DIPLOMATIC CONVERSIONS:

RECOVERING SACHEM INFLUENCE IN

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEW ENGLAND MISSIONARY WRITINGS

by

Marie Balsley Taylor

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of Purdue University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English

West Lafayette, Indiana

May 2017

THE PURDUE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL
STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

Dr. Kristina Bross, Chair

Department of English

Dr. Derek Pacheco

Department of English

Dr. Christopher Lukasik

Department of English

Dr. Jean O'Brien

The University of Minnesota Department of History

Approved by:

Dr. Manushag Powell

Head of the Departmental Graduate Program

For Dad

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All scholarship is collaborative, but this dissertation has been more collaborative than most. Over the last four years, I've relied on a large network of family members, friends, and colleagues across the country who have encouraged me, fed me, cried with me, and watched my kids for me so I could squeeze in a few hours of writing time. To this community, I am eternally grateful.

In the academic world, I've had the incredible support of a several faculty mentors who have encouraged me and challenged me to push my scholarship to the next level. I am particularly thankful to my advisor, Kristina Bross, who convinced me that I have something to say and who also cared for me as a person and not just as an advisee. My other professors at Purdue, Derek Pacheco and Chris Lukasik have provided helpful insights and ideas and Angelica Duran has always been a great source of encouragement. In Minnesota, I've discovered a whole new academic community that has taught me to speak across disciplines and helped me to think about my project from a new perspective. I will always be thankful to Jean O'Brien and the American Indian and Indigenous Studies Writing Group at the University of Minnesota who have wholeheartedly adopted me into their community. You are amazing group of scholars and friends. I'm also thankful to my fellow academic parents here in Minnesota, Jen and Luke Freeman and Wes and Lydia Garver Burdine who have provided support both as fellow scholars and as friends.

My family has sustained me over the last few years. My mom, Marsha, and my mother-in-law, Jayne, have watched my kids, cleaned my house, and provided prayers and encouragement to me and my family as we've walked through this process. My mom

also gave me my first taste of the Puritans when she had me read *Pilgrim's Progress* in the first grade. Her passion for learning is contagious. My sisters, Clair, Karen, and Elaine, have also been an amazing source of support. Karen even moved in with us for a few months to watch my kids so I could focus on writing. Not only do my sisters give good fashion advice, but they are amazing aunties to my kiddos and constantly amaze me with their thoughtfulness. My father-in-law, and former professor, Dan Taylor has been an encouragement and a resource for intellectual ideas. My sister-in-law Julie Taylor has gone out of her way to help whenever she could. My kids, Maeve, Abraham, and Esther have kept me laughing and helped me maintain perspective. It takes a village to write a dissertation and I have a great one.

Six months before this dissertation was completed, my father passed away from cancer. In the weeks before his death, he made sure to encourage me to move forward on my work and told me how much he would have liked to be at my graduation. My dad loved God, loved his family, and loved to learn. He taught others to do the same. It was from my dad that I learned to think deeply, to wrestle with ideas, and to live deliberately. He also taught me that there was always time to study – it just may mean you get less sleep. It was also from my dad that I learned to be mentally tough. In the weeks preceding his death, he continued to preach, to teach, and to pour love into other people despite being in excruciating pain. I was blessed to have such an amazing father.

Finally, and most importantly, this dissertation is for my husband Nate. He believes in me more than I believe in myself. He sees the best in me, loves our kids, and is always up for an adventure. Thank for carrying me through.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Author: Taylor, Marie Balsley. Ph.D.
Institution: Purdue University
Degree Received: May 2017
Title: Diplomatic Conversions: Recovering Sachem Influence in New England Missionary Writings.
Major Professor: Kristina Bross

This dissertation focuses on the role that seventeenth-century Algonquian leaders, or sachems, played in shaping the writing of early New England Protestant missionaries. The sachem was often the first figure with whom English arrivals came into contact, he or she played a fundamental role in forming missionary conceptions and beliefs about indigenous people. By synthesizing historical, anthropological, and theological sources with close readings of tracts, letters, sermons and other documents, I argue that English Protestant interpretations of indigenous diplomatic practices often served as the central means by which early missionaries determined and articulated the success or failure of their proselytization attempts. With a focus on English Protestants like Roger Williams, John Eliot, Daniel Gookin, and the Quaker missionaries, and on their relationship with specific converts, like the Pequot sachem Wequash and the Massachusett sachems Cutshamekin and Josias Wompatuck, my dissertation offers a new approach to several important Early American literary texts by reading them as sites of cross-cultural negotiation rather than the product of Protestant missionary imposition.

INTRODUCTION

The story of the Puritan mission is one of transformation. In most accounts, the Puritan missionaries are portrayed as deliberate laborers striving to transform the people and lands of Southern New England. This narrative of determination began early. In 1691, a year after John Eliot's death, the Puritan minister Cotton Mather published a posthumous account of the most famous figure of the Puritan mission. Mather eulogized the deceased minister for his "blessed work of evangelizing these perishing Indians."[1] A picture of Puritan piety, Mather's Eliot is a divinely inspired visionary. As Mather writes, it was the "Lord Jesus Christ which enkindled in [Eliot] a Fury, for the dark, dying damning souls of these Natives." While God gave Eliot his vision, it was Eliot's own single-minded determination that allowed the mission to succeed.[2] First preaching, then "translating the Bible," and finally "gathering…a Church at Natick," Mather emphasizes the many steps of Eliot's laborious efforts. On his deathbed, Mather's Eliot retains the same fortitude as he continues to preach and extol others until he is finally rewarded for his labors as he departs for heaven uttering the words, "welcome joy."[3] Anxious to protect Eliot's legacy, Mather exonerates the Puritan missionary from potential future criticism. Any failure of the mission, Mather explains is "Truly, not because our Eliot was wanting in his *offers* and *labours* for their good." But is rather the fault of the Indians

[1] Cotton Mather, "The Life and Death of the Renown'd Mr. John Eliot who was the first Preacher of the Gospel to the Indians in America: Second Edition." (London: Printed for John Dunton at the Raven in the Poultrey, 1691), 67. Eliot died in 1690 and Mather's account of Eliot was later included in his 1702 Magnalia Christi Americana.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Cotton Mather, "Life and Death of the Renown'd Mr. John Eliot," 128.

– "many of the obdurate Infidels would not receive the *Gospel of Salvation.*"[4] Mather's Eliot has fulfilled the terms of his contract regardless of the Indians' response.

More than one hundred years later, Eliot was still lauded as a dedicated worker whose legacy inspired antebellum politicians and writers alike as they tried to "deal" with the "Indians problem." Literary scholar Joshua David Bellin explains that in the nineteenth-century the "Apostle to the Indians" was transformed into the "Apostle of Removal."[5] Put in service to a new cause, Eliot continued to be portrayed as a headstrong laborer extolling others to continue his work converting the Indians. In Catharine Maria Sedgewick's *Hope Leslie* (1827), a fictional re-telling of New England's founding, Sedgewick includes Eliot at the trial of an Indian woman, Magawisca, who was accused of plotting against the colony. In his speech at the trial, Eliot takes up his old mantle. As Sedgewick writes, "[Eliot] intimated that the Lord's chosen people had not now, as of old, been selected to exterminate the heathen, but to enlarge the bounds of God's heritage, and to convert these strangers and aliens to servants and children of the Most High!"[6] Though sympathetic to the plight of the Indians, Sedgwick's Eliot aims the create more English laborers working to convert New England's native people. As in Mather's account, Sedgwick shows any failure of the mission as the fault of the Indians. In *Hope Leslie* Magawisca rejects his Eliot's teachings and, at the end of the novel, the resistant Indian woman is subsequently banished to the forest, never to return.

---

[4] Ibid., 93.
[5] Joshua David Bellin, "Apostle of Removal: John Eliot in the Nineteenth Century." *The New England Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (1996), 7.
[6] Catharine Maria Sedgwick, *Hope Leslie; Or, Early Times in Massachusetts,* ed. Mary Kelley (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987), 283

Despite the proliferation of scholarship on the missionary project in the last few decades, contemporary scholars continue to portray the Puritan missionaries as active, deliberate enforcers of a pre-meditated agenda. In his well-known revisionary account of New England's founding, historian Francis Jennings chastises Eliot's missionary vision as one in which the Bay Colony largely fabricated "as the by-product of an attempt to seize the territory on the west shore of Narragansett Bay."[7] In reformulating the mission as malevolent rather than benevolent, Jennings attributes an ever-increasing agency and deliberation to the aging minister – an agency which Jennings's claims provided the impetus for the Indian uprising during King Philip's War. Revising Jennings's revision, Richard Cogley took a more nuanced approach to Eliot and his mission in 1999 producing a detailed and layered history of the mission's formation that still serves as an important source for Eliot and his work. Yet, Cogley too claims that the Puritan mission is the product of Eliot's imagination which he then enacted through his labors.[8] Cogley's study of Eliot's agency led him to coin a new term describing the aims of the mission. As Cogley describes, the mission operated under the "affective model." The affective model reflects the Puritans' belief that "taught that Indians would yearn to participate in the English way of life once they had witnessed the virtues of the colonists."[9] Reinforcing the power-dynamic that has always been at the heart of the story of the Indian mission, the affective model captures the central idea that, in the colonial New England missionary project, the Indian's only choice was to accept, reject, or resist.

---

[7] Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of* Conquest (New York: Norton and Co., 1975), 232
[8] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 52-53.
[9] Ibid., 5.

In *Diplomatic Conversions*, I complicate the narrative that reads Eliot and his fellow missionaries as the sole progenitors of a deliberate Puritan missionary agenda by focusing on the role that seventeenth-century Algonquian leaders, or sachems, played in forming many of the concepts that undergirded the early New England Protestant mission. While I clearly tread a well-worn path in writing about the New England missionary project and its founders, I aim to tell a new tale. By fleshing out our understanding of some of the sachems who challenged, instructed, cajoled, and even inspired the New England Puritan mission, I show that the vision of Eliot and his fellow Bay Colony missionaries was not as fixed as it often appears but was rather dependent on the participation and ideas of its Algonquian participants, namely Algonquian sachems. The sachem was often the first figure with whom English arrivals came into contact, and as a representative of his or her community, he or she played a fundamental role in forming missionary conceptions about indigenous people. By synthesizing historical, anthropological, and theological sources with close readings of tracts, letters, sermons and other documents, I argue that English Protestant interpretations of indigenous diplomatic practices often served as the central means by which early missionaries determined and articulated the success or failure of their own proselytization attempts. With a focus on English Protestants like John Eliot, Roger Williams, Daniel Gookin, and the Quaker missionaries, and on their relationship with specific converts, I offer a new approach to several important Early American literary texts by reading them as sites of cross-cultural negotiation rather than the product of Protestant missionary imposition. By understanding the mission and its textual production as the product of exchanges between Native people and English settlers, I re-position the New England mission as a movement

created out of uncertainty – an uncertainty that required the English settlers to work with indigenous participants in order to craft a mission that served both English diplomatic aims at the same time as it took into account the sovereignty and customs of the local native nations.

Methodology

Though the New England colonists proliferated stories about their New England missionary project much faster than they created converts, I take as my premise the fact that their narratives of the mission were based on the lives of actual indigenous converts.[10] Any success that the mission enjoyed, however small, at some level depended on the consent of its native participants. While many of the mission's participants joined the mission after their own communities had been destroyed by colonial diseases or warfare, they did not abandon the kinship ties and diplomatic aims that had guided Southern New England Algonquian life for centuries before the arrival of European colonists. When they became part of the mission, they brought these concepts along. As Abenaki scholar Lisa Brooks explains in her oft-cited notion of the common pot, New England's native people conceived of their world as cooperative and interdependent. This interdependence extended to the arriving Europeans. As Brooks writes, "As soon as Europeans settled on the coast, they became inhabitants in Native space. In the common pot, shared space means shared consequences and shared pain. The actions of the newcomers would affect the whole."[11] In order to protect the whole, native New

[10] See Laura Stevens, *The Poor Indian*: *British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 3.
[11] Lisa Brooks, *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 5.

Englanders sought a way to "incorporate the 'beings' from Europe into Native space."[12] In this project, I interpret the actions of the mission's indigenous participants as being performed out of a common pot mentality – in essence, the convert's actions are evidence of their attempts to re-make the whole.

Re-conceptualizing the missionary project as one dependent on its indigenous participants allows us to see the missionaries themselves in a new light – as colonizers whose actions and writings were influenced by the people over whom they attempted to exert power. This approach necessitates a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics of colonial encounter. As Joshua David Bellin argues in his 2001 *The Demon of the Continent: Indians and the Shaping of American Literature*, in order to recognize Indian people's significance to American literature, "past (and persistent) paradigms of encounter must be revised" – we must, "do away with the concept of fixed cultures."[13] Using what he terms an "intercultural literary criticism," Belin views texts as "taking shape through, and shaping in turn,…cultural interrelationships" – specifically cultural interrelationship between America's native inhabitants and its settlers.[14] This approach is counter the prevalent view of the missionary project that has anchored past scholarship on the New England missionary project. Rather than continuing a long historical narrative of fixed cultural interaction, I view the missionary project and its literary production as the result of intercultural encounter. The effect of this approach is that we can see how indigenous concepts and ideas came to be foundational to New England missionary texts.

---

[12] Ibid., 7.
[13] Joshua David Bellin, *The Demon of the Continent*: *Indians and the Shaping of American Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2001), 4.
[14] Ibid., 5.

The intercultural encounter model extends to our understanding of narrative agency as well. In her 2012 book *Abyssinia's Samuel Johnson: Ethiopian Thought in the Making of An English Author*, Wendy Belcher coins a model of colonial and post-colonial interaction she titles "the Discursive Possession Model."[15] For Belcher, the concept of discursive possession encapsulates the idea the "Europeans were acted upon, not always acting subjects, and were changed, often deeply and irrevocably, not only by their experiences but also by the deliberate action and discourse of those they colonized."[16] As Belcher writes, "in postcolonial and colonial studies, possession has usually been material, referring to the colonizer's possession of the colonized's land, resources, and bodies." In attempting to rethink colonial encounters, Belcher suggests that we should also think about possession in spiritual terms. "In many cultures, spiritual possession is a way of thinking about asymmetrical relationships between subjectivities." Translating that model to literature, Belcher argues that discourse itself can be "possessed" by the colonized. As she writes, "Authors can be the function of texts, even texts from outside the hegemonic systems in which they participate." The idea of possession in a literary sense "can help us to locate agency outside of the European traveler, author, intellectual" and "prevent…us from assuming that Europeans are in control of themselves, their representations, or their texts."[17]

Working out of the frameworks established by Brooks, Bellin, Belcher and others, I focus on tracing the sustained encounters between specific missionaries and sachems in order to analyze the role that indigenous thought plays in shaping a missionary's writings

[15] Wendy Belcher, *Abyssinia's Samuel Johnson: Ethiopian Thought in the Making of An English Author,* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 6-7.
[16] Ibid., 6.
[17] Ibid., 7.

over time. This approach not only provides a new context for a number of important New England missionary texts, it also brings to the fore many Southern New England Algonquian sachems who have been largely overlooked. Focusing on the Pequot sachem Wequash, the Massachusett sachems Cutshamekin and Josias Wompatuck, as well as the Massachusett leader Waban, I show how these individuals used their relationships with the missionaries to instruct the missionaries in common pot diplomacy at the same time as they attempted to protect their lands and communities. The names of these sachems are peppered throughout both primary and secondary sources on the missionary project; however, none of them have received sustained scholarly attention. This lack of attention is in part a problem of sources. The sachems upon which I focus did not pen their own accounts in the same way that the missionaries did. Rather, they left their marks upon the colonizers in treaties, verbal confrontations, conversion narratives, and other conversations that went unrecorded or were highly mediated within colonial texts.

The process I've used to recover the biographies of these largely ignored sachems has relied on several disciplinary methodologies. While my recovery of the sachems comes out of my field's close reading practices, my experience working with a number of Native Studies scholars over the course of my writing this work meant that my methodologies have expanded to include Indigenous studies methodologies as well. In their introduction to *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies* (2016) Jean O'Brien and Chris Andersen suggest some broad tenets for indigenous studies methodologies. Quoting the Ojibwe and Choctaw author Clara Sue Kidwell, Andersen and O'Brien suggest that indigenous methodologies may include focus on "the central relationship between Indigenous cultures and land (or place); that historical relationship between indigenous

societies and settler communities were just that – relational – and as such, have to be told from both sides (which includes according agency to indigenous history); that sovereignty is an inherent right of Indian nations; that language is the essential key to understanding culture and therefore requires preservation…."[18] In this project, I have tried to be mindful of these adages in reconstructing the biographies of the indigenous sachems.

Part of my indebtedness to indigenous studies methodologies is that I have attempted to reconstruct the sachems upon whom I focus by tracing their kinship ties in order to create a fuller and more authentic picture of the sachem converts. For the Southern New England Algonquian sachems that I address kinship was a social, spiritual, and psychological reality. The relationships that made up a seventeenth-century Southern New England Algonquian indigenous community served as both a "focus of identity" and a source of "affective ties" for the community's members. More than just familial relationships, kinship ties included obligations to extended family members and others whom the Algonquian had accorded kinship ties through marriage or diplomacy.[19] As the figure responsible for maintaining and creating kinship ties, a sachem's familial, spiritual and political duties were defined through his or her relationship to his or her community. In his 2012 work *An Infinity of Nations,* Ojibwe scholar Michael Wittgen concisely articulates the tie between kinship and national identity when describing the Algonquian people residing among the Great Lakes. As he writes, indigenous nationhood was

[18]Jean O'Brien and Chris Andersen, "Introduction," in *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies*: Routledge Guide to Using Historical Sources, eds. Chris Andersen and Jean M. O'Brien, Eds (New York: Routledge, 2016), 2.
[19] Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500-1650* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 168.

premised on "a set of relationships that bound Native peoples to one another. Political alliance was expressed as kinship. Trade, as a form of peaceful exchange, was the outcome of interaction between people who were related to one another. One shared with relatives, provided for their needs when there was want, and expected a reciprocal kindness in return."[20] While some of the systems guiding the Southern New England Algonquian diverged from those practiced among the Great Lakes Algonquian, many of the kinship principles worked in a similar manner.

Using this concept of kinship as guiding point, I've reconstructed the lives of the sachems. Putting the indigenous convert in the center, I map out the webs that connect the convert to others, both their ties other indigenous people and their ties to the English settlers. I've also found that a full genealogical picture has to be extracted from sources written over a number of centuries. America's historical preoccupation with justifying settler land claims by diminishing indigenous claims using the logic of the disappearing Indian has meant that the genealogies of seventeenth-century indigenous people continue to be repeated and expanded upon in later archival documents.[21] Spanning centuries has required me to familiarize myself with the archival practices of each period. The result of this process has been that I've come away with a much fuller picture of both the indigenous converts themselves and their relationship to the New England missionary project.

---

[20] Michael Witgen, *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 75.

[21] For more about the colonial logic of trial identity and blood claims in New England see Jean O'Brien *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010) xxi-xxii

Kinship not only served as a guide for intertribal relationships, but it extended to intra-tribal relationships as well. As Colin Calloway explains, kinship was at the heart of Southern New England Algonquian diplomatic practices. "Dealing with other peoples as trade partners required making alliances and turning strangers who were potential enemies into friends and even relatives. Native peoples extended or replicated kinship…to include people with whom they were not related by birth or marriage, bringing them into their community by adoption, alliance, and ritual. Forging and renewing relationships of cooperation, coexistence, and kinship with others was essential to survival in the pre-contact multi-tribal world."[22] When the missionaries arrived, the sachem converts that I address acted towards the missionaries in a similar way as they had acted in previous diplomatic encounters – by extending kinship and reciprocity in exchange for new alliances.

