat of his empire, wickednesse, and chiefe designe he hath against the saints (London, 1655).
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Heath, James, The glories and magnificent triumphs of the blessed restitution of His Sacred Majesty K. Charles II from his arrival in Holland 1659/60 till this present, comprizing all the honours and grandeurs done to, and conferred by, Him (London, 1662).


Homes, Nathaniel, *A sermon, preached before the Right Honourable, Thomas Foote, Lord Maior, and the right worshipfull the aldermen, sheriffs, and several companies of the City of London. Vpon the generall day of thanksgiving, October the 8. 1650. at Christ-Church, London* (London, 1650).
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Lockyer, Nicholas, *A little stone out of the mountain church-order briefly opened by Nicholas Lockyer* (Leith, 1652).
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——— *The strong helper or, The interest, and power of the prayers of the destitute, for the building up of Sion. Opened in a sermon before the Honorable House of Commons assembled in Parliament, upon the solemn day of their monethly fast, April 30. 1645* (London, 1645).
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——— An Earnest Exhortation To the Inhabitants of New England, to hearken to the voice of God in his late and present dispensations as ever they desire to escape another Judgement, seven times greater then any thing which as yet hath been (Boston, 1676).

——— An historical discourse concerning the prevalency of prayer wherein is shewed that New-Englands late deliverance from the rage of the heathen, is an eminent answer of prayer (Boston, 1677).

——— A relation of the troubles which have hapned [sic] in New-England by reason of the Indians there from the year 1614 to the year 1675 wherein the frequent conspiracys of the Indians to cut off the English, and the wonderfull providence of God in disappointing their devices is declared : together with an historical discourse concerning the prevalency of prayer shewing that New Englands late deliverance from the rage of the heathen is an eminent answer of prayer (Boston, 1677).
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Moodey, Joshua, Souldiery spiritualized, or, The Christian souldier orderly and strenously engaged in the spiritual warre and so fighting the good fight represented in a sermon preached at Boston in New England on the day of the artillery election there, June 1, 1674 (Cambridge, 1674).

More, Thomas, For her highness the most illustrious incomparably virtuous and religious lady Elizabeth Princess Dowager. Given by a loyall true old friend, and most affectionately devoted servant. A funerall oration; or in a truth, a most just
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Morton, Nathaniel, New-Englands memoriall, or, A brief relation of the most memorable and remarkable passages of the providence of God manifested to the planters of New-England in America with special reference to the first colony thereof, called New-Plimouth (Boston, 1669).

Morton, Thomas, New English Canaan, or New Canaan containing an abstract of New England, composed in three booke: the first booke setting forth the originall of the natives, their manners and customs, together with their tractable nature and love towards the English (1632).

N. N., A Short Account of the Present State of New-England, Anno Domini 1690 (1690).

Nalton, James, Delay of reformation provoking Gods further indignation represented in a sermon preached at Westminster to the honourable House of Commons assembled in Parliament at their late solemn monethly fast, April 29, 1646 (London, 1646).


——— The History of the Puritans, or, Protestant Non-Conformists from the Death of Queen Elizabeth to the Beginning of the Civil War in the Year 1642 (Repr.; Bath: R. Cruttwell, 1792).

Nowell, Samuel, Abraham in arms, or, The first religious general with his army engaging in a war for which he had wisely prepared and by which not only an eminent victory was obtained, but a blessing gained also / delivered in an artillery-election-sermon, June 3, 1678, by S. N. (Boston, 1678).

Oakes, Urian, The unconquerable, all-conquering, & more-then-conquering souldier; or, The successful warre which a believer wageth with the enemies of his soul as also, the absolute and unparalleld victory that he obtains finally over them through the love of God in Jesus Christ: as it was discussed in a sermon preached at Boston in New-England, on the day of the artillery-election there, June 3d., 1692 (Cambridge, 1674).

——— The soveraign efficacy of divine providence ... as delivered in a sermon preached in Cambridge on Sept. 10, 1677, being the day of artillery election there, by Mr. Urian Oakes (Boston, 1682).

Ogilby, John, America: being the latest, and most accurate description of the new world containing the original of the inhabitants, and the remarkable voyages thither (London, 1671).

Owen, John, Eben-zer a memoriall of the deliverance of Essex, county, and committee, being an exposition on the first ten verses of the third chapter of the prophesie of Habakkuk in two sermons. The first preached at Colchester before his Excellency on a day of thanksgiving for the surrender thereof. The other at Rumford unto the committee who were imprisoned by the enemy Sep. 28. a day set apart unto thanksgiving for their deliverance (London, 1648).
Oυρανων ουρανία, the shaking and translating of heaven and earth a sermon preached to the Honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled on April 19, a day set apart for extraordinary humiliation by John Owen (London, 1649).

Of the death of Christ, the price he paid, and the purchase he made. Or, the satisfaction, and merit of the death of Christ cleared, the universality of redemption thereby oppugned: and the doctrine concerning these things formerly delivered in a treatise against universal redemption vindicated from the exceptions, and objections of Mr Baxter (London, 1650).


The branch of the Lord, the beauty of Sion: or, The glory of the Church, in it's relation unto Christ Opened in two sermons; one preached at Berwick, the other at Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1650).

The advantage of the kingdom of Christ in the shaking of the kingdoms of the world: or Providentiall alterations in their subserviency to Christ's exaltation. Opened, in a sermon preached to the Parliament Octob. 24. 1651. a solemn day of thanksgiving for the destruction of the Scots army at Worcester with sundry other mercies, by John Owen minister of the Gospell (Oxford, 1651).

God's work in founding Zion, and his peoples duty thereupon. A sermon preached in the Abby Church at Westminster, at the opening of the Parliament Septemb. 17th 1656 (Oxford, 1656).


Parker, Henry, Scotland's holy vvar a discourse truly, and plainly remonstrating, how the Scots out of a corrupt pretended zeal to the covenant have made the same scandalous, and odious to all good men, and how by religious pretextts of saving the peace of Great Brittain they have irreliugiously involved us all in a most pernicious warre (London, 1651).

Pell, Daniel, Pelagos. Nec inter vivos, nec inter mortuos, neither amongst the living, nor amongst the dead (London, 1659).

Petau, Denis, The history of the world, or, An account of time. Compiled by the learned Dionisius Petavius. ; And continued by others, to the year of our Lord, 1659. ; Together with a geographicall description of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America (London, 1659).

Peter, Hugh, Digitus Dei. Or, Good newes from Holland Sent to the wor. Iohn Treffry and Iohn Treffysis Esquires: as also to all that haue shot arrows agayst Babels brats, and wish well to Sion wheresouer (Rotterdam, 1631).

Gods doings, and mans duty opened in a sermon preached before both Houses of Parliament, the Lord Major and aldermen of the city of London, and the assembly of divines at the last thanksgiving day, April 2, for the recovering of the West, and disbanding 5000 of the Kings horse, &c. (London, 1646).

Mr. Peters last report of the English vvars occasioned by the importunity of a friend pressing an answer to seven quaeres (London, 1646).

A letter from Ireland read in the House of Commons on Friday Septemb. 28. 1649. From Mr. Hugh Peters, Minister of Gods word, and Chaplain to the Lord Lieutenant Cromwell. Of the taking of Tredagh in Ireland, 3352 of the enemies slain, amongst which Sir Arthur Aston the governour, Coll. Castles, Cap. Simons, and other slain. And the losse on both sides. Also the taking of Trim, and Dundalk (London, 1649).

A dying fathers last legacy to an onely child, or, Mr. Hugh Peter's advice to his daughter written by his own hand, during his late imprisonment in the Tower of London, and given her a little before his death (London, 1660).

Philipps, Fabian, The royall martyr: Or, King Charles the First no man of blood but a martyr for his people Being a brief account of his actions from the beginnings of the late unhappy warrs, untill he was basely butchered to the odium of religion, and scorn of all nations, before his pallace at White-Hall, Jan. 30. 1648 (London, 1660).