In the early years of settlement, the English arrivals payed attention to indigenous diplomacy to achieve their colonial aims. In *Paper Sovereigns* (2014), literary scholar Jeffrey Glover addresses the role that native diplomacy played in English texts. English settlers were preoccupied with reprinting Native treaties and concurrent indigenous acts of diplomacy to prove they had obtained "possession" of New England lands. This practice, as Glover points out, "led to a profound irony, one that powerfully shaped English colonial writing. When the English pointed to treaties with Native people as evidence of possession, Native words, gestures, and other ways of marking agreements suddenly became highly charged evidence in international legal disputes…"[23]

---

[22] Colin Calloway, *Pen and Ink Witchcraft*: *Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 12.
[23] Jeffrey Glover, *Paper Sovereigns: Anglo-Native Treaties and the Law of Nations, 1604-1664* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 3-4.

The same process, I argue, occurred in colonial missionary texts as well. Newly arrived and unfamiliar with native diplomacy, many of the missionaries interpreted indigenous diplomatic practices through a Christian framework. As literary scholar Sarah Rivett writes, the missionaries were inherently observant of Indian acts, which they copiously recorded, because they believed that "the evidence of God recorded on human souls could speak unequivocally as empirical verification that God's 'promise to his plantation' was finally bearing its fruits."[24] Interpreting the actions of native people, native sachems in particular, became a central way in which the missionaries articulated the success or failure of their mission. This interplay between indigenous diplomacy and religion not only shaped the way in which missionaries wrote about their mission, but it also shaped their own conceptions of colonial diplomacy and politics.

In this project, I focus on the time period between the 1630s and the 1670s – namely the time period between the Pequot War and King Philip's War. This time period encompasses the beginning years of the mission's formation. Consequently, this was also the time in which the majority of the founding documents of the New England mission were created meaning that it is an apt time for observing the role that native people played in forming those early texts. Between the 1630s and the 1670s two major wars took place – the Pequot War and King Philip's War. Both wars were devastating to native communities in Southern New England and both remain some of the bloodiest battles in American history. More than just instances in which native people were forced from their homes, the Pequot War and King Philip's War were moments in which native people

[24] Sarah Rivett, *The Science of the Soul in Colonial New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2012), 126.

reinforced their political ties and put their networks of diplomacy into place to protect, and later restore, their communities. In was as part of the diplomatic attempts that many sachems created ties with the New England mission. By focusing on the wars, their aftermaths, and the ways in which they connected (or distanced) sachems and missionaries, we can more clearly see the ties between sachem diplomacy and the formation of the Puritan mission.

The first three chapters of this project analyze the role that specific Algonquian sachems played in shaping missionary genres, while the final chapter illustrates the ways that Algonquian diplomacy became embedded into later missionary writings. The three sachems –Wequash (Pequot), Cutshamenkin (Massachusett), and Josiah Wompatuck (Massachusett)– were prominent figures in both the English and Algonquian society. As sachems, all three were influential leaders within their Algonquian communities. Their prominence also mean they were significant converts to the English Protestant missionary project and their conversion accounts were recorded in multiple English language sources. Further, the sachems' authority led missionary leaders to focus on them as representative the larger indigenous conversion experience. The result being that actions and practices of the sachems had a significant influence on missionary interpretations of indigenous conversion. The fourth chapter of my project looks at the ways that the diplomatic practices of these sachems eventually became embedded into missionary writings. I offer a close reading of Daniel Gookin's 1677 *Doings and Sufferings,* a text that uses the logic of kinship to redefine civility. My focus on these converts and their lasting influence yields specific and detailed examples of the ways in which the process

of documenting and explaining Christian conversion in seventeenth-century New England was a cross-cultural one.

By taking into account the role that sachems played in forming missionary thought, this dissertation contributes to the existing scholarship in three meaningful ways. First, my work is a recovery project that uses biography to explicate the lives and experiences of many overlooked, yet significant, seventeenth-century Algonquian leaders. Recovering the lives of these converts allows us to further recognize the early seventeenth-century New England colonial world as an indigenous one in which colonial leaders were peripheral interlopers whose actions and movements were largely dictated by established indigenous structures and leaders. Second, this dissertation challenges scholars to rethink the aims and processes of the Protestant missionary project. If we think of the missionary project as in many ways a diplomatic engagement between indigenous and English leaders, we can understand many larger, and as of yet overlooked, implications of the missionary endeavor. While proselytization was clearly a central goal of the English missionaries, their project was also a political and social one in which leaders from different communities engaged with one another using the language of religious practice. Finally, this project provides us with a new way of thinking about authorship and agency in missionary texts. Despite the clear authority of the English authorial voices that capture the conversion accounts, I show that authorship in these texts is not limited to the English narrator, but is equally shaped by indigenous voices.

A Note on Audience

One important proscription of native studies methodologies is that scholars who work in the field should acknowledge their positionality "in relation to the peoples, communities, and/or nations involved."[25] In this work, I have not directly consulted members of the tribes about whom I write. I have presented portions of most of my chapters at Indigenous Studies conferences, including the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association and have worked with other native scholars to develop many of my ideas and concepts. However, I have not met directly with the Southern New England Algonquian tribal historians or used their archives. This is partly a matter of resources – as a doctoral student, I have limited funding for visiting archives and I hope to visit many of them as I revise this into a book. However, it is also in part a matter of audience. While native people play a central role in my dissertation, the end goal of my dissertation is to better understand the mindset of New England's first missionaries. This does not mean that I am not interested in indigenous history, but rather that my training, interests, and background make me better suited to study the colonial perspective. With that in mind, my project still has an anti-colonial aim. By acknowledging the undeniably truism that indigenous experience is central to American experience, I hope to continue the work of other scholars in re-telling the New England story as one inextricable from native ideas, practices, and beliefs.

[25] O'Brien is referencing Linda Tuhiwai Smith's work, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (1999). Jean O'Brien, "Historical Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies: Touching on the Past, Looking to the Future," in *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies*: Routledge Guide to Using Historical Sources, ed. Chris Andersen and Jean M. O'Brien (New York: Routledge, 2016), 19.

A Note on Terms

In using the term "diplomacy," I am referring to the process by which the political or social entities that I discuss – English, Pequot, Massachusett, Narragansett – established and maintained social, political, and commercial relationships with one another. Though the English Puritans in New England typologized themselves as the second nation of Israel – set apart from the English metropole, they saw themselves as part of the English colonial project. In treaties, travel narratives, and religious writings, the English writers derived their authority for land claims, judicial courts, and even the missionary project from their status as members of the English nation. Roger Williams is, to a certain extent, an exception to this rule. However, while Williams was ousted by the Bay Colony, he continued to identify as a member of the English nation despite his antipathy to the state's role in religious affairs.

For the Algonquin, nations were defined through kinship groups and alliances, but they maintained the same sovereignty that the New Englanders attributed to England. Tribal nations made land claims, conducted diplomacy and enacted judicial decisions all based on their status as members of a particular nation. Though the English, Pequot, Massachusett, and Narragansett all defined their national loyalties and obligations differently, they were all working on behalf of larger political and social obligations through diplomatic processes. Because of my understanding of these dynamics, I refer throughout to indigenous tribes as singular when I am talking about them as political entities as a way of referencing them as a unified political entity or nation, rather than a cultural group: i.e. the Pequot, the Narragansett, the Mohegan, etc.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter one argues that indigenous diplomacy played a significant role in shaping the description of conversion contained in two of the earliest New England missionary texts, Thomas Weld and Hugh Peter's *New Englands First Fruits* (1643) and Roger Williams *A Key into the Language of America* (1643). Both accounts tell the tale of Wequash's conversion as evidence of a developing Indian mission. However, by contextualizing the life and actions of Wequash, a Pequot sachem, I show that Wequash's conversion was in large part motivated by his desire to establish diplomatic relationships with English leaders. Among other things, this relationship facilitated Wequash's aims of reuniting scattered Pequot captives following the Pequot War. His physical location next to the English town of Saybrook also allowed him to re-settle upon his family's land. I argue that Wequash's diplomatic agenda and kinship obligations are central to the ways that the observing missionary pen their accounts of his conversion and the concurrent formation of the conversion narrative formula.

The second chapter addresses the role the Cutshamekin, a prominent Massachusett sachem and convert, played in instigating the post-sermon question and answer session. As scholars have shown, the post-sermon question and answer session is a literary convention usually attributed to John Eliot. It was intended by Eliot as a sort of catechism that verified the authenticity of indigenous conversion. I argue that the post-sermon question and answer session was an adaptation of a post-treaty negotiation process used by Cutshamekin in both the Pequot War and the 1644 submission of the sachems. As the target of John Eliot's first missionary visit in 1646, Cutshamekin was the sachem responsible for forming many of Eliot's conceptions about indigenous people and

practices. Adapting Cutshamekin's processes, Eliot later incorporated the question and answer session into his own missionary dealings. Significantly, I posit that Cutshamekin's influence was not limited to Eliot's missionary practices, but also influenced Eliot's political imagination. In the final part of the chapter, I point to several ways that Cutshamekin's influence can be seen in Eliot's later writings, most prominently in Eliot's *The Christian Commonwealth* (1651).

Chapter three analyzes the influence that indigenous leaders had in shaping the continuing narrative about Quaker-Indian relationships. In this chapter, I focus on the earliest account of an encounter between a Quaker and an Indian, a 1656 meeting between Quaker Nicholas Upshall and an "Indian Prince" described in Humphrey Norton's *New England's Ensigne* (1659). Using historical accounts, indigenous archives, and maps of the region, I identify the un-named Indian prince in the account as the Massachusett sachem and one-time convert, Josias Wompatuck. My paper argues that uncovering the historical actors behind Norton's account allows us a new means of contextualizing the Quaker-Puritan conflicts of the 1650s and 1660s as ones that took place on Algonquian land, were shaped by Algonquian people, and that played out on top of longstanding relationships between English settlers and Algonquian inhabitants. Re-inserting specific native people into the Quaker narratives not only allows us to re-think the relationship between Quakers and Indians, it also allows to re-conceptualize the familiar narrative told about the historical relationship between Quakers and Indians. Rather than continuing the dominant narrative which characterizes relations between native people and Quakers in religious terms, I show that native leaders like Wompatuck may have been drawn to the Quakers because they represented strategic opportunities for

new alliances and friendships. Native leaders may have conceived of these alliances as ones that would secure access to land and facilitate their ability to continue their own spiritual practices based on kinship, community, and reciprocity.

The final chapter moves away from describing a specific sachem and instead gestures to the broader ways in which sachem diplomacy became embedded into the language of the New England missionary project. In chapter four, I read closely Daniel Gookin's 1677 tract *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England* in order to show how Gookin makes an argument for Praying Indian civility through reliance on an indigenous concept of treaties. Written as a defense for the Praying Indians during King Philip's War, Gookin's tract redefines civility. Challenging writers like William Hubbard who argue that Indians, converted or not, are inherently savage, Gookin's tract defines civility as one's ability to honor one's covenants. He illustrates civility by including numerous examples of Praying Indians who have maintained their agreements with the English despite facing severe repercussions. At the center of his tract, Gookin reprints the 1644 treaty made between the Bay Colony and the Massachusett sachem Cutshamekin as a way of reminding the Bay Colony of their treaty obligations to native people. In redefining civility as an act based on covenants/treaties, Gookin employs a concept of civility and nationhood that closely parallels that practiced by his Algonquian converts. I argue that this parallel is not merely coincidence, but the result of Gookin's almost 25-year career as an Indian Agent responsible for facilitating Praying Indian judicial systems. Gookin's adaptation of indigenous concepts illustrates the extent to which missionary writers over time had –

consciously or not – made indigenous concepts central to their understanding and articulation of the Indian mission.

Taken together, the stories of these sachems provide us with a new picture of the Puritan Indian mission. Not merely an endeavor in which the Puritans labored and the Indians responded, the mission is rather a negotiation of beliefs and practices that took place on native lands, and as such, was guided by native people.

CHAPTER ONE:
CONVERT, CAPTAIN, PEQUOT: THE ROLE OF SACHEM DIPLOMACY IN *A KEY INTO THE LANGUAGE OF AMERICA* AND *NEW ENGLANDS FIRST FRUITS*

In 1643, the Massachusetts Bay Colony decided it was time to go public with their colonial missionary project. While in London, Bay Colony agents Thomas Weld and Hugh Peter published *New Englands First Fruits,* the first of several tracts describing Puritan missionary efforts among the Southern New England Algonquian. As they write, the tract was printed because they New England missionaries could "no longer conceale" the "*first Fruits* [God] had begun to gather" amongst "those poore *Indians.*" The tract claims one named convert – Wequash – along with some other short vignettes illustrating the "sprincklings (sic) of Gods spirit, upon a few Indians."[1] Despite their paltry conversion tally, Weld and Peter enthusiastically promise that their initial convert indicates "a sure pledge...of a greater *Harvest*."[2] By describing, or rather more accurately "invent[ing]... a policy of evangelism" in print, Bay Colony leaders hoped that their tract would assure their English supporters that they were (finally) fulfilling the aims of their 1628 charter to "win and incite the Natives of Country, to the knowledge and Obedience

[1] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits,* in *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*, ed. Michael P. Clark (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003), 58, 62.

[2] Peter and Weld were the New England company representatives who had the book published in London and they are often credited as the authors. However, the tract was a collaboration between several Bay Colony leaders. For this reason, I alternate between using "Bay Colony authors" and "Weld and Peter" when describing the tract's authorship. See Richard Cogley, John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 4. For the tract's publication information see William Kellaway, *The New England Company 1649-1776: Missionary Society to the American Indians.* (London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, 1961), 8-10.

of the only true God and Saviour of mankind" which was the "principal end of this Plantation."[3]

In *New Englands First Fruits,* Weld and Peter justified the Bay Colony's meager harvest of souls by reminding readers that proselytization was a process that required years of cultivation. Not only did colonial leaders have to overcome the Indians' "infinite distance from Christianity" and "civility," but they also had to address "the difficulty of their Language to us and of ours to them" as well as the "diversity of their own Language to it selfe."[4] Attempting to further rationalize their limited success, the Bay Colony authors invoke a narrative of benevolent conquest by reminding readers that the natives themselves had to consent to proselytization.[5] As Weld and Peter explain, their mission could only proceed through a process of peaceful, albeit slow, diplomatic negotiation: "it was not with violence and intrusion, but free and faire, with their consents and allowance the chief Sagamores of all that part of the Countrey (sic)...professed we were all much welcome." Emphasizing their benevolent, Weld and Peter argue that it was the "humanity of the English towards them" that first gave the Indians "a good esteem of our Persons," and later "brought [them] to hearken to our words, and then to serve our God."[6] For the

---

[3] Charles I, *A Copy of the Kings Majesties Charter for Incorporating the Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New-England in America,* 1628. (Boston: Printed for S. Green, for Benj. Harris at the London Coffee House, 1689), 22.
Kristina Bross describes New England evangelism as "invented" because the textual production proclaiming missionary success far outpaced actual conversions: *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons,* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), 7.

[4] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits,* 58.

[5] For more information on the development of benevolent conquest see Ken MacMillan's "Benign and Benevolent Conquest? The Ideology of Elizabethan Atlantic Expansion Revisited," *Early American Studies* 9, no.1 (2011): 32-72.

[6] Ibid., 63.
As Bross notes, the Bay Colony's preoccupation with their performance as "peaceful" conquerors was intended to distinguish their colonial project from the "violent" and "superficial" practices of Spanish colonialism. Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones,* 15-16.

Massachusetts Bay authors, the burgeoning missionary project was clear evidence that their larger diplomatic mission to colonize and civilize the New England Indian was off to a running start.

Despite the optimism of *New Englands First Fruits,* not everyone in colonial New England was as confident that the mission was going to be a success. Only a few short months after Weld and Peter's tract, Roger Williams, the English Separatist minister who had been banished by the Bay Colony in 1635, submitted his own first-hand account of the New England mission to English readers. Williams's 1643 *A Key into the Language of America* forwards a different take on the state of English/Algonquian relations. In his work, which is comprised of an Algonquian dictionary interspersed with Williams's observations regarding Algonquian – namely Narragansett – customs and practice, Williams presents himself as a consummate diplomat who has already overcome the linguistic and cultural challenges bemoaned by the Bay Colony. Alluding to his developed relationships with several Algonquian sachems and his deft command of indigenous languages, Williams indirectly points out the feebleness of the excuses that the Bay Colony uses to justify their lack of missionary success. To further chide Massachusetts Bay leaders, Williams re-interprets the conversion account of their star convert, Wequash. Williams, who visited Wequash a few days before his death, describes the Pequot as paradoxically repentant and resistant. He writes that the dying Wequash suffered from a "broken Heart" at the same time as he projected as "sence of inward hardnesse and unbrokennesse."[7] Countering Weld and Peter's confident claims that the

[7] Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America*, Ed. John J. Teunissen and Evelyn J. Hinz, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973), 88.

Puritan missionary project bodes of future success anchored in Wequash's pious conversion, Williams's portrayal of Wequash implicitly frames the New England mission as lacking the requisite spiritual authority illustrated by the uncertain state of Wequash's soul.

As scholars have noted, these competing narratives over the effectiveness of the New England missionary project do not merely chronicle a dispute over Indian souls, but are reflective of attempts by both Williams and the Massachusetts Bay Colony to gain "discursive control" among English readers and by extension, political control over New England lands.[8] The 1643 tracts were produced at the same time as their respective authors were in a dispute over toleration, separation, and the role of New England in the larger English colonial project.[9] These two accounts, and their conflicting descriptions of Wequash's conversion, are thus illustrative of competing English intentions regarding the authority of the New England Algonquian mission and the broader colonial project. Both Williams and the Bay Colony were not only competing for souls, they were also contenting for New England land claims. Both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America* were intended to showcase the authority and capability of their

[8] Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones*, 190. See further analysis on the rhetorical importance of Wequash's account in Laura Stevens *The Poor Indian: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 185-186. For more information on the metropolitan significance of the two accounts and their ties to land claims, see Jonathan Beecher Field, *Errands into the Metropolis* (Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College Press, 2009), 37; Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 18-20; and Jeffrey Glover, *Paper Sovereigns: Anglo-Native Treaties and the Law of Nations, 1604-1664* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 202-204.

[9] Williams's penned *A Key into the Language of America* during his 1643 voyage to London to petition the English government for a charter incorporating the towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Newport into the new colony of Rhode Island. Appealing to the English throne directly allowed Williams to work around the authority claimed by Massachusetts Bay over these lands. In 1643, thanks in part to *A Key into the Language of America*, a Parliamentary commission issued Williams a patent for Providence Plantation much to the dismay of the Massachusetts Bay Colony leaders. See Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 23-26.

respective authors to govern, negotiate, and cultivate indigenous lands. However, as I will show, these two accounts are not only an attempt by competing New England leaders to garner authority for their colonial endeavors, but they also represent the discursive, diplomatic, and political aims of their protagonist, Wequash himself.

In this chapter I take a new approach to the tensions between *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America* by paying close attention to the role that the Pequot sachem Wequash played in shaping English authorial interpretations of indigenous conversion. Rather than reading the 1643 accounts solely as the product of colonial in-fighting, I argue that the discrepancies between the two narratives of Wequash's conversion are evidence of the role that Wequash himself played in forming English conceptions of missions, diplomacy, and power by managing and manipulating his relationship with English settlers. Like Williams and the leaders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Wequash understood the developing missionary project in terms of its larger spiritual and political import. However, Wequash's spiritual and political aims differed from those of the English. Whereas Williams and the Bay Colony were both concerned with garnering English political approval, Wequash was intent on negotiating with colonial leaders – both English and Algonquian –to re-gather the scattered Pequot captives back onto Pequot lands after the devastation wrought by the Pequot War (1636-1637).[10]

By close reading Wequash's conversion accounts in both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America* alongside of Wequash's biography and our knowledge of Algonquian kinship ties and social structures, I reveal the important

[10] Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones*, 83.

role that Algonquian diplomacy played in the power struggles and strategies that came to define the New England's early missionary attempts. Approaching Wequash's conversion narrative in light of his position as a sachem with profound kinship and diplomatic responsibilities also helps us to understand early New England Protestant missionary literature as deeply inculcated within Algonquian practices. Though Williams and the Bay Colony agents interpreted Wequash's words and actions through their respective Protestant lenses, Wequash performed his actions within the context of his social position as a Pequot sachem working in the best interest of his followers.

Crafting Authority: The Transatlantic Function of Diplomacy and Warfare

Literary scholars have thoroughly addressed the close relationship between form and function in both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key Into the Language of America.* The later especially has received extensive scholarly attention. As a unique work that includes a Narragansett word list, anthropological observations, and poetry, *A Key into the Language of America* is ripe for formal analysis. Approached as both as a snapshot of Narragansett culture as well as a document Williams crafted to give himself authority as cultural observer, *A Key into the Language of America* formally functions as a text of both conquest and encounter.[11] Though *New Englands First Fruits* has received less scholarly analysis than *A Key*, it is still formally important for what it tells us about how the New England missionaries wanted to position their mission both spiritually and politically. As Bross writes the text "represent[s] a new construction of errand for the

[11] For a helpful overview of scholarship on *A Key* as well as an interesting analysis of the document's aural qualities, see Nicole Gray's "Aurality in Print: Revisiting Roger Williams's *A Key Into the Language of America*." *PMLA* 131, no. 1 (2016): 64-83.

Puritans in a time of insecurity."[12] Though both *A Key Into the Language of America* and *New Englands First Fruits* function independently, the two documents were written in competition with one another. As such, analysis of the relationship between the two texts opens up new avenues for understanding the documents' form and content.

As literary scholar Jonathan Beecher Field points out, approaching these documents as part of a transatlantic dispute over political authority "change[s] the way we read collateral documents from Massachusetts."[13] Field explains that both texts were written for the "discursive sphere" of the "Atlantic Ocean" which allowed their respective authors to construct the colonial world in ways that were beneficial to their particular political and spiritual aims. Both works attempted to convince their readers of the same thing – that their respective authors were authorized to colonize and make land claims in New England. The Bay Colony authors viewed their right to own New England territory as a chartered one and by reporting on their successful mission efforts, *New Englands First Fruits* assured English readers that the Bay Colony was filling the terms of their charter. Williams, on the other hand, dismissed the religious basis of England's political authority and as such, viewed the Crown as unfit to claim New England's lands. For Williams, land claims needed to be made directly with native people.

A Key into the Language of America attempts to prove to English readers that Williams is fit to take on negotiations with native people. As Beecher Field explains, Williams uses his position as cultural interlocutor to help his readers imagine themselves having a conversation with native New Englanders thus encouraging a view of the

[12] Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones*, 11.
[13] Jonathan Beecher Field, *Errands into the Metropolis*, 31.

Narragansett as "members of a civil, human, and well-regulated society."[14] Similarly, Jeffrey Glover notes that Williams's text is invested in constructing the Narragansett as lawful land purveyors. As Glover explains, Williams uses "the genre of the phrase book" to show that the "Narragansett have a working political system and legally valid practices for the transfer of property and rights" in order to "prove the validity of his own purchases from the tribe."[15] *A Key* uses its formal conventions to contrast the claims made by the authors of *New Englands First Fruits* who portrays their potential converts as needing salvation because they are "poor Indians, who have ever sate in hellish darknesse."[16]

In focusing on the texts' transatlantic reception, however, scholars have overlooked the role that indigenous people and places played in the formation of both *A Key into the Language of America* and *New Englands First Fruits*, particularly the influence that Wequash himself had on the shape of both accounts. While Wequash's presence in both texts is often noted as the primary indication that the texts were in conversation with one another, the details of his story are overlooked in part because both accounts portray Wequash in terms of his relationship to the English authors. In *New Englands First Fruits,* Wequash is described primarily in terms of his performance of civility and his relationship his English proselytizers. As a convert, Wequash stands apart from his fellow Indians. Weld and Peter stress that he is a "proper man of person" who "dwelt amongt the English at Connecticut."[17] Though he is less concerned with Wequash's performance of civility, Williams also prioritizes Wequash's relationships

[14] Ibid., 41.
[15] Jeffrey Glover, *Paper Sovereigns*, 190.
[16] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 58.
[17] Ibid, 61, 62.

with English leaders and the Pequot's ability to intellectually comprehend Christian practice. In *A Key into the Language of America,* Williams terms Wequash "my old friend" at the same time as he depicts the Pequot convert's deft ability to engage in "discourse" "concerning his Soule (sic)."[18] The resulting effect of these two accounts is a picture of Wequash that makes him recognizable to English readers as a civilized Indian who has abandoned his previous Algonquian kinship ties and lands in favor of English ones.

Wequash's Algonquian ties, however, have not been entirely erased within the early historical record. Rather, they can be glimpsed in the asides and references to Wequash and other Algonquian in accounts that were not as carefully curated for an English readership. By mining the letters, journals, military accounts, and personal writings of Roger Williams and other colonial leaders, we can piece together a picture of Wequash within both the Algonquian kinship world and the English colonial one that deepens and complicates our understanding of New England's first proclaimed convert. By close reading the figure of Wequash constructed in the 1643 accounts alongside of critical engagement with Wequash's kinship ties in light of his role within the New England missionary project, I reveal the extent to which the naissance of the New England mission and the concurrent missionary texts were grounded as much in Algonquian kinship ties and negotiation practices as they were fueled by Protestant theology and English diplomacy.[19]

---

[18] Roger Williams, *A Key into the Language of America*, 88.

[19] These accounts need to be interrogated in terms of their larger diplomatic significance because the generic conventions embedded in these 1643 narratives still form the primary lens through which we continue to access Wequash and other indigenous converts today. Starting with Increase Mather's 1677 claim that Wequash was a "a *Pequot* Captain, who was revolted from the Pequots" continuing through Samuel Drake's nineteenth-century designation of Wequash as a "traitor" up until Alfred Cave's influential

As part of my attempts to rethink *A Key into the Language of America* and *New Englands First Fruits* as text shaped by indigenous people, I want to enter the conversation surrounding Wequash by contextualizing the English constructions of the Pequot convert in terms of their conflicting representations of colonial diplomacy and Christian evangelism. The authors of both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America* are preoccupied with presenting themselves as consummate diplomats able to skillfully negotiate the political affairs of the colony in order to promote the successes of their colonial mission. Though this language of diplomacy is clearly intended to promote New England as a growing and thriving colonial settlement, the discussions of diplomacy in both of these texts are more than just a means of providing evidence to English readers of continued colonial power. Rather, a close reading of the discussion regarding diplomacy in these texts reveals the extent to which English conceptions and descriptions of diplomacy were structured by English interaction with Algonquian people, specifically Algonquian leaders.

The Pequot War was the first large-scale diplomatic engagement between English settlers and New England's indigenous inhabitants. The war was a contest between the

---

twentieth-century description of Wequash as "the renegade Pequot," analysts of the Pequot War cite Wequash's role in the war as one that required him to turn his back on his Pequot people. Increase Mather, *A Relation of the Troubles which have Hapned in New-England, By Reason of the Indians there; From the Year 1614. To the Year 1675.* (Boston: John Foster, 1677), 31; Samuel Gardner Drake, *The Book of the Indians, Or, Biography and History of the Indians of North American from Its First Discovery to the Year 1841.* Book II (Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey, 1841), notes to page 96; Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996) 146, 148.
For other scholarly references to Wequash that focus on him as an isolated or renegade figure see: Karen Kupperman, *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 204; Lion Gardiner, *Relation of the Pequot Warres*, Ed. Andrew Neuman (*Early American Studies* 9, no. 2 (2011), pg 480, n 28; Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 104; Scott Weidensaul's *The First Frontier: The Forgotten History of Struggle, Savagery and Endurance in Early America* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, 2012), 140.

English and their Narragansett allies against the Pequot in which hundreds of Pequot men, women, and children were killed, many of them burned alive by the English during the war's central battle, the Mystic Massacre.[20] Both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America* were printed a mere five years after the close of the war, and the events of the war shape the contours of both narratives as they attempt to reckon with the violence and devastation wrought by the war as part of their efforts to justify their colonial mission. The alliances formed as a result of the war and the rhetorical import given to the war itself profoundly shape the ways in which Williams and the Bay Colony interpret the state of Wequash's soul. By establishing a clear trajectory between the naissance of the colony, the violence of the Pequot War, colonial diplomacy, and the emergence of Wequash as the first Algonquian convert, the authors work to convince their English readers that God's mission was clearly being fulfilled on foreign shores.

New Englands First Fruits, the earlier of the two tracts, locates the Pequot war within a larger Puritan narrative that categorized the colonial project as a battle between the forces of God and the forces of darkness.[21] As historian Alfred Cave explains, "In the Puritans' vision of the New World as a spiritual battleground between the Elect and the Forces of Darkness, the survival of the New World Zion required decisive action to nip in

[20] English troops killed between 600-700 Pequot at Mystic Massacre alone. Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War*. 151.

[21] The narrative of light versus darkness or civilized versus uncivilized did not originate in retrospect but was developed during the events of the war. In 1638, Captain John Underhill, leader of the Bay Colony forces, writes that the war was an occasion in which "that insolent and barbarous Nation, called the *Pequeats*...were drove out of their Countrey...by the sword of the Lord." John Underhill, *Newes from America; Or, A New and Experimentall Discoverie of New England; Containing, A Trve Relation of Their War-like Proceedings These Two Yeares Last Past, with a Figure of the Indian Fort, or Palizado* (1638), ed. Paul Royster (Electronic Texts in American Studies, Paper 37): 1-2. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/etas/37.

the bud the Indian conspiracies whose existence, though intangible, was necessary to fulfill Puritan ideological expectations."[22] Yet, while the 1643 track retains the language of light versus darkness, it also subtly reframes the narrative. Intent on promoting their missionary efforts to their English readers, the authors of *New Englands First Fruits* promote an updated vision: now that the Pequots have been soundly defeated, the Bay Colony's task becomes that of "giving light to those poore *Indians*, who have ever sate in hellish darknesse."[23]

To provide evidence that they are hard at work converting darkness to light, the authors of *New Englands First Fruits* include a list of five instances which they claim shows evidence of the "*first Fruits* [God] hath begun to gather in amongst [the Indians]." As part of their list, the authors describe the experience of "Divers of the *Indians* Children, Boyes and Girles we have received into our houses, who are long since civilized, and in subjection to us, painfull and handy in their businesse, and can speak our language familiarly." These children were among the estimated 300 Pequot captives that Governor Winthrop distributed to his friends and allies at the war's end, the majority of them being women and children.[24] In *New Englands First Fruits,* the brutality of captivity is redefined as a divinely ordained method of provoking spiritual regeneration, or of converting darkness to light. The tract explains that, "divers of [the child captives] can read English, and begin to understand in their measure, the grounds of Christian Religion."[25]

---

[22] Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War*, 10.
[23] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 58.
[24] Michael L. Fickes estimates the number of captives to have been 319. See his article, "They Could Not Endure That Yoke"; The Captivity of Pequot Women and Children after the War of 1637." *The New England Quarterly* 73, no. 1 (2000): 61.
[25] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 59.

To illustrate the extent of their success, the Bay Colony authors describe the children's transformation as both spiritual and social. Some of the captive children are so "convinced of their sinfull and miserable Estates, and affected with the sense of Gods displeasure, and the thoughts of Eternity" that they "pray in secret and are much in love with us, and cannot indure to returne any more to the *Indians.*" In this description, the Bay Colony authors position the war as a starting point for their subsequent mission. The power of Puritan light is so effective that the it not only conquers the Pequot, but it also transforms them into proto-Puritans. As the future of the Pequot tribe, the children's supposed desire to remain in English captivity illustrates the extent to which the tribe's future trajectory has been changed. The desperate children have replaced their Pequot identity with a Christian one, and they are now happy to merely bask in the glow of the Puritan light.

The narrative's exaltation of the children's transformation worked on a logic of colonial dispossession. As Andrea Cremer explains, in showing the Pequot children as submissive, the Bay Colony authors work to "prove their governing capabilities" both physically and rhetorically. The language of the tract in its emphasis on Pequot submission serves to "transform…the status and power of both English and Pequots in New England." In emphasizing the children's whole-hearted submission, the authors of *New Englands First Fruits* "rhetorically render…the Pequots from hypermasculine threat to effeminized slaves."[26] Describing their possession of Pequot bodies allows the authors to claim conquest over Pequot souls and by extension, Pequot lands.

[26] Andrea Robertson Cremer, "Possession: Indian Bodies, Cultural Control, and Colonialism in the Pequot War" *Early American Studies*, 6, no. 2 (2008), 302.

Not content to show the Pequot war as a means by which only Pequot children were transformed, *New Englands First Fruits* prioritizes the conversion narrative of the Pequot leader, Wequash, "that famous Indian…, who was a Captaine, a man of proper person, and of a very grave and sober spirit."[27] The last and longest account included in the tract, Wequash's tale is also the only example of a clearly discernable Indian conversion. Echoing the narrative of the Pequot children, the Bay Colony authors point to the terror of divine violence during the Pequot War as the impetus for Wequash's quest for the English God:

> [Wequash], a few years since, feeling and beholding the mighty power of God in our English Forces, how they fell upon the *Pegans*, where diverse 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 poor Wretch…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 *Indians*.[28]

Here it is the violence of the war that makes the English God visible. Like the captive children, the Bay Colony authors emphasize that Wequash's exposure to the light changes the trajectory of his life. In *New Englands First Fruits* Wequash's powerful and emotional response to war, and the violence of the Mystic Massacre in particular, is evidence to English readers that Wequash has been truly called by God. As Weld and Peter explain, following the battle Wequash "could have no rest or quiet because he was ignorant of the *English mans God.*" Within the larger narrative of the missionary project being portrayed, the Pequot War initiated the conversion of the first convert, which then inspires the commencement of the New England missionary project: more than any

[27] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 61.
[28] Ibid., 61.

deliberate action on the part of the Bay Colony, it is the divine violence of the war that serves as the most effective way to bring light into the darkness.

Yet, Wequash's conversion account is more than just evidence of spiritual regeneration. It is also a means by which the Bay Colony authors illustrate the effectiveness of Bay Colony's colonial project for their transatlantic readers. At the same time as the Pequot War instigates Wequash's spiritual transformation, it also serves as evidence that God aided the English in subduing their Pequot enemies. Pitting the Pequot troops against the English ones, Weld and Peter use Wequash's narrative, and his position as an Algonquian military leader, to remind readers of the power of the English military – a force so great that it had the ability to slay "diverse hundreds of [Pequots]…in an houre." As they explain, it was "the power of God" and "the Lord, as a God of glory in great terrour" who directed English military action. Killing two birds with one stone, Wequash's conversion account confirms the relationship between the Bay Colony's victory in the Pequot War and God's divine favor upon the colonial project. The war not only paves the way for settlement, it also creates new subjects for the expanding empire. Violence was a multi-faceted means by which God cleared and prepared Algonquian land and people for the New England way.

Emphasizing God's continued favor, the Bay Colony officials follow their accounts of the Pequot war converts with a description of the current state of affairs in colonial New England. Delineating the ways that the Bay Colony has "truly exercised...justice towards [the Indians] in all particulars..." and treated them "fairly and courteously, with loving termes (sic), good looks and kind salutes," *New Englands First Fruits* explains that "God hath so kept [the Indians], that we never found any hurt from

them, nor could ever prove any intentions of evill against us."[29] As they note, the only instance of conflict with the Indians was "that act of the Pequots, long since, to some few of our men." This is a marked contrast from earlier narratives of the Pequot War that emphasized the Pequot as a threat to English civilization. Now confident in their victory, Weld and Peter have the freedom to employ a retrospective benevolence. English retaliation against the Pequot was divinely ordained and thus predestined to occur. In this construction, the Pequot War was a minor event in which the limited number of English casualties serves to exemplify the respect with which the Pequot now beheld their New England colonizers.

Portraying the Pequot War as a precursor to Puritan missions not only allowed Weld and Peter to display the Bay Colony's benevolent diplomacy, it also encouraged future settlement by promoting New England to potential colonists as a contained and controlled space. Of course, New England was not as controlled as Weld and Peter may have hoped. The Bay Colony authors deliberately minimized the violence of the war and its aftermath as part of their efforts to promote New England's peaceful state in contrast to the violence escalating in England at the start of the English Civil War (1642-1651). As Kristina Bross writes, Weld and Peter's emphasis on a peaceful New England "suggests that the successful conclusion of the Pequot War in 1638 closed the period of violence in New England permanently, even as England's troubles continued."[30] Emphasizing a peaceful New England reinforces the Bay Colony's claims that they are a model colonial enterprise well-versed in diplomatic relations with indigenous people. It

[29] Ibid., 63.
[30] Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones*, 14.

also conveniently sets up the Bay Colony as the ones best suited to make and support their land claims. As Jeffrey Glover notes, one audience for *New Englands First Fruits* the Committee for Foreign Plantations – the governing body that adjudicated land claims. Attempting to pre-empt an impending dispute with Roger Williams over land claims in Narragansett Bay, the Bay Colony attempted to show that they could both control the land and convert its inhabitants.[31]

In *A Key Into the Language of America,* Roger Williams also draws a line between the Pequot War, Wequash's conversion, and his own authority using the language of colonial diplomacy. Yet, whereas *New Englands First Fruits* frames the violence of the war as an explicit sign of God's divine favor upon Massachusetts Bay's missionary efforts, *A Key into the Language of America* cites the war, and Williams's role in it, as evidence of his own personal knowledge of Indian people and places – essentially Williams's participation in the war authorizes him to serve as a missionary and diplomat to New England's native people. Williams's desire to prove his diplomatic adeptness was, in part, motivated by the Bay Colony's claims of authority over New England land and people. Williams penned *A Key Into the Language of America* during his 1643 voyage to London to petition the English government for a charter incorporating the towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Newport into the new colony of Rhode Island – towns claimed at the time by the Massachusetts Bay authorities. By appealing directly to the English throne, Williams attempted to bypass Bay Colony authority. In 1643, thanks in part to *A Key into the Language of America*, a Parliamentary commission issued

[31] Jeffrey Glover, *Paper Sovereigns*, 201.