Pitcairne, Alexander, The spiritual sacrifice, or, A treatise wherein several weighty questions and cases concerning the saints communion with God in prayer are pro pounded and practically improved by Mr. Alexander Pitcarne (Edinburgh, 1664).

Prynne, William, Sad and serious politicall considerations touching the invasive war against our Presbyterian Protestant brethren in Scotland, their late great over throw, and the probable dangerous consequences thereof to both nations and the Prorestant [sic] religion which may serve as a satisfactory apology for such ministers and people, who out of conscience did not observe the publike thanksgiving against their covenant, for the great slaughter of those their brethren in covenant (1650).

Pendennis and all other standing forts dismantled: or, Eight military aphorismes, demonstrating the uselesness, unprofitableness, hurtfulness, and prodigall expensivenes of all standing English forts and garrisons, to the people of England (London, 1656).

R. C., The present condition of Dublin in Ireland; with the manner of the siege, and how it is straitened, by the Marquesse of Ormond, L. Inchequin, &c. / Represented in two letters, from a Colonell in Dublin, to his brother a merchant in London. Dated at Dublin, June 22. 1649 (London, 1649).

R. P., Berachah, or Englands memento to thankefullnesse being a hymne or spirituall song setting forth the praises of God, and extolling the wondrous works which he hath wrought for the Church of England alate, drawn forth from the scriptures, especially those songs made upon the like occasion, and composed together, to draw out our hearts the more in praises (London, 1646).

Ram, Robert, *The souldiers catechisme: composed for the Parliaments Army: consisting of two parts: wherein are chiefly taught: 1 the iustification 2 the qualification of our souldiers. Written for the incouragement and instruction of all that have taken up armes in this cause of God and his people; especially the common souldiers* (1644).

R[ichardson], J[ohn], *The necessity of a well experienced souldiery, or, A Christian common wealth ought to be well instructed & experienced in the military art delivered in a sermon, upon an artillery election June the 10th, 1675, by J.R. (Cambridge, 1675)*.

Ricraft, Josiah, *The civil vwarres of England briefly related from His Majesties first setting up his standard 1641, to this present personall hopefull treaty: with the lively effigies and eulogies of the chief commanders ...: together with the distinct appellations, proper motions, and propitious influences of these memorable starres, chronologically related from anno. 1641 to anno. 1648* (London, 1649).

Rogers, John, *Jegar-Sahadvtha: an oyled pillar. Set up for posterity, against present wickednesse, hypocrisies, blasphemies, persecutions and cruelties of this serpent power (now up) in England (the out-street of the beast.)* (1657).

Rowlandson, Mary, *The soveraignty & goodness of God, together, with the faithfulness of his promises displayed; being a narrative of the captivity and restauration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson. Commended by her, to all that desires to know the Lords doing to, and dealings with her, Especially to her dear children and relations, / written by her own hand for her private use, and now made publick at the earnest desire of some friends, and for the benefit of the afflicted* (Cambridge, 1682).

S[altonstall], N[athaniel], *The present state of New-England, with respect to the Indian VVar wherein is an account of the true reason thereof (as far as can be judged by men): together with most of the remarkable passages that have happened from the 20th of June, till the 10th of November, 1675 / faithfully composed by a merchant of Boston, and communicated to his friend in London* (London, 1676).

——— *A new and further narrative of the state of New-England being a continued account of the blody Indian-War, from March till August, 1676, giving a perfect relation of the several devastations, engagements, and transactions there: as also the great successes lately obtained against the barbarous Indians, the reducing of King Philip, and the killing of one of the queens* (London, 1676).

——— *A Continuation of the state of New-England being a farther account of the Indian warr, and of the engagement betwixt the joynt forces of the United English collonies and the Indians on the 19th of December 1675... Together with an account of the intended rebellion of the Negroes in the Barbadoes* (London, 1676).

Scottow, Joshua, *A narrative of the planting of the Massachusetts Colony anno 1628 with the Lords signal presence the first thirty years: also a caution from New-
Englands apostle, the great Cotton, how to escape the calamity which might befall them or their posterity (Boston, 1694).
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