Williams a patent for Providence Plantation much to the dismay of the Massachusetts Bay Colony leaders.[32]

Like the Bay Colony authors, Williams's conceptions of diplomacy are deeply wedded to his theological beliefs. While the Puritan founders typologized themselves as the second nation of Israel and conceived of God's violence as a means of bringing about salvation, Williams believed that God no longer ordained nations. As he explains in his 1645 tract *Christenings Make Not Christians,* the Biblical Jews were "the onely People and Nation of God, esteemed (and that rightly) all other People." Following the return of Christ, "the CHRISTIANS, the followers of Jesus, are now the only People of God, his *holy nation.*"[33] For Williams, the Pequot nation was no more or less a "*Pegan"* nation than the English one. By extension, Williams's dismissed the Bay Colony's claims that God used violence to both defeat the Pequot and bring them to Christianity as a sign of his favor on the English nation. As Williams explains, "it must not be, (it is not possible it should be in truth) a conversion of People to the worship of the Lord Jesus, by force of Armes and swords of steele."[34] For Williams, both diplomacy and salvation took place on an individual level.

Like *New Englands First Fruits*, Williams frames Wequash's narrative in *A Key Into the Language of America* in order to garner authority for Williams's spiritual and diplomatic actions in colonial New England. Central to Williams's narration of Wequash is his emphasis on his personal relationship with the Pequot convert. Though Weld and

[32] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 23-26.
[33] Roger Williams, *Christenings Make Not Christians, Or A Briefe Discourse concerning that name Heathen, commonly given to the INDIANS. As also concerning that great point of their CONVERSION*. (London, Printed by Lane Coe, for I.H. 1645), 2-3.
[34] Ibid., 14.

Peter may have met Wequash and the other Narragansett leaders at some point during or after the war, (Hugh Peter negotiated with Pequot leaders as part of an English diplomatic mission in July of 1636 and both men were ministers in Massachusetts Bay) they relied on second hand accounts, namely that of the Puritan minister Thomas Shepherd, to relate the story of Wequash's conversion to their English readers.[35] By contrast Williams relied on his first-hand experience to describe the state of Wequash's soul.

Further echoing *New Englands First Fruits*, Williams shows the Pequot War as the event that brought Wequash and Williams together. In the weeks leading up to the 1637 Mystic Massacre, Williams had several meetings with the Narragansett, and with Wequash in particular. In the winter of 1636, Williams had taken shelter among the Narragansett after being banished by the Massachusetts Bay authorities. That spring he acquired land from the Narragansett sachems Canonicus and Miantonomi in order to set up his small Providence settlement. By the summer of 1636, when the events that would eventually lead to war began, Massachusetts Bay Governor Henry Vane requested Williams to negotiate with Canonicus for the return of two Englishmen who had been taken captive while travelling with the murdered English Captain John Oldham.[36] Williams agreed to the negotiations and began his long-standing role as a go-between for the Bay Colony and the Narragansett – a position he would informally continue throughout his life.

It was Williams (with Miantonomi's prodding) who first introduced Wequash to the English when he recommended that the Pequot captain serve as a guide for the

[35] Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War*, 92, 101-102.
Weld and Peter were in England at the time of Wequash's death. They left on their fundraising mission in August 1641 so it is likely that they did not have contact with Wequash after his conversion.
[36] Ibid., 106.

English during the Mystic Massacre. In a 1637 letter to John Winthrop, Williams explains that Wequash was one of two Pequot guides who "have lived...with the Narragansett, and know every pass and passage amongst them."[37] The two men continued their personal relationship until the time of Wequash's death in 1642. In *A Key into the Language of America,* Williams references his long relationship Wequash in order to establish his authority as a cultural mediator. As Williams writes, a few days before the Pequot's death, Williams, along with the Connecticut colonist and lawyer George Fenwick, went to visit Wequash who was residing two miles outside of Saybrook, Connecticut on the banks of the Connecticut River. At this final meeting Wequash reminded Williams of an earlier meeting "some two or three year before" when Wequash "had lodged at [Williams's] House" and "where [Williams's] acquainted him with the *Condition* of *all mankind,* & his *Own* in particular..." After their final meeting, Wequash explains to Williams that, "*your words were never out of my heart to this present.*"[38] In foregrounding his long relationship with Wequash as the catalyst that initiated Wequash's salvation rather than attributing it to the violence of the war manifest in the power of the English forces as the authors of *New Englands First Fruits* claim, Williams portrays Wequash's conversion as a more authentic one because it was based on choice and not coercion.

Yet, despite their clear differences, both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America* unite the Pequot War and the missionary project under the

[37] Roger Williams, *Letters of Roger Williams 1632-1682*. Ed. John Russell Bartlett (Providence: Printed for the Narragansett Club, 1874, 2012 reprint):19.
[38] Williams calls it "preparation" foregrounding his account of Wequash with the explanation: "I know there is no small *preparation* in the hearts of Multitudes of them. I know their many solemne *Confessions* to my self, and one to another of their lost *wandering Conditions*." Roger Williams, *A Key*, 87.

twin banners of colonization and diplomacy using Wequash's conversion as a linchpin. While *New Englands First Fruits* frames the war as a necessary step in Massachusetts Bay's diplomatic mission and Williams implicitly positions his role in the war as evidence of his missionary authority, both versions of Wequash's conversion narratives emphasize that the actions of the English colonists, performed with God's favor, facilitated the salvation of indigenous souls like Wequash. The frameworks of each account seek to assure readers that in the aftermath of the Pequot War, New England's native people have been, or have the potential to be, first allies and then converts.

The Ties of Kinship

As both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key Into the Language of* America illustrate, the nuances of warfare are easily elided when a narrative is deployed for an transatlantic audience. More interested in identifying the forces of good and evil, the authors of the two tracts overlook the various factions involved in the war as well as their motivations. It is only be untangling the events of the war as well as Wequash's location within the war can we better understand the conditions and relationships out of which *New Englands First* Fruits and *A Key into the Language of* America were constructed. While English accounts of the Pequot War portray it as an ideological battle between the civil English and heathen Algonquian, the contours of the war were shaped by pre-colonial indigenous relationships and interests as well. Though the story of the Pequot War is commonly told as a story of English conquest, many of the indigenous players in the war saw English participation as a secondary concern. Instead, they joined the war efforts out of their desire to maintain trade relationships and exert sovereignty in the face

of both internal and external challenges. As anthropologist Kevin McBride explains, the impetus for the war was "the culmination of decades of tension between Native tribes further stressed by the arrival of Europeans."[1]

In order to better understand the significance of the Pequot War to Wequash and articulate his own diplomatic aims, we must first locate the Pequot convert within his larger Algonquian community. Both *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America* were particularly invested in the terms that they used to designate Wequash's status – for Weld and Peter Wequash was "the famous Indian Wequash, who was a Captaine," and for Williams, Wequash was "the *Pequit Captaine."*[2] Both accounts translate Wequash's rank into English terms; however, it is only Williams's account that indicates that the naissance of Wequash's authority comes from his position within the Algonquian community.[3] In his letters, Williams records several encounters that he had with the Pequot leader between 1637 and 1642 and during that time he refers to Wequash by a number of different titles. Following their first meeting, Williams describes Wequash simply as "a Pequot...who ha[s] lived these three of four years with the Narragansetts." A few weeks later, Williams terms Wequash "a Pequot guide," and "a

[1] Kevin McBride et al. "Battle of Mistick Fort: Site Identification and Documentation Plan Public Technical Report. National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program GA-2255-09-017. *Battlefields of the Pequot War: Mashantucket Pequot Museum & Research Center.* April 2016, 10.
[2] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 61; Williams, *A Key*, 87.
[3] Though the term captain clearly reflects an English interpretation of Algonquian social structures, it is possible that the specific choice of the word may have been influenced by Algonquian power dynamics. Michael Witgen cites a parallel translation example that took place among the French and Algonquian in the 1670s by the French Jesuit translator Father Claude Allouez – whom Witgen cites as a skilled translator. Witgen explains that in a translation of Algonquian relationships back to the French, Allouez employed the term "captain" as "the French translation for ogimaa in Anishinabemowin, a word that meant leader and signified a person skilled in diplomacy, warfare, trade, or hunting – someone with access to manidoo and the willingness to use such power and resources on behalf of the people of the leader's community." In the case of Wequash, the particular titles that the missionary authors give him, though clearly anglicized, seem to illuminate something about his power and status among the Pequot and Algonquian. Michael Witgen, *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native World Shaped Early North America*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013),78.

man of great use." And, most saliently for my purposes, in an October 1637 letter Williams cites Wequash as "a Sachem with the Pequots."[4]

While the New England colonies had different categories of leadership for political leaders and military leaders, among the Southern New England Algonquian, the sachem had both political and military responsibilities. As anthropologist Kathleen Bragdon explains, "The sachem was a representative of the community with a pivotal or transformative role."[5] He or she was responsible for social and political stability. In order to protect his followers, the sachem maintained a complicated network of relationships – within his fellow kinship group, with other social groups, and with non-physical beings, or manitou. The sachem conducted his activities within a larger Algonquian cosmology of balance and reciprocity. Balance was maintained by preserving proper relationships, both social and spiritual, which was signified by the proper performance of a variety of ceremonies and rituals. Sickness, death, and warfare could be evidence that spiritual or social balance was out of order, often because an individual or group had improperly treated another or had failed to perform the proper ceremonies.[6] When faced with disorder, it was a sachem's responsibility to perform the actions necessary to restore balance.

Using Williams's references to Wequash as a starting point, we can re-construct our understanding of Wequash's position within the Algonquian community. Seventeenth-century primary and secondary source references, nineteenth-century

[4] Roger Williams, *Letters*, 18-19, 38, 67.
[5] Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1550-1650* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 153.
[6] Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees: Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts, 1650-1790* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 55.

genealogical records, as well as Wequash's actions throughout his life all confirm Williams's claim that Wequash was in fact part of the Algonquian leadership from his birth. From my research recovering Wequash's biography, I estimate that Wequash was born sometime in the late 1610s to the Eastern Niantic sachem Wepitamock and an unknown Pequot woman who may have been a leader among the Pequot.[7] Wepitamock and his brother Ninigret (Wequash's uncle) led the Eastern Niantics – a Southern Algonquian kinship group closely aligned with the Narragansett.[8] Born into a large Algonquian community in which both of his parents were likely leaders, Wequash would have known the importance of communal responsibility and the significance of kinship ties from an early age. And both would have remained foundational to him throughout his life. Like their relatives and sometimes rivals the Pequot, during Wequash's early life the Narragansett and the eastern Niantic were rapidly becoming powerful entities within the seventeenth-century New England world.

European settlement altered Algonquian communities and influenced indigenous practice. Prior to the arrival of Europeans, Algonquian society was largely organized into small villages comprised mostly of family members and led by a hereditary sachem. For

---

[7] Wepitamock was alternatively known as Momojoshuck, Seepocke, and Aquawoce. I would place the year of his birth as no later than the late 1610s based on the fact that he was old enough to challenge Sassacus for the grand sachemship after the death of Tatobem in early 1634, meaning he would have likely reached at least his teens by that time. For claims that Weptimock was Wequash's father and that his mother was Pequot see John William De Forest. *History of the Indians of Connecticut,* (Hartford: WM. JAS. Hamersley, 1853), 179-180; Rhode Island General Assembly, *Narragansett Tribe of Indians: Report of the Committee of Investigation; A Historical Sketch and Evidence Taken, Made to the House of Representatives, At its January Session, A.D. 1880* (Providence: E.L. Freeman & Co, 1880): notes to page 12; and *Collections of the Rhode-Island Historical Society, Vol. III* (Providence: Marshall, Brown and Company, 1835), 65. For further support that Wequash and Wequashcook were brothers, see "Garrett, Harman." *Yale Indian Papers Project.* Paul Grant-Coasta ed., *The New England Indian Papers Series,* (New Haven: Yale University Library Digital Collections), np, http://yipp.yale.edu/bio/bibliography/garrett-harman-1678

[8] Ninigret is also referred to in some sources as Yanemo or Jannemo.

the most part these villages operated independently. As Europeans arrived in greater numbers, these smaller villages began to draw together into larger confederates run by powerful sachems.[9] The consolidated groups controlled trade with Europeans and other indigenous groups, collected tribute from smaller villages, and facilitated diplomatic relationships both through negotiations and warfare. Wequash's father, Wepitamock, and uncle, Ninigret, who may have shared leadership responsibilities as dual sachems, maintained a fairly powerful role among the confederation of tribes developing on the Southern New England coast.[10] Though substantially smaller in number than the Narragansett or the Pequot, the Niantic were a well-respected group who enjoyed a reciprocal relationship with the Narragansett. They did not pay tribute to the Narragansett and were largely treated as equal partners in trade and diplomacy.[11]

The reciprocal relationship between the Eastern Niantic and the Narragansett may have been due in part to the strong kinship ties that existed between the two groups. On his father's side, Wequash was related to the powerful Narragansett sachems, Miantonomi and Canonicus, through both marriage and birth. Wequash's paternal grandmother was Canonicus's sister, the elder of the two Narragansett sachems thereby

[9] There is some debate as to whether or not the concept of the grand sachem was invented by the English in order to better categorize and sign treaties with Indian leaders See Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England 1500-1650*, 152-153 for some discussion of the power dynamics among sachems. However, whether or not grand sachems existed is not central to my argument. It is only necessary to observe that Wequash was under the leadership of Miantonomi and Canonicus in whatever way that arrangement was facilitated.

[10] Though the sachemship was usually passed from father to son, Wequash did not inherit his father's position as head of the Niantics. This may have been for one of two reasons – one, Wequash did not desire a role among the Niantics because of his Pequot ties or two, and probably more likely, Wequash died in 1642 while his father Wepitamock was still alive. Wepitamock remained the sachem of the Niantic until his death in the early to mid-1650s.

[11] Julie Fisher and David Silverman, *Ninigret, Sachem of the Niantics and Narragansetts: Diplomacy, War, and the Balance of Power in Seventeenth-Century New England and Indian Country* (Itaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014), 17-18.

making Canonicus Wequash's great-uncle. Wequash's aunt on his father's side, Quaiapen, was married to Canonicus's son, Mixano, making Mixano Wequash's uncle by marriage.[12] Wequash was also related to the younger of the two grand sachems, Miantonomi, who was himself the nephew of Canonicus. Wequash's paternal grandmother was Miantonomi's aunt – meaning Wequash's father was Miantonomi's first cousin.[13] Though less is known about Wepitamock's father, Sasious, Wequash's paternal grandfather, it seems likely that he held a leadership position among the Niantic tribe because of the fact that both of his sons were appointed to serve as Niantic sachems.

As the son of Wepitamock and nephew of Ninigret, Wequash was aligned with several powerful Narragansett and Niantic leaders from his birth. Though his ties to the Niantics and the Narragansett are most clearly delineated within the historical record, he was likely also aligned with several other Algonquian kinship groups. Many of the Southern New England Algonquian leaders used marital relationships among their sons and daughters to consolidate power, manage alliances, and forge diplomatic relations. As a result, the sachems of several Algonquian confederates and villages were closely related to one another by marriage and by birth resulting in a closely intertwined network of leaders. As Julie Fisher and David Silverman explain, "their unions had made the sachems of the Narragansett, Pequots, Mohegans, Montauaketts, and probably other regional groups, an extended cousinage, sometimes kissing, sometimes clashing."[14]

Despite his father's clear identification as a member of the Niantic, Wequash is often referred to as a Pequot – an identification that seems to originate on his mother's

[12] Quaiapen was also known as Matantuck, Magnus, or "Old Queen." See Howard M. Chapin, *Sachems of the Narragansetts* (Providence Rhode Island Historical Society, 1931), 63.
[13] For a genealogical mapping of Wequash's family see Chapin, *Sachems of the Narragansetts*, 109-111.
[14] Julie Fisher and David Silverman, *Ninigret*, 7.

side.[15] Because Wequash was titled a "Pequot sachem" and because his father was a Niantic sachem, or a person of high status, it seems likely that Wequash's mother was the daughter of a Pequot sachem or a sachem herself. As Kathleen Bragdon points out, among the New England Algonquian, matrilineal ties were often just as significant as patrilineal ones in establishing lineages and "determining inheritance of office."[16] Both Wequash, and his brother, Wequash Cook identified as Pequot throughout their lives and also maintained their claims to Pequot land and Pequot people until they died.[17]

Captivity and Warfare

In the same way that Williams and the Bay Colony authors crafted their narratives of Wequash to emphasize their own diplomatic abilities, Wequash also crafted his conversion narrative with diplomatic aims in mind. These aims are evident through a close analysis of Wequash's actions during the Pequot War. As mentioned above, Wequash's first meeting with Williams came a few weeks before the Mystic Massacre while Wequash was serving as a member of Miantonomi's negotiating party.[18] At the meeting, the two parties discussed the terms upon which the Narragansett would be willing to aid the English in their upcoming attack on the Pequot. This meeting between

[15] Nineteenth-century historian John William De Forest suggests that, "it seems probable that [Wequash's] mother was a woman of the Pequot race." John William De Forest, *History of the Indians of Connecticut,* 181.

[16] As Bragdon points out, among the New England Algonquian, matrilineal ties were often just as significant as patrilineal ones in establishing lineages and "determining inheritance of office." Kathleen Bragdon *Native People of Southern New England 1550-1650*, 158.

[17] a. Wequash Cook was also known as Cushawashet or Harmon (Harman) Garret.
b. The sources on the relationship between Wequash Cook and Wequash are quite scant and difficult to decipher. As several contemporary scholars have noted, the two men, though often confused, are not the same man. In the account that Governor Winthrop gives of Wequash's conversion, he refers to Wequash as "Wequash Cook." While some have taken this to be a mistake on Winthrop's part, it seems that that Wequashcook (or Harmon Garret) and Wequash were brothers – both the sons of Wepitamock.

[18] Roger Williams, *Letters*, 17.

Williams and Miantonomi was part of larger negotiations occurring between Williams, Massachusetts Bay Colony, and the Narragansett sachems in the weeks leading up to the war.[19] At the talks, Miantionomi finally agreed to an alliance as long as Williams and the English abide by several conditions. Among other things, Miantonomi's pre-war requirements establish the duration of the attack, the location of the fighting, and most importantly, the treatment of any potential Pequot captives. All of Miantonomi's stipulations are intended to uphold Algonquian values and promote the growth of the Narragansett confederacy, both in terms of people and trade.

It is as a result of the meeting between Williams and Miantonomi that Wequash became involved in the Pequot War. One of Miantonomi's requests is that the English leaders employ Wequash as a guide for the English forces. As Williams explains in his letter to Winthrop, Miantonomi recommends "especially two Pequots, viz., Wequash and Wuttackquiackommin, valiant men, especially the latter, who have lived these three or four years with the Narragansett, and know every pass and passage amongst them."[20] In this brief reference, Williams illuminates the reason behind Wequash's initial participation in the Pequot War. Wequash was not a traitor or a renegade Pequot as scholars repeatedly claim. Rather Wequash, like Williams, saw his role in the war as a

[19] Legal historian Adam Hirsch points out that the meeting between Williams and Miantonomi reflected a pre-war negotiation process common to seventeenth-century indigenous warfare. English leaders like Winthrop were operating with a European conception of warfare in which most wars were waged over land rights and with the intent to turn enemies into subjects. By contrast, Algonquians like Miantonomi were not driven to warfare for land scarcity and Algonquian governing structures did not require full subjugation of an enemy tribe in order to obtain allegiance. Instead, indigenous leaders often met to describe the terms of a battle and the conditions of success before a battle or skirmish took place. See Adam J. Hirsch "The Collision of Military Cultures in Seventeenth-Century New England." *The Journal of American History* 74, no. 4 (1988): 190. For Miantonomi's war incentives see Michael Oberg. "'We Are All the Sachems from East to West': A New Look at Miantonomi's Campaign of Resistance." *The New England Quarterly*, 77, no. 3 (2004): 483-484.

[20] Roger Williams, *Letters*, 18-19.

diplomatic one and, also like Williams, Wequash's service required him to deftly balance his numerous political and social allegiances.

In writing that Wequash had lived among the Narragansett for three or four years, Williams's letter indicates that Wequash had relocated among the Narragansett sometime around 1633 or 1634. Wequash likely left the Pequot in the aftermath of the 1634 death of the Pequot sachem Tatobem. Tatobem's death, the result of a trade conflict between the Dutch and the Pequot, fueled an internal struggle within the Pequot confederacy.[21] Wequash was one of several sachems contending to take over as the new leader of the Pequot. In part, possibly because of his mother's status, Wequash seems to have had a strong claim to succeed the elder leader and was a significant rival to Tatobem's son Sassacus for the position of grand sachem.[22] Though succession among the Southern Algonquian primarily passed from father to son, many tribes employed matrilineal succession alongside of, or in place of, patrilineal succession. Wequash's bid, however, was unsuccessful and Sassacus was appointed grand sachem in his father's stead.[23]

The imbalance Wequash and his followers felt in the wake of Sassacus's succession likely resulted in his movement to the Narragansett. Among the seventeenth-century Algonquian, a sachem's followers could choose to join another sachem or challenge a sachem's rule if the leader "fell short in their public responsibilities or in their

[21] In 1633, Dutch traders, angry that the Pequot would not allow other Algonquians to access to the Dutch trading fort, captured and executed Tatobem despite the Pequots' willingness to cooperate with Dutch demands for ransom. In response to the execution of Tatobem and as a result of the mounting trade tensions, Pequot warriors and their Western Niantic allies murdered the English trader John Stone in 1634, mistaking him for a Dutch trader. Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War*, 58-60.
[22] Oberg cites Wequash as an "important rival to Sassacus." Michael Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans,* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 47. Cave cites him as "an unsuccessful contender for the grand sachemdom." Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War*, 66.
[23] According to Oberg, an unknown sachem briefly led the Pequots after Tatobem's death and before Sassucus's succession, however, this interim sachem was killed quickly after he took over leadership responsibilities. Michael Oberg, *Uncas*, 42-43.

character."[24] As historian Michael Oberg points out, Sassacus was a "weaker and less effective leader" than his father Tatobem had been. [25] After becoming sachem, Sassacus "was unable to hold together even those who were nominally Pequot" and several of his followers aligned themselves with the Narragansett.[26] Passed over as sachem, Wequash and his followers joined a large number of Pequot sachems and leaders that were reaffirming their kinship ties with the Narragansett. Though we have limited historical records indicating the number of Pequot leaders who moved to the Narragansett, in the fall and winter of 1634, we do know the Pequot sachems Wuttackquiackommin, and Sassawwaw (or Soso) and the Mohegan sachem Uncas (who was also Tatobem's son-in-law) also moved from the Pequot to align with the Narragansett.[27]

Both a Pequot and a member of the Narragansett, Wequash's entry into the Pequot War placed him in position that required him to negotiate among a number of kinship ties. However, Wequash's position was not unique. The Narragansett sachems including Miantonomi, Canonicus, the Mohegan sachem Uncas, as well as Wequash's Niantic relatives all had kinship ties to the Pequot. It is, in fact, Wequash's large web of kinship connections and his knowledge of Pequot lands that make him well-suited to serve as a guide for the English forces. As Miantonomi tells Williams, the two Pequot guides "know every pass and passage amongst them" – making them extremely valuable to the English soldiers who were unaccustomed to the terrain.

---

[24] Julie Fisher and David Silverman, *Ninigret*, 16.
[25] Michael Oberg, *Uncas*, 48.
[26] Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England 1500-1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 210.
[27] This shift of alliances reflected the larger tensions growing between the Pequot and Narragansett. The two formerly close allied groups were at odds with one another and preparing for potential conflict. As Kevin McBride notes, in 1634 the Pequot constructed two military, Mistick and Weinshauks, in preparation for an "anticipated conflict" with the Narragansett. See Kevin McBride, *Technical Report*, 34.

However, a look at the rest of Mianotonomi's stipulations reveals that the Narragansett sachem expected Wequash and Wuttackquiackommin to act as more than merely indigenous guides. Rather, they were to use their knowledge of the Pequot land and people in order to gather Pequot captives during the fighting. As Williams writes, Miantonomi desired that the two men be given "armor to enter their houses."[28] Immediately following his request for armor, Miantonomi details his requirements for the treatment of the captives. As Williams relates, the sachem explains that "it would be pleasing to all natives, that women and children be spared, &c." Hesitant to trust the English leaders and suspicious of English warfare practices, Miantonomi equipped his own men with the authority and resources necessary to identify and collect Pequot captives.[29]

For Miantonomi, the gathering of Pequot captives was not merely a periphery task, but a primary one. The Narragansett confederacy joined with the English against the Pequot in large part because of their desire to obtain Pequot captives. Miantonomi, Uncas, Wequash, and the other Algonquian leaders repeatedly address the issue of captives in their negotiations with the English. The interconnected ties between the Pequot, Narragansett, Niantic, and Mohegan meant that the sachems desired captives in order to bring their relatives, especially the women and children, back into their own villages in order to build up their populations in the aftermath of colonial epidemics and warfare. Further, Algonquian sachems like Miantonomi, Uncas, and Ninigret were

[28] Roger Williams, *Letters of Roger Williams*, 18-19.
[29] McBride confirms the centrality of Narragansett practices to the battle's success. McBride explains that the Pequot were a much more formidable enemy than has been assumed. English success was the result of "intelligence gathering, careful planning, logistics, prior military experience, and tactical adjustments based on previous encounters..." A large part of English success was due to the presence of the Pequot guides and the aid of Miantonomi and his men. Kevin McBride, *Technical Report,* 8.

interested in taking in Pequot survivors in order to obtain rights to Pequot lands, resources, and trade relationships. As Oberg writes, the sachems "hoped to supplant the Pequots by adding the strength of the survivors to their own network of village communities. They each hoped to place themselves at the center of the Pequots' network of intercultural trade, to dominate the wampum economy as the Pequots had done, and incorporate the remaining Pequots into their disease-ravaged populations."[30] Significantly, as Wequash's actions later show, Wequash commission to gather captives placed him in a position not only to grow the Narragansett confederacy but to re-create the Pequot community as well.[31]

English and the Algonquian participants in the war continued to go back and forth about the proper placement of captives long after the war was over. There are several letters documenting disputes between the English, Narragansett and Mohegan over each group's right to harbor Pequot captives. As the description of the captive Pequot children in *New Englands First Fruits* illustrates, it was not just the Narragansett and their confederates who were concerned with gathering Pequot captives, but the English as well. At the end of the Pequot War, English leaders were keen to gain control of Pequot lands and resources while at the same time limiting the power of their now former Narragansett allies. Governor John Winthrop oversaw the distribution of the captives throughout the English households and several prominent New England leaders took in Pequot captives as both a sign of their status and to grow the wealth of their households.

---

[30] Michael Oberg, *Uncas*, 72.

[31] Wequash was already facilitating the gathering and transferring of Pequot captives even before he took part in the Mystic Massacre. As Williams explains to Winthrop in a second May 1637 letter, Wequash has been charged with facilitating the transfer of "some squaws" to Canonicus and Miantonomi. These women were possibly Pequot women that Wequash has led away from the Pequots into the shelter of the Narragansett for protection before the ensuing battle. Roger Williams, *Letters of Roger Williams*, 23.

The captives also provided willing subjects for proselytization. Among the leaders who requested captives included two of Wequash's chroniclers, Roger Williams and Hugh Peter as well as the Puritan missionary John Eliot, who later used his captive as a translator for his missionary efforts.[32]

At the close of the Pequot War, the Narragansett and English were divided over the distribution of Pequot lands and Pequot bodies. The English eventually brokered a deal that would give them access to Pequot lands and subdue their former allies through the Treaty of Hartford. The treaty, which was signed on September 21, 1638, officially ended the Pequot War and the terms of the treaty gave the English primary access to the Pequot captives and divided the remaining survivors between Miantonomi and Uncas requiring the Algonquian sachems to pay tribute to the English for every captive they kept.[33] It also designated all Pequot lands as "English by Conquest" and further stipulated "neither shall the Narragansets nor Mohegans possess any part of the Pequot Country without leave from the English (*sic)*."[34] Though their victory over the Pequot had been due in large part to their Algonquian allies, the English acted as if they had "automatic rights to all the spoils."[35]

---

[32] See Andrea Cremer "Possession," 295-345 for a helpful overview on both Pequot Captives and Roger Williams's position on the captives. For more information on Hugh Peter's request to Winthrop for Pequot captives and the fact that Hugh Peter had "an Indian servant, named Hope, who was whipped for running away and for drunkenness," see Eleanor Bradley Peter, *Hugh Peter: preacher, patriot, philanthropoist, fourth pastor of the First church in Salem, Massachusetts* (New York, Privately Printed, 1902), 10, 16.

[33] According to Fisher and Silverman, "the Indian signatories [of the Treaty of Hartford] particularly the Narragansett, appear to have interpreted the treaty less as a binding agreement than as a symbol of peace, as a means, in the words of the document, for 'all former injuries and wrongs offered each to other [to be] remitted and buried and never to be renewed any more from henceforth": Julie Fisher and David Silverman, *Ninigret*, 41-42.

[34] John Haynes, et al. "Treaty of Hartford" (Copy), 21 September 1638, ed. Paul Grant-Costa et. al. *Yale Indian Papers Project*, Yale University: http://hdl.handle.net/10079/digcoll/2389

[35] Julie Fisher and David Silverman, *Ninigret*, 41.

The English push for power coupled with the internal tensions among the Algonquian allies led to a massive reorganization of power dynamics in New England after the Pequot defeat. No longer allied against the powerful Pequot, the Narragansett, Mohegan, Niantic, and English fought among one another. These tensions were largely evident in the attempts by the sachems to gather and harbor Pequot survivors. Miantonomi and Canonicus tried to negotiate with the English through Roger Williams for the Pequot captives they were promised in the Treaty but were often met with disappointment.[36] At the same time, Uncas, attempting to outmaneuver Miantonomi, worked with the Connecticut leaders to gain more land rights and acquire Pequot captives. Meanwhile, Wequash and his family members including his father, uncle, and brother – Wepitamock, Ninigret, and Wequashcook – were also striving to gather Pequot captives for themselves. The Algonquian leaders all leveraged their relationships with the English in order to facilitate their task.

Wequash's Diplomatic Conversion

Wequash's location within the Pequot War and his status as a sachem working to gather Pequot followers provides us a means for re-reading the descriptions of Wequash's conversion that anchor *New Englands First Fruits* and *A Key into the Language of America*. Layering Wequash's actions and motivations as a sachem alongside of the English rhetoric of diplomacy and conversion produces a multi-faceted reading of the missionary texts that illuminates their reflection of both English and Algonquian thought

[36] As a result of the Pequot defeat, the Narragansett became, in many ways, the "colonists' primary indigenous rival." Julie Fisher and David Silverman, *Ninigret*, 41.

and practice. While the English authors read and interpreted the events of the Pequot War and the subsequent conversion of Wequash for their English readers using a transatlantic lens, the subject of their interpretation, Wequash, was simultaneously reading English actions as he responded to the war and Christian conversion from his position as an Algonquian sachem. It is only by triangulating the two missionary texts with Wequash's background can we expose their status as the product of multiple conversations taking place concurrently. No longer merely evidence of English missionary aims or attempts to bolster diplomatic credibility, the texts instead serve to reflect the multiple dialogues taking place between Williams, the Bay Colony, English readers, and Wequash the Pequot sachem.

To illuminate the presence of indigenous diplomacy within these two these texts, I return to analyze the references to Wequash within both *A Key into the Language of America* and *New Englands First Fruits* in order to contextualize his actions and words as ones that come out of his position as an Algonquian sachem. In *New Englands First Fruits,* Weld and Peter begin their story of Wequash with the Mystic Massacre. Building upon their larger narrative of English diplomacy, Weld and Peter pinpoint the most violent battle of the Pequot War as the naissance of the English mission to the Indians. As they write, it was during the battle that Wequash, "feeling and beholding the power of God in our English Forces," began his conversion process. It was during the battle, they explain, that "the Lord as a God of glory in great terror did appeare unto the Soule and Conscience of this poore Wretch."[37] In this telling of the battle, the violence of the massacre is redemptive as it provided an experience of saving grace for the Pequot

[37] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 61.

soldier. For Weld and Peter, Wequash's response to the battle serves to reinforce the text's larger narrative – the Bay Colony is the party best suited to control New England land and convert its people.

Wequash's response to the Mystic Massacre can be interpreted within an Algonquian context as well. To the Algonquian participants in the war, and the Pequot specifically, the Mystic Massacre was most certainly an event of profound spiritual significance because it brought extreme imbalance and destruction to the Pequot and Algonquian world. The Pequot would have recognized English victory in the war as the result of English spiritual power. In *New Englands First Fruits,* Wequash acknowledges English power using an Algonquian cosmology. In explaining that the English God was a "most dreadfull God" because he helped the "one *English* man...to slay and put to flight an hundred *Indians,*" Wequash reveals his belief that the English forces won because they had accrued spiritual power – power that the Pequot did not have.[38] Among the Southern New England Algonquian, spiritual power was located within both humans and non-humans in varying degrees. Not static, power could be accrued. Through actions, prayers, performances, alliances, etc. power was constantly moving. The English victory meant that they had somehow gained spiritual power.

Wequash's words indicate that the sachem was in awe of English spiritual power. However, his acknowledgment of English strength does not make him exceptional. In *News from America,* the English Captain John Underhill records that several indigenous participants in the war had the same response to English victory as Wequash. As Underhill writes, "Our *Indians* came to us, and much rejoyced at our victories, and

[38] Ibid.

greatly admired the manner of *English* mens fight." Though Wequash and his fellow soldiers were clearly impressed by the magnitude of English power, they do not necessarily wish to emulate the English nor obtain the same power. As Underhill writes, the Algonquian allies "cried *mach it, mach it;* that is, it is naught, it is naught, because it is too furious, and slaies too many men."[39] Wequash and his Algonquian allies clearly saw the battle as an event of spiritual import, however, but that does not mean that they desired to emulate the English. Rather, Wequash and his fellow soldiers are fearful of a "dreadful" God who seems to kill indiscriminately.

Fear of English power was likely a motivating factor in Wequash's decision to establish closer alliances with the English. Echoing his earlier move from the Pequot to the Narragansett in the aftermath of Sassacus's succession, Wequash sought an alliance with the English as part of his larger attempts to protect and restore the Pequot community. Wequash's alliance with the English seems to have given him increased opportunities to gather Pequot captives – an activity in which he was already actively engaged before his conversion took place. In "Relation of the Pequot Warres," English soldier Lion Gardiner records his encounter with Wequash in the days before the Mystic Massacre. Attempting to tract down missing Pequot, Gardiner asks Wequash, "how many of the pequits wear yet alive that had he[l]ped to kill English men?" In response, Gardiner explains that Wequash "write them downe as may apeare by his own hand."[40] In this

[39] John Underhill, *News from America*, 38. Lopenzina suggests that it may have been Wequash himself whom Underhill was quoting in this passage. Drew Lopenzina, *Red Ink: Native Americans Picking Up the Pen in the Colonial Period.* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2012), 79.
[40] Lion Gardiner, "Relation of the Pequot Warres," 481-482.
Wequash plays a similar role in 1640 when he reveals to Thomas Stanton that "one of the petty Sachems of Nayantick was aboard Mr. Oldham's pinnance, and that some goods and gold are at Nayantick." The exchange is recorded in Roger Williams July 21, 1640 letter to Governor Winthrop. Coincidentally, this is also the last mention of Wequash in Williams's letters. Roger Williams, *Letters*, 139.

reference, Wequash's expert knowledge of the Pequot and their affiliation with the English is evident. Like his fellow sachems Miantonomi, Canonicus, and Uncas, Wequash was engaged in a network of captive trading. By giving the English the names of the few Pequot who had murdered English soldiers, the sachems hoped to protect themselves and the other Pequot who had not killed English soldiers.[41] In Gardiner's account, Wequash's strategy pays off and he is rewarded for revealing the hidden captives with some sort of trade deal.[42]

Wequash's favor with the English leaders also allows him to build up his own power base. A few months after the Massacre, in the fall of 1637, Wequash, along with the Mohegan sachem Uncas, raided Long Island to capture Pequot survivors. Roger Williams writes in an October 1637 letter to Governor Winthrop that "there are many of the scattered Pequot rendezvoused with Uncas the Mohegan Sachem and Wequash the Pequot, who being employed as one of the guides to the English in their late wars, is grown rich, and a Sachem with the Pequots: and hath five or six runaways."[43] Michael Oberg put the number of captives that Wequash brought home with him at thirty.[44] Significantly, Wequash is gathering captives during the period in which Weld and Peter claim that he is going "up and down bemoaning his condition and filling every place he came with sighes and groanes."[45] While Weld and Peter's description of Wequash registers for an English readership as Christian contrition, the movement in which

[41] For more on strategy and captivity during the Pequot War, see Michael Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans*, 53.
[42] As Gardiner explains to the Montaukett sachem Wyandanch, "if you will kill all the pequits that come to you and send me their heads then I will give to you as to weakwash and you shall have trade with us." Lion Gardiner, "Relation of the Pequot Warres," 482.
[43] Roger Williams, *Letters of Roger Williams*, 67.
[44] Michael Oberg, *Uncas*, 74.
[45] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 61.

Wequash was partaking may actually have been the result of his captive gathering – an activity suspiciously absent from the missionary accounts. In either case, it seems that following the Mystic Massacre, Wequash leveraged both his relationship with the English and with the other Algonquian sachems, namely Uncas, to establish himself as a more powerful Pequot leader. [46]

It is after Wequash's Long Island raid that the Pequot sachem seems to have experienced his conversion moment. As Weld and Peter explain, after going "up and down" Wequash met with "some *English* (well acquainted with his language)."[47] In *A Key into the Language of America*, Williams makes it clear that he himself is the "English" referred to by Weld and Peter. Though Wequash may have been interested in English religion, it is also likely that he turns to Williams and other English leaders after the Massacre because these relationships offered him the opportunity to build networks of reciprocity among the English. Though *New Englands First Fruits* is vague about the number of English with whom Wequash meets, other accounts explain that Wequash met with several English leaders in the aftermath of the Massacre. Not only does he re-establish his ties with Williams, he also befriends Lion Gardiner (as evidenced through his trade deal with Gardiner), forms an alliance with the Massachusetts Commander

[46] Wequashcook later confirms his brother's sachem status among the Pequot. J. Hammond Trumball explains that, "After the death of Wequash, Hermon Garrett assumed his name and claimed to succeed him as Sachem. But his right was contested by Ninigret, (a younger brother of Momojoshuck who had married Harmon Garrett's sister) on the ground that the sons of Momojoshuck were not of the whole blood. In a deed given by Herman Garrett in 1672, he describes himself as "sachem or prince and rightful owner of" certain lands within the reputed bounds of Stonington (east of Pawcatuck River,) which lands were "given to his eldest brother Wequashcooke by his father Wettamozo and at his brother Wequashcook's death given to him, the said Hermon Garrett, or alias Wequashcook, as the next brother and heire." Hammon J. Trumball, *The Public Records of The Colony of Connecticut from 1666 to 1678: With the Journal of the Council of War, 1675 to 1678: Transcribed and Edited, In accordance with a Resolution of the General Assembly, with notes and an appendix* (Hartford: F.A. Brown, 1852): note on page 57.

[47] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 62.

Israel Stoughton, and has at least one meeting with Governor Winthrop, possibly more. Further, sometime after the massacre he began his friendship with the Massachusetts Bay minister Thomas Shepherd, who will later serve as one of the eyewitness testimonies for *New Englands First Fruits.*[48] Regardless of whether it was motivated by Christianity or it was the result of his desire to gather captives, Wequash's developing relationship with the English after the war clearly provided him with a number of new opportunities.

According to *New Englands First Fruits*, the most salient evidence of Wequash's conversion is his physical re-location. As Weld and Peter write, Wequash "enquired after God with such incessant diligence" that he eventually decided to "to dwell amongst the English at *Connecticut.*"[49] Though the authors clearly intended English readers to interpret Wequash's physical re-location as verification of his ever-increasing spiritual acumen, Wequash's move to Connecticut also conveniently put him back near the location where the Pequot were gathering together. In an April 1638 letter to Governor Winthrop, Williams provides evidence that Wequash may have moved to Connecticut in part because of his ties to the Pequot. Williams writes that, "The Pequots are gathering into one, and plant their old fields, Wequash and Uncas are carrying away the people and their treasure, which belong to yourselves."[50] Though it is not evident, the Bay Colony leaders may have known that Wequash was gathering Pequots at the same time as he was initiating himself into Christian practice because they were aware that Uncas, Wequash's

[48] In May of 1637, Williams sent Wequash directly to Winthrop with a message detailing a recent skirmish that had occurred between Wequash and another Pequot. Roger Williams, *Letters,* 21. In an August 14th, 1637 letter to Winthrop, Israel Stoughton explains that Wequash was almost killed when he went with Stoughton on an expedition to capture the remaining Pequots in the final days of the war. Edward Elias Atwater, *History of the Colony of New Haven to Its Absorption into Connecticut History of the Colony of New Haven to Its Absorption into Connecticut*, (New Haven, Printed for the Author, 1881), 343.
[49] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld *New Englands First Fruits,* 62.
[50] Roger Williams, *Letters of Roger Williams*, 92.

ally, was himself gathering captives. However, even if they were aware of Wequash's actions, the sachem's desire for closer ties not only benefited Wequash, but it benefitted the English as well. English leaders saw an alliance with Uncas as one way that they could access and control Pequot lands and they perhaps took the same approach to Wequash.[51] Frustrated with the Narragansett sachems, the English focused on forming strategic ties with other Algonquian sachems in the hopes that these sachems and their follower would be dependent upon English power.

The specific location of Wequash's re-location is significant to his status as a Pequot sachem. A brief look at the land records at the time of Wequash's move to be "near the English at Connecticut" reveals that in moving to Connecticut, Wequash's resided upon Uncas' land. In *A Key into the Language of America*, Roger Williams specifically locates Wequash at the time of his death as dwelling two miles away from George Fenwick's house "in *Say-Brook* Fort at the mouth of that River."[52] Though at the time of Wequash's death in 1642, Fenwick was the owner of the land around Saybrook Fort, he did not acquire ownership until 1639. In 1638, when Wequash and Uncas moved to Connecticut after the Mystic Massacre to begin gathering Pequots, Uncas was the recognized owner of the land around Fort Saybrook. Uncas obtained the land after his marriage to "a daughter of Sebequanash, sachem of the Hammonassets." In 1639, he sold

[51] Michael Oberg, *Uncas*, 79-80.
[52] Roger Williams, *A Key*, 88. This is the location at least, where Wequash was residing at the time of his death, though he may have lived in other areas around Connecticut. Winthrop's journal confirms that this was where Wequash died. In 1642, Winthrop writes that Wequash, "an Indian, living about Connecticut river's mouth, and keeping much at Saybrook with Mr. Fenwick, attained to good knowledge of the things of God and salvation by Christ, so as he became a preacher to other Indians, and labored much to convert them, but without any effect, for within a short time he fell sick, not without suspicion of poison from them, and died very comfortably." John Winthrop, *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630-1649*, ed. by Richard S. Dunn, James Savage and Laetitia Yeandle (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996) 208.

the land to Fenwick.[53] Thus, when Wequash moved to the lands around Saybrook Fort, it is quite likely that his actions were determined primarily by his kinship obligation to the Pequot – obligations facilitated by his relationship with English leaders.[54]

The intimate connection between Wequash's ties to the English and his work as a Pequot sachem extends to Wequash's posture and language within his conversion accounts as well. After relocating to Connecticut, the authors of *New Englands First Fruits* describe Wequash's attitude towards the English as one of humility, despair, and contrition. They explain that Wequash would "smite his hand on his breast, to complaine sadly of his heart, saying it was *much machet*, (that is very evil)." After confessing Christianity, he maintained his penitent attitude exhibiting "an eminent degree of meeknesse and patience, that now, if any did abuse him, he could lie downe at their feet, and if any did smite him one the one cheeke, he would rather turne the other than offend them."[55] On one level, Wequash's humility may have been evidence of his growing awareness of Christian practice and his personification of the Biblical adage found in Matthew 5:39 that encourages Christians to "turn the other check."[56] In fully adapting the

---

[53]a. Edward Elias Atwater, *History of the Colony of New Haven*, 332-333. It seems that Uncas sold the land sometime in 1639 given the fact that Winthrop records him and his family settling in the location at that time. John Winthrop, *Journal*, 211.
b. As Atwater explains, the location also gave them easy access to Pequot lands across the Connecticut River. After Uncas sold the land to Fenwick, he withdrew to the east side of the Connecticut River, "to a region which had formerly belonged to his ancestors, the Pequot sachems, [and] was assigned to him as a his portion of the spoils of war." Edward Elias Atwater, *History of the Colony of New Haven*, 333.
[54] There is some evidence that Wequash also had land claims in the area. Ralph Dunning Smith refers to a September 1641 land transaction between Wequash and Henry Whitfield in which Wequash sells Whitefield "a tract of land call the Neck, extending along on the sound, as it was then described, from East river to Tuckshishoag or Tuxis pond, for the consideration of 'a frieze coast or blanket, an Indian coat, one faddom Dutchman's coat, a shirt, a pair of shoes and a faddom of wampum." However, Atwater later claims that that land was actually owned by Uncas – a claim that Wequash himself seems to have acknowledged. Ralph Dunning Smith, *The History of Guilford, Connecticut From Its First Settlement in 1639* (Guilford, CT by J. Munsell), 1877, 10.
[55] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 62.
[56] Matthew 5:39 reads, "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (KJV).

practices of Christian humility, Wequash appeared to English readers as a fully contrite, fully committed Christian convert.

Yet on another level, it may also have been evidence of Wequash's adeptness at Algonquian diplomacy and his recognition of the expanding authority of Connecticut and Massachusetts Bay colonial leaders. As Abenaki scholar Lisa Brooks points out, "the act of demonstrating great need in order to request assistance from a divine being, an animal or plant helper, or a human relation was common in the Native northeast."[57] Understanding the English as a powerful ally, Wequash may have attempted to make himself appear vulnerable in order to invoke aid and support from the more powerful English leaders. As Brooks explains, this posture of humility was in line with the native spiritual beliefs: "Native people understood prayer as the pitiful application to a being that held *Manitou.*"[58] As part and parcel of this posturing, Wequash likely also practiced English rituals and ceremonies. As *New Englands First* Fruits explains Wequash "became thorowly reformed according to his light." Both "hating and loathing himselfe for his dearest sinnes," Wequash practiced "temperance and abstinence on all occasions" and put "away all his Wives, saving the first."[59] Appealing to the English whom he perceived as powerful beings because of the war-time victory, Wequash's words and actions are ones in line with his status as a Pequot sachem. Wequash's contrition and his conformation to English social practices gave Wequash increased power among the English. Though it may have required him to relinquish some Algonquian alliances – particularly those that he had forged through marriage – it seems more importantly to

[57] Lisa Brooks, The Common Pot: Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008); 225.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits*, 62.

have allowed him to continue to gather Pequot captives under English sanction and protection.

In interpreting Wequash's actions as those of a penitent convert, the authors of *New Englands First Fruits* indicate the extent to which Wequash's indigenous practices of diplomacy were successful. This is not to claim that Wequash's humility was merely a duplicitous performance, but rather to say that the Algonquian beliefs that guided his actions were interpreted favorably by the English leaders. The overlap between English and Algonquian understanding of submission, power, and kinship played to Wequash's advantage. In fact, Wequash's adept interpretation of English practice and belief was so effective that after his 1642 death by suspected poisoning the Massachusetts Bay leaders venerated not only an exemplary convert, but offered evidence that he had "suffered Martyrdome for Christ" – the highest accolade available to a Christian convert.[60] As Weld and Peter explain, Wequash's death came as a result of "some of the Indians, whose hearts Satan had filled" being so angry at Wequash for his proselytization attempts that the "did secretly give him poyson."[61] Writing to a friend, Thomas Shepherd proclaims Wequash's death a clear example of Protestant martyrdom – not only because Wequash was poisoned, but also because of his exemplary deathbed piety. Rejecting the healing efforts of an Indian "*Powow,*" or spiritual leader, Wequash final words were, "*If Jesus Christ say that Wequash shall live, then Wequash must live; if Jesus Christ say that Wequash shall dye, then Wequash is willing to dye, and will not lengthen out his life by any such meanes.*" Maintaining his trust in the power of the English God, the dying

[60] Ibid., 62.
[61] Ibid.

Wequash portrayed in *New Englands First Fruits* used his final words to reaffirm his commitment to English power. In categorizing Wequash as a martyr, one of the most well-defined and translatable categories of Protestant piety, Shepherd indicates that Wequash's adept reading of English cultural practice was so effective that he can easily be recognized among English readers as one of their own.[62]

While it is possible that Wequash was poisoned for his efforts to proselytize his fellow Algonquian, his death must be placed within the larger post-war context of the early 1640s. Wequash's death, though tragic, was not unique among the Indian allies who had sided with the English during the Pequot War. At the time of Wequash's death, tensions were high among the Algonquian leaders who had aided the English during the Pequot war. Wequash, his brother Wequashcook, his uncle Ninigret, and Uncas were all using a variety of avenues to gather Pequot survivors with the result being that they repeatedly angered their former allies, the Narragansett sachems Miantonomi and Canonicus. Convinced that the Wequash and Uncas were taking what had been promised to the Narragansett, Miantonomi and Canonicus turned to Roger Williams to plead their case with the English authorities.

The tensions were so high among the former Algonquin allies that in the early 1640s, a number of the sachems faced death threats or were killed by other indigenous

---

[62] Adrian Chastain Weimer explains that "the historical imagination of martyrdom was a shared repertoire of images, actions, and language for seventeenth-century English Protestants." She explains that "the shared ideal of holy suffering...allowed visible piety to break through social and theological boundaries." Adrian Chastain Weimer, *Martyr's Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 151-152.
b. It is also interesting to note that Thomas Shepherd claims Wequash was a martyr when only a few years earlier Shepherd and other Massachusetts Bay leaders had worked to discredit Anne Hutchinson's claims of martyrdom: see Adrian Chastain Weimer, *Martyr's Mirror*, 68. Hutchinson may have been back in Shepherd's mind at the time when he wrote his description about Wequash because she was killed at the hands of Siwanoy warriors in August 1643.

leaders. In 1643 John Winthrop reports that Uncas encountered "a Pequot Indian" who "shot him with an arrow through the arm, and presently fled to the Narrowgansets..."[63] Surviving his first poisoning attempt, Uncas faced a second attack from Miantonomi's ally Sequaseen. In retaliation, Uncas "burned to the ground the wigwams in Sequassen's village" – an attack that provoked Miantonomi to defend his ally. The fight between the warriors of Uncas and Miantonomi eventually resulted in a war between the Narragansett and the Mohegan that ended with Uncas clubbing Miantonomi to death under the sanction of English authorities.[64] In this light, Wequash's death may have been the consequence of his actions and identity in the aftermath of the Pequot War – either his work gathering Pequot or his status as an ally and relative of sachems like Uncas, Ninigret, and Wequashcook who were increasingly antagonistic to Narragansett leaders. Following the war, Wequash had acquired not only powerful allies, but powerful enemies as well.

Curiously, in *A Key into the Language of America*, Roger Williams makes no mention of Wequash's death by poisoning at the same time as he avoids any claims that Wequash was a martyr – omissions likely resulting from a combination of Williams's position within the English leadership and his knowledge of post-war Algonquian power dynamics. Wequash had a markedly different relationship both in life and in death with

---

[63] John Winthrop, "A Declaration of former Passages and proceedings betwixt the English and the Narrowgansets, with their confederates wherein the grounds and justice of the ensuing warre are opened and cleared," (Cambridge, MA, 1645), 3.

[64] Michael Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans*, 100-107).

b. In 1659, Wyandanch the Montauckett sachem and friend of Lion Gardiner's who served with the English in the Pequot War, was also killed by poisoning. Though it occurred quite a few years after Wequash's death, it illustrates that poisoning deaths were not unique among the Algonquian. Gardiner claims, "it was by poyson also 2 thirds of the Indeans upon long Iland died." Lion Gardiner, *Relation of the Pequot War*, 487.

Williams than he had with the New England colonial leaders. Ousted by Massachusetts Bay, Williams did not wield the same political power as those involved with the production of *New Englands First Fruits.* Whereas Weld and Peter were representatives of Massachusetts Bay, allied with John Winthrop and closely tied to the Connecticut colonial leaders, Williams was an outsider in colonial New England. Though clearly influential, Williams had much less ability to determine internal colonial affairs. This was especially true with regards to the distribution of Pequot captives and Pequot lands. Williams, like all of the other colonial leaders, had to go through Winthrop in order to request Pequot captives.[65] Further, having been banished Massachusetts Bay, Williams was in no position to make claims for the Pequot lands within the claimed jurisdiction of Connecticut Colony.[66]

Wequash's relationship with Williams was also distinct from his relationship with other colonial leaders because Williams had more intimate knowledge of Narragansett affairs. Though Williams heartily endorsed Wequash as a guide to the English during the Mystic Massacre, their relationship following the Massacre became increasingly complicated and convoluted. As Wequash became aligned with Uncas and moved away from his ties to Miantonomi and Canonicus, Williams was increasingly skeptical of Wequash's motivation. The tension between the men first surfaced in July of 1637 when

[65] In the years following the war, Williams was increasingly conflicted regarding the practice of keeping Pequots as slaves, but in months following the Mystic Massacre, Williams clamored for his own Pequot captive alongside of several other English leaders. In 1637 he wrote Winthrop requesting a Pequot child for "keeping and bringing up." Specifically, Williams had "fixed [his] eye on this little one with the red about his neck..." Roger Williams, *Letters,* 35. See Andrea Cramer, "Possession," 341-343 for a helpful overview of Williams's position on captivity.

[66] Williams did eventually gain more power as he established Rhode Island. As I mentioned earlier, *A Key Into the Language of America* was written in an attempt to override the Massachusetts Bay leaders and appeal directly to the English government. However, in 1637, his power to govern Pequot affairs was relatively limited.

Williams describes the naissance of the dispute between Wequash and Miantonomi. Writing to Winthrop, Williams explains that, "Miantunnomu was displeased with Wequash...[because] Wequash was suspected to deal falsely when he went to hunt for the Pequots at the rivers mouth."[67] Rather than working exclusively with the English system established for captive gathering by the 1638 Treaty of Hartford, Wequash and Uncas worked both within and around the English system using a wide variety of avenues and relationships to achieve their larger goal of re-gathering the scattered Pequots. From the perspective of Williams and the Narragansett sachems, Wequash and Uncas's approach to captive gathering defied the rules established by the English authorities at the same time as it threatened Narragansett growth. By taking captives and land that had been designated for the Narragansett, Uncas and Wequash alienated themselves from their former Narragansett allies.[68]

The complicated relationship between Wequash and Williams manifests itself in Williams's account of Wequash's conversion found in *A Key into the Language of America* in two ways. First, as a result of Williams's status and position among the English leaders, Wequash likely positioned himself differently when interacting with Williams than he did with the other colonial leaders. Rather than approaching Wequash using a posture of humility and supplication, Wequash viewed Williams with varying degrees of trust and caution. Wequash was aware that Williams's loyalties lie first with the English, and second with the Narragansett. At certain moments, Wequash approached Williams as a useful ally. At other times, he worked against Williams to further the aims

[67] Roger Williams, *Letters*, 47.
[68] As Oberg explains, "Roger Williams...continually urged Winthrop not to trust Uncas" because he believed that Uncas and his allies continued to harbor the Pequots who had killed English soldiers. Michael Oberg, *Uncas*, 79.

of his Pequot kin. These conflicting exchanges between the two men also not only influenced Wequash's approach to Williams; it also affected the way that Williams understood their relationship and represented Wequash to his English readers. Sometimes confident of Wequash's sincerity and other times suspicious of the Pequot sachem's motivation, Williams's writing about Wequash is both fluctuating and complex.

Evidence of the thorny relationship between Wequash and Williams is palpably evident in Williams's interpretation of the state of Wequash's soul. In *A Key into the Language of America,* Williams prefaces his account of Wequash's conversion by explaining that he is "not so confident as others" in regards to his "owne Hopes of [Wequash]." This lack of confidence, though consistent with Williams's larger theological approach to salvation, also stems at least in part from the diplomatic context described above in which the two men had previously engaged with one another – a context that permeates their final exchange. During their final recorded conversation, Williams explains that Wequash reminded him of an earlier meeting that the two men had "some two or three yeare before" in which Wequash had "lodged at [Williams's] house." In *A Key into the Language of America,* Williams frames this earlier meeting as evidence of his proselytization attempts in which the two men discussed "the *Condition* of *all mankind,* & his *Own* in particular."[69] However, the meeting between the two men, which seems to have taken place sometime in 1639 or 1640, was almost certainly part of larger negotiations between Williams, Wequash, Uncas, and the Narragansett that were taking

[69] Weld and Peter also frame the meetings between Williams and Wequash in terms of Williams's proselytization efforts. Though they don't name Williams directly, they write that "it pleased the Lord that some English (well acquainted with his Language) did meet with him; thereupon as a Hart panting after the water Brookes, he enquired after God with such incessant diligence that they were constrained constantly for his satisfaction to spend more then halfe the night in conversing with him." Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, *New Englands First Fruits,* 62.

place in the aftermath of the Pequot War.[70] Though Williams recounts their earlier meeting as primarily evangelistic in nature, the fact that it was in the context of larger political negotiations reveals the extent to which spiritual practice and political diplomacy were intertwined.

After discussing their earlier meeting in the face of Wequash's impending death, Williams again challenges Wequash to repent. In response, he writes that Wequash "replyed in broken English" with the phrase "*Me So big naughty Heart, me heart all one stone!"* Though Wequash's words come to us through multiple filters, his ambiguous language can be located within the larger picture that we have uncovered of Wequash as a Pequot sachem. In citing his heart as "naughty" and "all one stone," Wequash gives Williams, and by extension, Williams's English readers, an ambiguous picture of his soul. On one hand, Wequash's words affirm that he understands William's Christian message as he echoes the language of Christian repentance. Yet, on the other hand, Wequash remains non-committal. His heart remains hard and his final words give us scant evidence as to whether or not Wequash is rejecting Christianity or repenting.

In clarifying Wequash's words for his English readers, Williams seems to only succeed in producing more questions about the state of Wequash's soul. Williams glosses Wequash's words as "Savory expressions using to breath from compunct and broken Hearts, and a sense of inward hardnesse and unbrokennesse" – a short explanation rooted

[70] Though I cannot find a reference to an extended meeting between the two men in 1639 or 1640, they did have a history of meeting as part of diplomatic negotiations. Their first extended meeting was in 1637. As Williams explains in his second May 1637 letter to Winthrop, following Wequash's fight with a fellow Pequot, Wequash and his followers spent "five or six days" at Williams's house during which time Williams "had much opportunity to search into particulars." As a result of the meeting, Williams intercedes for Wequash by having Wequash meet directly with Winthrop in order to explain his role in the skirmish. See Roger Williams, *Letters*, 21-23.

in the tumultuous history between the two men. By using a string of antonyms that are deliberately vague despite their poetic appeal, Williams both illuminates and obscures the true motivations behind the Pequot's actions. Characterizing Wequash's words as "savory expressions" from a "compunct and broken" heart, Williams invokes a sense of repentance and contrition. In employing the word "savor," Williams invokes the Biblical phrase "sweet savour," an oft-repeated expression used throughout the Old Testament to characterize offering that were considered acceptable to God. As words acceptable to God from a repentant heart, Williams's presents Wequash's words and attitude as evidence of his penitent soul.[71] Yet, in the same sentence Williams undercuts his observation of Wequash's repentance by pointing to Wequash's continued "sense of inward hardness and unbrokeness." Though repentant and contrite, Wequash remains defiant and loyal to his Pequot identity.

It is this defiance that precludes Williams from claiming Wequash's death as martyrdom. For Williams, authentic martyrdom necessitates true contrition and meekness. As he explains in a 1672 tract, true martyrs are "men and women known to be of holy and heavenly Spirits towards God, and of low and meek Spirits towards all, yea their very enemyes."[72] Williams's clearly sees Wequash's death as occurring while Wequash was in a state of repentance; however, it was not the death of a martyr because

[71] The Biblical use of "sweet savour" primarily refers to acceptable burnt offerings in the Old Testament. I.e. "But ye shall offer a burnt offering, a sacrifice made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord: one bullock, one ram, seven lambs of the first year without blemish:" Numbers 29:36 (KJV). In the New Testament the phrase is used in 2 Corinthians 2:15 to refer to Christians. "For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish." Sarah Rivett suggests that Williams applies the term "savory" as part of his attempts to provide sensory confirmation, and thus scientific, verifiable evidence, of Wequash's conversion. See Rivett, *Science of the Soul*, 186-187.

[72] Williams, *George Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes* (Boston, Printed by John Foster, 1676), 272. For further information regarding Williams's stance on martyrdom, see Weimer, *Martyrs' Mirror*, 113-114.

of Wequash's lack of sincerity in both language and performance. Well aware that Wequash retained a desire to re-gather the Pequot against the wishes of the English leaders, Williams does not observe the proper posture in the Pequot captain. Rather than a martyr, Williams merely cites Wequash as a potential example of divine "*preparation"* – clearly Williams sees evidence that God is working, yet finds it impossible to truly verify the state of Wequash's soul.

The After-Life of Wequash

Scholars have interpreted the differences in the two accounts of Wequash as evidence of the larger contest of authority between Williams and Massachusetts Bay. As a result, Wequash has come down to us as a "contested" convert.[73] And while there are clearly differences in the two 1643 accounts of Wequash's conversion, as I have shown, the differences are rooted as much in Wequash's deliberate actions as they are in authorial interpretation. However, the 1643 accounts are significant for more than just their contested proclamation of the "first" Algonquian convert. Rather, they initiated a larger missionary movement and instigated a genre – what Bross terms "the Christian Indian deathbed scene."[74] Developing out of the popularity of both the conversion narrative genre and the deathbed confession, the 1643 accounts of Wequash paved the way for the accepted conventions used by subsequent New England writers to confirm the sincerity of Indian transformation to readers. The fact that the naissance of this genre

[73] Laura Stevens cites Wequash's deathbed scenes as the first example of "an Indian [who] becomes contested interpretative territory" and Drew Lopenzina refers to Wequash as a "contested figure in the battle over who would frame the overall experience in the colonies." Laura Stevens, *The Poor Indian,* 186 and Drew Lopenzia, *Red Ink,* 80.

[74] See Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones,* 192-193, as well as Laura Stevens, *Poor Indians,* 185-186 for more information on the Christian Indian deathbed scene.

was rooted in Algonquian practices of diplomacy and postures of supplication requires us as scholars to rethink the agency and control held by the English authors. While the English held the pen, they were limited in their interpretation of the lives of the actual Algonquian that they encountered upon New England's soil. Wequash may have performed his conversion sincerely enough, but his motivation and performance was rooted in Algonquian practice and this practice became the standard by which future converts were judged and recorded.

Yet, Wequash's significance extends beyond his generic contributions to the New England literary conventions. As I have shown, he was more than just a discursive figure whose actions were circulated among a transatlantic readership. Though they are often overlooked, Wequash's actions, and those of his fellow sachems, facilitated the regrowth of the Pequot people. Wequash played a significant role in re-gathering the scattered Pequot after the devastation of the Pequot War. When Wequash died in 1642, his brother Wequashcook took over his task. In 1664, Wequashcook convinced New England commissioners Daniel Gookin and George Denison to officially to restore the lands claimed by Wequash and Uncas to the Pequot.[75] In his 1677 will, Wequashcook passed that land down to his "wife and children" ensuring that the Pequot lands continued to be in the hands of Pequot people for succeeding generations.[76]

---

[75] See Daniel Gookin, "Report to the Massachusetts General Court on the Laying out of Land for the Pequot," June 16, 1664. Grant-Costa, Paul, et. al., eds., Yale Indian Papers Project, Yale University: http://jake.library.yale.edu:8080/neips/data/html/1664.06.16.00/1664.06.16.00.html

[76] Harman Garrett, "Will of Harman Garrett, February 1, 1678." Grant-Costa, Paul, et. al., eds. Yale Indian Papers Project, Yale University: http://images.library.yale.edu:8080/neips/data/html/1678.02.01.00/1678.02.01.00.html

Though the land changed hands several times, the actions of Wequash and his family ultimately played a significant in the sustaining of Pequot identity, lands, and culture. Throughout his life, Wequash remained loyal to the Pequot people as he worked to restore Pequot communities. When Wequash engaged with the English leaders, it was in light of his role as a diplomat. When he gathered his fellow Pequot as captives, it was in accordance with his responsibility to restore balance. When he performed Christian practice, it was with a mind to sustain and restore his people. Despite the variation in the textual records referring to Wequash, Wequash himself was consistent. As a captain, a convert, and a sachem – Wequash was first and foremost a Pequot.

CHAPTER TWO:
THE SACHEM AND THE MINISTER: RE-EXAMINING CUTSHAMEKIN'S INFLUENCE ON JOHN ELIOT'S POLITICAL IMAGINATION

Three years after the transatlantic debates between the Bay Colony and Roger Williams over the true state of Algonquian conversion in New England, the Bay Colony made their first sustained efforts to actively develop their meager "first fruits" into a full-fledged harvest. In 1646 Massachusetts Bay leaders officially tasked local ministers to make "knowne ye heavenly counsell of God among ye Indians.[1] One of the first to go was Roxbury minister John Eliot. Despite Eliot's later fame as the "Apostle to the Indians," his initial efforts to proselytize the Southern New England Algonquian were disastrous.

In *The Day-Breaking If Not the Sun-Rising of the Gospel* (1647) and its follow-up, *The Clear Sun-Shine of the Gospel Breaking Forth* (1648) Eliot provides some brief details about his maiden missionary journey. In September of 1646, Eliot, a few other Puritan ministers, and their interpreter Cockenoe (Eliot's Pequot War captive) walked about four miles from Roxbury to Neponset, the headquarters of the Massachusett sachem Cutshamekin.[1] Once there Eliot and his party proceeded to pray and preach to the

---

[1] Nathaniel B. Shurtleff. ed."4 November 1646." *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: Volume II: 1642-1649*. (Boston: From the Press of William White, 1853), 178-179. Cogley points out that Eliot's positioning as the first minister to the Algonquian was likely circumstantial rather than deliberate. He writes that Eliot was "distinctive only in the sense that he was the first minister to take his turn." Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 49.

[1] Eliot explains that his journey to Cutshamekin took place "six weekes before" his meeting with Waban, which he dates as October 28, 1646. See John Eliot, "The Day-Breaking if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospel with the Indians in New-England (1647)." *The Eliot Tracts* Ed. Michael P. Clark. (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 83-84.

Neponset residents. As Eliot explains, Cutshamekin and his followers were not impressed with his attempts to "convince, bridle, restrain, and civilize them," but instead "were weary, and rather despised what I said." [2] Frustrated by this sound dismissal Eliot shifted his missionary focus to Waban, a less prominent Massachusett leader residing in the village of Nonantum who was open and receptive to Eliot's message.[3]

When describing his early missionary endeavors for an English readership, Eliot only mentions his first visit to Cutshamekin in strategic snippets tucked in amidst glowing reports of his later successes with Waban.[4] In these snippets, Eliot draws upon a Puritan theology of saving grace to assure readers that the blame for his initial failure was not the result of his inexperience, but was instead the consequence of Cutshamekin's lack of preparation. Analyzing the post-sermon responses of both groups of Massachusett, Eliot emphasizes the marked contrast between Waban and Cutshamekin. In contrast to the weariness displayed by Cutshamekin, Waban's responds to Eliot's sermon with a series of questions that show "cleare understanding" and reflect evidence of the "special wisedom of God." For Eliot, these questions that were "far different from what some

---

William Wallace Tooker suggests that Cockenoe may have been taken into an English household rather than sold into slavery in Barbados because he was not Pequot, but only an ally of the Pequot. Margaret Ellen Newell suggests that Cockenoe was a Long Island Montauket Indian who was merely visiting Pequot relatives when he was captured in 1638 and placed into the service of Richard Callicott. William Wallace Tooker, *John Eliot's First Indian Teacher and Interpreter, Cockenoe-de-Long Island, And the Story of His Career from the Early Records* (New York: Francis P. Harper, 1896), 11.
Margaret Ellen Newell, *Brethren by Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American Slavery.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015), 94-95.

[2] John Eliot, "The Clear Sun-Shine of the Gospel Breaking Forth Upon the Indians in New-England." (1648). *The Eliot Tracts.* Ed. Michael P Clark. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 124.

[3] Governor Winthrop terms Waban "a new sachem" and Eliot calls him "the chief minister of Justice." John Winthrop, *Journal of John Winthrop 1630-1649 Volume II,* ed. Richard S Dunn, James Savage, and Laetitia Yeandle (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1996), 319; John Eliot, "The Day-Breaking if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospel with the Indians in New-England (1647)," *The Eliot Tracts,* ed. Michael P. Clark (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 83.

[4] John Eliot, "The Day-Breaking," 83.

other *Indians* under *Kitshomakin* ...had done."[5] Eliot continues his comparison between Waban and Cutshamekin a few paragraphs later when he describes the differences between Christian and non-Christian Englishmen for his Nonantum audience. He illustrated these differences by explaining that "many English men did not know God but were like to *Kitchamekins* drunken Indians" – again holding up the sachem as the tract's central figure of unrepentance for both his Indian listeners and his English readers.[6]

Though Cutshamekin eventually joined Eliot's Praying Indian community and even served as the first appointed sachem of the Praying Town at Natick, Eliot's writings continued to portray the Massachusett sachem with suspicion. In an account written as the sachem was nearing death, Eliot re-iterates his skepticism about Cutshamekin's motives explaining that though the sachem is "constant in his profession," he was "doubtfull in respect of the throughnesse of his heart."[7] Repentant or not, Eliot's writings continually employ Cutshamekin as the typological example of a sinful, or "bad" Indian.

Contemporary scholars continue to rely heavily on Eliot's portrayal of Cutshamekin as an unrepentant convert when characterizing the significance of the Massachusett sachem to the New England missionary project. Yet, whereas Eliot saw Cutshamekin's defiance as evidence of sin, observers today often cite it as an indication of Algonquian resistance. Cutshamekin's rejection of Eliot's conversion attempts serve as evidence that the sachem remained committed to his Massachusett beliefs and community. Pointing to the palpable tension between the Puritan missionary and the Massachusett sachem, they argue that Cutshamekin's eventual partnership with Eliot was

[5] Ibid., 84.
[6] Ibid., 89.
[7] John Eliot, "Strength Out of Weakness" (1651), *The Eliot Tracts*, ed. Michael P. Clark. (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 228.

one born out of necessity rather than desire. By the 1640s, the Massachusett were reeling from the mass devastation wrought by European diseases at the same time as they were isolated from many of their former allies, most notably the Narragansett, in the aftermath of the Pequot War. Faced with a distinct lack of options, scholars like Neal Salisbury and Richard Cogley have posited that Cutshamekin joined the Praying Indian community at Natick out of desperation because it was the sole means of unifying his fragmented community and maintaining some modicum of power in the face of colonial chaos.[8] In contemporary analysis, Eliot's hard-hearted convert has been transformed into a resistant or rebellious sachem-hero working to subvert a developing colonial system in order to sustain the interests of the Massachusett.

While characterizations of Cutshamekin as either rebellious or resistant aptly reflect the coerced position into which the sachem was placed by colonial powers, these characterizations remain, on some level, within Eliot's original binary. Transformed from "bad Indian" to "good," Cutshamekin continues to be defined by Eliot's favor or lack thereof. In this chapter, I forward a more expansive reading of the Massachusett sachem by contextualizing Eliot's references to Cutshamekin in terms of his responsibilities as a cross-cultural diplomat – responsibilities that were intricately connected to his status as a Massachusett sachem. A historical analysis of the many pre-1646 references to

[8] See Neal Salisbury, "Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (1974): 36 and Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 55.
Several other scholars refer to Cutshamekin as a "reluctant" convert including Harold W. Van Lonkhuyzen "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians: Acculturation, Conversion, and Identity at Natick, Massachusetts, 1646-1730" in *New England Encounters: Indians and Euroamericans, ca. 1600*-1850, ed. Alden T. Vaughan (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1999), 210 and Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees*: *Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts, 1650-1790* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 43.

Cutshamekin and the Massachusett makes it clear that he was an important political figure among both the Algonquian and the English long before Eliot and his Puritan colleagues attempted to convert the Massachusett to Christianity. Cutshamekin was the brother of Chickatawbut, a powerful Massachusett sachem who defended his followers against incursions by Plymouth Colony settlers and who later established diplomatic ties with the Massachusetts Bay authorities. After becoming sachem of the Massachusett in 1633, Cutshamekin continued to develop his brother's diplomatic networks. During the events of the Pequot War, Cutshamekin served as a military leader and diplomatic liaison working to facilitate negotiations among the Massachusett, the Narragansett, the Pequot, and the Bay Colony. In this role, he advised colonial leaders like Governor Endecott and Governor Winthrop on how to properly liaise with the local Algonquian. By the time of Eliot's 1647 visit, Cutshamekin had already spent more than twenty-five years instructing English leaders in the ways of Algonquian diplomacy.

The value of approaching Cutshamekin in terms of his status as a diplomat is not only that it provides us with a new perspective on an often overlooked seventeenth-century Massachusett sachem, but that it also allows us to re-examine the role that the Algonquian diplomacy played in shaping Eliot's missionary writings. Like the descriptions of Wequash circulated by Roger Williams and Bay Colony officials in 1643, Eliot penned his portrayals of Cutshamekin in order to emphasize the conversion potential among the Algonquians and illuminate the success of New England missionary efforts. Further adding to Eliot's tendency to characterize Cutshamekin solely in terms of his conversion potential is the fact that many of Eliot's descriptions were composed in retrospect as Eliot and his fellow missionaries attempted to construct a coherent and

comprehensive narrative of missionary growth. By reevaluating the rapport between the two men as one of mutual dependence rather than that of proselytizer and potential convert, I show that Cutshamekin's extensive experience and status had a significant impact on both Eliot's political imagination and missionary writings. When Eliot began forming the Praying Town of Natick, he had extremely little practical experience by way of political organization. Cutshamekin's experience and status meant that he held significant sway over Eliot's potential Algonquian converts. A reading of the textual encounters between the two men over time reveals the growing rapport and mutual dependency that developed between the untested missionary and the experienced sachem. Cutshamekin's influence over Eliot is evident from the two men's first recorded meeting in 1646 in which the sachem guides the missionary through a series of diplomatic procedures and treaty protocols familiar to New England and Algonquian political leaders. The sachem's guidance continues as Eliot goes about the process of forming the first Praying Indian community at Natick – a community that is significantly governed by what Jean O'Brien aptly terms a "hybrid government" incorporating "elements from three kinds of polities: English, Indian, and scriptural."[9]

Evidence of Cutshamekin's influence on Eliot extends beyond Eliot's missionary writings. Around the same time as Eliot and Cutshamekin were working to establish the governing system at Natick, Eliot was also concerned about England's political system which was disintegrating in the midst of the English Civil War. In late 1651 or early 1652, Eliot penned his political treatise *The Christian Commonwealth* addressed to Oliver Cromwell and his followers. Eliot's tract, noted as "the first book of political theory

[9] Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees*, 48.

written by an American," proposed a new governing system for England based on the practices instituted at Natick.[10] While the tract has been cited as the product of Eliot's utopic vision rendered through the lens of Puritan millennial theology, I contend that a close reading of the treatise in light of Eliot's relationship with Cutshamekin reveals evidence that Eliot's utopic imagination was shaped in part by Cutshamekin's deft political instruction. Derived from the governing system established at Natick, the foundational principles of the system that Eliot proscribes for England relies on existing Algonquian practices. Deliberately or not, *The Christian Commonwealth* endorses Algonquian kinship units as a means of organizing society at the same time as it promotes a judicial system parallel to those practiced by Cutshamekin and the Massachusett as the ideal system for a rebuilt England. *The Christian Commonwealth* provides evidence that Cutshamekin's influence was not limited to Eliot's missionary attempts, but rather that it became embedded into Eliot's political imagination. Irrevocably changed by his relationship with the sachem, Eliot textually transforms Cutshamekin's Algonquian tenants and sends them back across the Atlantic as a guide to shape the political future of the English nation.

Setting the Stage: Pequot War Diplomacy and the Missionary Project

Because Eliot's writings have so thoroughly embedded Cutshamekin within the New England missionary narrative, the sachem's earlier role in facilitating Algonquian/English political relationships is often overlooked, or when mentioned, is

[10] Paul Royster, Preface to *The Christian Commonwealth: or, The Civil Policy of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ. An Online Electronic Text Edition*, (Lincoln, NE: Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries), Paper 10. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libraryscience/19.

seen as merely tangential to his later interactions with the Puritan missionaries. However, Cutshamekin's performance as a potential convert is inseparable from his responsibilities as a sachem diplomat. In both roles, Cutshamekin was guided by his attempts to facilitate Algonquian diplomacy. Lisa Brooks illustrates the basis of Algonquian diplomacy using the metaphor of the common pot: "As soon as Europeans settled on the coast, they became inhabitants in Native space. In the common pot, shared space means shared consequences and shared pain. The actions of the newcomers would affect the whole."[11] Contextualizing Cutshamekin's actions within this framework allows us to map the sachem's actions with consistency. From the start, Cutshamekin endeavors to learn English practices and negotiate with English arrivals, be they military leaders or missionaries, in order to better facilitate balanced relationships among the English and the Massachusett. Both pre-and post-conversion, the sachem continually attempts to bring English settlers into Algonquian space in a way that allowed the Algonquian, and the Massachusett in particular, to continue to thrive.

Cutshamekin's consistency as both a sachem and a convert is presciently illustrated by a close look at his responses to repeated English questions put to him as part of larger colonial negotiations. The first set of questions occurred as a result of Cutshamekin's participation in a series of treaties between several Algonquian sachems and Massachusetts Bay. As Richard Cogley has shown, the outcome of these 1643 and 1644 treaties, often collectively referred to as "the submission of the sachems" served as an impetus for the Bay Colony's on-the-ground missionary efforts.[12] While the term

[11] Lisa Brooks, *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 5.
[12] See Cogley for more information about the relationship between the two events. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 23-51.

"submission" aptly invokes the unequal power dynamics surrounding the encounter, the arrangement made between the Bay Colony and the Algonquian was not solely one of submission, but a negotiation. The 1643 and 1644 treaties, which were largely facilitated by Cutshamekin, reflect a diplomatic process in which Cutshamekin was forced to make a difficult decision in the face of encroaching colonial power. In the end, he decided to align his followers and tributaries with the English in order to gain protection from the Narragansett – a decision that ultimately persuaded the English that the time for their missionary efforts was at hand. Yet, more than just a divine sign to the English, the treaties serve as an important moment in which Cutshamekin's performance of sachem diplomacy is evident.

After the 1638 Treaty of Hartford formally ended the Pequot War, tensions between the Bay Colony and the Narragansett escalated. The two former allies now continually attacked one another as the Bay Colony attempted to set itself up as the established power in the region and obtain ownership over local Algonquian land. Leaders like Cutshamekin and the Mohegan sachem Uncas, both of whom had participated in the English-Narragansett alliance attempted to maneuver between the two former allies. On June 22, 1643 two less prominent Algonquian sachems, the Pawtuxet sachem Soconoco and the Shawomet sachem Pumham, also caught between the feuding parities, approached Governor Winthrop with a request that they be accorded protection from Narragansett in return for their allegiance to the Bay Colony.[13] Winthrop readily agreed to their request clearly aware that the sachems' allegiance would add both land

[13] See the formal petition of the sachems in Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, ed. "22 June 1643." *The Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, Volume II, 1642-1649,* 40.

and power to the Bay Colony. The request was even more appealing because it was a direct challenge to the Bay Colony's primary rival, the Narragansett, as both Soconoco and Pumham were Narragansett tributaries. Unfortunately, the two sachems' 1643 decision hampered Cutshamekin's efforts to facilitate balance among the Massachusett, the Narragansett, and the Bay Colony.

Throughout the duration of the war, Cutshamekin had served as a military leader and diplomatic liaison between the Narragansett and the Bay Colony.[14] Massachusett Bay leaders repeatedly relied on Cutshamekin's experience for advice on how to engage with the local Algonquian and indigenous leaders like Miantonomi and Canonicus trusted and respected the Massachusett sachem's status and skill.[15] Well versed in negotiating between English and Algonquian diplomatic protocols, Cutshamekin used his role to advocate for Massachusett interests at the same time as he attempted to balance the tense relationship between the English and the Narragansett. One telling example of his skill occurred in 1636 when Governor Winthrop requested Cutshamekin to accompany former Governor Endecott on an expedition to Block Island to find the Pequots whom the Bay

[14] Cutshamekin had become sachem following his brother Chickatawbut's death in 1633. See John Winthrop, *Journal*, 101.

[15] Chickatawbut (also known as Obtakiest) was himself an important player in establishing the diplomatic landscape between the Southern New England Algonquian and the English colonists in the early years of settlement. He was one of the first sachems encountered by Myles Standish's Plymouth colonists in 1622 when the colonists destroyed the grave of Chickatawbut's mother. Chickatawbut attempted to retaliate militarily but his military strategy was thwarted when colonists were tipped off to his approach by the Wampanoag sachem Massasoit. See Thomas Morton. *New English Canann, or New Canaan* (London: Printed for Charles Greene, 1632), Book III, Chapter III. For more details on the significance of the event in terms of cross-cultural signification, see Erik R. Seeman, *Death in the New World: Cross-Cultural Encounters, 1492-1800* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 146-153. A few years later, when the Massachusetts Bay settlers arrived, Chickatawbut strove to establish diplomatic ties with the settlers and quickly made friends with Winthrop and the other leaders. Eventually he became a well-known figure at Winthrop's dinner table. The Bay Colony and the Massachusett leadership ties remained strong until Chickatawbut's death in 1633 as evidenced by their reciprocal willingness to prosecute community members who disregarded the established alliance between the two parties. See John Winthrop, *The Journal*, 50-51, 57, 78.

Leaders held responsible for the death of English trader John Oldham.[16] Winthrop recounts that on this expedition, Cutshamekin "crept into a swamp & killed a pequott & having flead of the skinne of his head." Cutshamekin then "sent [the scalp] to Canonicus." In this act, Cutshamekin used Algonquian diplomacy to assure the Narragansett sachems that the Massachusett and Massachusett Bay were willing to aid them in their fight against the Pequot. His actions also potentially served as an indirect signal to the Narragansett that the English had decided to place the blame for Oldham's murder on the Pequot, and not the Narragansett.[17]

Canonicus recognizes and responds to Cutshamekin's gesture. After receiving the scalp, Winthrop explains that Canonicus "presently sent it to all the Sachems about him, & returned manye thankes to the Englishe" at the same time as he "sent [a] fathom of wampom to Cutshamkin."[18] In his actions, Canonicus invokes the complicated web of kinship ties and alliances that existed among the Algonquian sachems. Sending Cutshamekin's sign around to the other sachems, Canonicus signals that the Narragansett have aligned with the Massachusett and the English against the Pequot. His decision to send wampum to Cutshamekin directly, rather than to the English, illustrates the use of another tool of Algonquian diplomacy. As Cave points out, "wampum exchanges sealed treaties of peace and alliances of war…Dominant sachems received wampum tribute

[16] Oldham was not actually killed by the Pequot, but by the Manisses of Block Island. Though the Manisses had, at one time, been tributaries of the Pequot, at the time of Oldham's death, they seem to have been tributaries of the Narragansett. See Kevin McBride, "Battle of Mistick Fort: Site Identification and Documentation Plan." *Public Technical Report: National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program*, GA-2255-09-017. 11; Matt Cohen, "Lying Inventions: Native Dissimulation in Early Colonial New England" in *Native Acts: Indian Performance, 1603-1832*, ed. Joshua David Bellin and Laura L. Mielke (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), 36.
[17] As Cave writes, Cutshamekin's actions in this instance were "particularly effective in stirring up long-standing Narragansett animosity toward the Pequots." Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996), 125.
[18] John Winthrop, *Journal*, 186.

from subordinate sachems, whom they were then obliged to protect."[19] In sending the wampum, Canonicus recognizes Cutshamekin's status and acknowledges that the role that the Massachusett sachem played in facilitating diplomatic ties.[20] Cutshamekin's act of cross-cultural diplomacy was successful as it resulted in an October 1636 meeting between himself, the Bay Colony, and the Narragansett sachems Canonicus and Miantonomi in which the three parties formalized their alliance against the Pequot.[21]

Through complicated diplomatic performances like this one, Cutshamekin worked to sustain an alliance between the Narragansett, the Massachusett, and the Bay Colony throughout the duration of the Pequot war. As dynamics shifted post-war, Cutshamekin's status as a cross-cultural diplomat worked against him as evident in the 1643 Treaty between Soconoco, Pumham, and the Bay Colony. Drawing on Cutshamekin's status and knowledge of Algonquian kinship connections, Bay Colony leaders forced the sachem to publicly testify against Miantonomi in a land dispute between the Bay Colony, the Narragansett, and Samuel Gorton – an English settler who was a continual thorn in the side of the Bay Colony. In 1642 Miantonomi had sold a large tract of Soconoco and Pumham's land south of Pawtuxet to Gorton. Miantonomi claimed authority over the

---

[19] Alfred Cave, *The Pequot War*, 53.
Salisbury explains that the Pequot saw Cutshamekin's killing of a Pequot as the event that started the war. He writes that "Until then [the Pequot] had carefully refrained from violence despite repeated English efforts to humiliate and otherwise provoke them. But with the blood of a Pequot shed and no alternative means of obtaining reparation available, they had no choice." Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England 1500-1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 218.

[20] Cogley reads Cutshamekin's actions here as those solely undertaken in his role under the authority of Massachusetts Bay. He writes, that in sending the scalp to Canonicus, Cutshamekin "symbolically reaffirmed the alliance of the Narragansett and Massachusett, but the latter, acting for Massachusetts Bay, were now calling the shots." He provides no basis for this reading, other than the fact that the Massachusett were beset by disease and disorder. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 34.

[21] See John Winthrop, *Journal*, 190-192.

land because of the tributary status that the two sachems had earlier established with the Narragansett. The Bay Colony required Cutshamekin to serve as their expert witness and explain the nature of tributary claims among the Algonquian. Backed into a corner, Cutshamekin testified that the Pawtuxet and Shawomet sachems were "free sachems as himself" and that even though they sometimes sent Miantonomi presents in honor of his status, they retained the rights to their own land.[22] The Bay Colony then used Cutshamekin's testimony as justification to nullify Gorton's land claims and place Soconoco and Pumham (and their land) under Bay Colony jurisdiction.

Following his testimony, Cutshamekin moved to shore-up his ties with the Bay Colony.[23] In December of 1643, a few months after the treaty between Soconoco, Pumham, and the Bay Colony, Cutshamekin, his successor and heir Josias Wompatuck and the Agawam sachem Masconomet privately met with Winthrop to initiate a similar treaty between the Algonquian sachems and the Bay Colony.[24] Though the treaty required a significant curtailing of Massachusett power, the sachem likely decided that it would be in the best interests of the Massachusett to initiate a treaty with the Bay Colony on his own terms in order to retain some negotiation rights rather than being forced into English subjection or overtaken by the now-angered Narragansett.[25] In March of 1644, the sachems formally signed an agreement with the Bay Colony officials at the Courthouse in

[22] John Winthrop, *Journal*, 459.
[23] Cutshamekin was one of several sachems who were moving to gain English ties at the same time. See Jenny Hale Pulsipher, *Subjects Unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2005), 26-27.
[24] Among the sachems whom aligned with Cutshamekin were his nephew and future successor, Josias Wompatuck, Masconomo, the Agawam sachem, and Passaconaway, a Pawtuxet sachem, as well as the "Squa Sachim," a female Pawtucket sachem and wife of Nanepashemet, and Nashowanon, and Wossamegon — two Nipmuck sachems. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 36.
[25] Ibid., 34-35.

Boston. The terms of the treaty stated that Cutshamekin and the other sachems "put orselues, or subjects, lands, & estates under the government & jurisdiction of the Massachusets, to bee governed & ptected by them."[26] The result of the agreement was the creation of what Neal Salisbury describes as "a new legal status, one in which [the Algonquian] were neither independent nor assimilated into white society."[27] The signing of the treaty with Massachusetts Bay marked a definite change in the status of Massachusett/English relations. No longer allies, the Massachusett had now become tributaries of the English.

Despite the clear shift in power dynamics Cutshamekin remained a powerful leader in his own right. At the time of the 1644 treaty, the Massachusett sachem retained several followers and tributaries. He also held the rights to a large amount of land. His status is evidenced by the terms on which he signed the 1644 treaty. As Winthrop notes, when Cutshamekin offered his loyalty to the Bay Colony, he did not just speak for himself and his fellow Massachusett. Rather, he sought protection from Massachusetts Bay in "his own name and the names of all the sachems of Watchusett, and all the Indians from Merrimack to Tecticutt" – an area that comprises almost three quarters of modern-day Connecticut.[28] The agreement with Massachusetts Bay did not revoke Cutshamekin's status as a sachem as it was a position with inherent rights that the English could not take

---

[26] Nathaniel Shurtleff, ed., *The Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England, Volume II*, 55.
[27] Neal Salisbury, "Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot," 36.
[28] John Winthrop, *Journal*, 494.
As Dennis Connole explains that this area included several tribes and accounts for the whole of Massachusett territory at the time. "The Indians of 'Wachusett' included the Nashaways and the Quabaugs, two Nipmuck tribes that inhabited the area to the south and west of Wachusett Mountain. Both happened to be, at the time the submissions were signed, tributaries of the Massachusett tribe. Denis A Connole. *The Indians of the Nipmuck Country in Southern New England, 1630-1750: An Historical Geography*. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc, 2007); 65. My preliminary and very rough mapping out of the area seems to indicate that it was a stretch of land around 250 miles by 75 miles.

away from him. His passion for his people, his responsibilities to sustaining balance, and his knowledge of English practice did not diminish as he negotiated for colonial protection.

Reading and Misreading Diplomatic Protocols of Space and Place

Cutshamekin's role during the 1643 and 1644 treaties serve as more than just evidence of the sachem's diplomatic prowess. Rather, they present a comparative framework in which to decipher the sachem's cross-cultural diplomatic practices which can then be assessed against Cutshamekin's later exchanges with Eliot and his performance as convert. By placing both the 1644 treaty and Eliot's texts in the context of Algonquian ethnography and ritual performance, we can arrive at a reading of Cutshamekin that saliently illuminates the central role that diplomacy played in his exchanges with both the Bay Colony officials and the Puritan missionaries. In both the treaties and his later exchanges with Eliot, Cutshamekin's words cannot be separated from his status as a sachem and his performance as a cross-cultural diplomat. Among the seventeenth-century Massachusett, the practice of diplomacy was intimately tied to a number of linguistic and physical practices, or rituals. As Stephanie Fitzgerald writes, indigenous legal performance of the time was a "ritualized act" that was intended to "transmit…'social knowledge, memory, and identity.'"[29] Cutshamekin's performance throughout the treaty negotiations were clearly grounded in his social and religious identity as a Massachusett and his drive to protect his people.

[29] Stephanie Fitzgerald, "'I Wannatuckquannum, This Is My Hand:' Native Performance in Massachusett Language Indian Deeds." Joshua David Bellin and Laura L. Mielke, eds. *Native Acts: Indian Performance, 1603-1832* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 146-147.

Yet, his experience with English tradition meant that he had gained an adeptness at English rituals of diplomacy as well. His ability to clearly speak English, to negotiate cross-cultural symbols like the Pequot scalp, and his performance of English civility all combine to convince Winthrop and other Bay Colony leaders that Cutshamekin is prepared for Christian salvation. Following their December 1643 meeting, Governor Winthrop wrote in his journal that "We now began to conceive hope that the Lord's time was at hand for opening a door of light and grace to those Indians…"[30] As Cogley points out, Eliot and his fellow Bay Colony missionaries chose Cutshamekin as their first potential convert because "his preeminence among the sachems of 1644 probably led [them] to assume that he was the one most eager to receive Christian instruction."[31] Thus Cutshamekin's performance of diplomacy and English civility had a reflective effect – though grounded in Algonquian ritual, the sachem adapted his diplomatic practices to fit within an English context. The result being that the sachem's adeptness at diplomacy convinced English leaders of their own assumptions about civility and Christianity in the wilderness.

It is in the intersection between cross-cultural performance and Algonquian ritual that we must contextualize the first 1646 exchange between Cutshamekin and Eliot. At the same time as Eliot and the Bay Colony missionaries employed the actions of the

---

[30] John Winthrop, *Journal*,.494.
Cogley argues that the colonists saw the submission as a "voluntary action" which led them to "conclude that the local Indians had affected the English virtues" thus providing evidence that they were prepared for Christian instruction. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*. 51.
[31] Ibid., 40.
Eliot confirms this perception in "The Day Breaking" when he refers to the Massachusett "as the "*Indians* inhabiting within our bounds." John Eliot, "The Day-Breaking if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospel with the Indians in New-England (1647)." *The Eliot Tracts with Letters from Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*, ed. Michael P. Clark. (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.), 83.

Algonquian during the 1644 treaty as a guide to their subsequent steps, Cutshamekin and his followers used the same event to shape their interpretation of the missionaries' advances. Though Eliot's letters employ heavy-handed Protestant rhetoric to ensure that readers understand his first 1646 journey as a missionary one, Eliot's actions and Cutshamekin's response to Eliot's visit point to the fact that the sachem interpreted, and responded to Eliot's visit as an extension of the 1644 treaty. Even before Eliot and the other Puritan missionaries opened their mouths to speak, they were relaying significant signals to Cutshamekin and the Massachusett about the nature and intent of their visit. These signals were evident in the physical location of the meeting as well as in the means by which Eliot and the Puritans approached Cutshamekin and his followers. Consciously or not, Eliot's pre-sermon performance made it almost certain that the burgeoning missionary and the seasoned sachem were reading and responding to their initial encounter through vastly different lenses.[32]

Significant to diplomatic practices among both the Algonquian and the English was the means by which the parties approached one another – in both cultures, the supplicant approached the one to whom he or she is making a request. In coming forward with a petition, the requestor signals his or her desire to initiate proceedings or treat with a more powerful party.[33] This posture of supplication is employed by Cutshamekin when

[32] This encounter may be an example of what Richard White calls a "creative misunderstanding." Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815.* 20th Anniversary Edition (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[33] Kathleen Donegan describes an early instance in which a more powerful Roanoke sachem, Wingina [Pemisapan] refused to meet with arriving English settlers at Jamestown because of his significant power and status. As Donegan writes, "The English could not comprehend that Wingina's status so exceedingly surpassed any they could ever hope to have that he would never be the one to make initial contact, much less leave his principal seat to do so." Kathleen Donegan, *Season of Misery: Catastrophe and Colonial Settlement in Early America.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 31.

initiating his 1644 meeting with Governor Winthrop. The Governor's December 12th, 1643 journal account indicates that when Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems informed him of their willingness to "tender…themselves" to Massachusetts Bay, they first visited the governor at his home or headquarters, presumably uninvited. After laying out the terms of the treaty with Winthrop, Cutshamekin and his party "offered to come to our next court to make their acknowledgment" – an agreement that the sachem kept at the March 7th, 1644 meetings of the Boston Court.[34] Cutshamekin's approach and willingness to make a public confirmation of a private arrangement point to the power dynamics at play between the two parties. Though Cutshamekin was a powerful sachem at the time of his 1644 request, his decision to petition the English leaders directly at the Bay Colony headquarters in an acknowledgement of increased Bay Colony control over Massachusett lands and peoples.

Significantly, this posture of supplication is the same that Eliot employs when he visits the sachem two years later. As Eliot explains in *The Day-Breaking*, the ministers embarked upon their missionary journey with confidence and zeal, "having sought God," rather than having sought an invitation from the Algonquian.[35] Once in the Massachusett villages, Eliot and his party approached the Algonquian "Wigwams" with salutations and then proceeded directly to the "principall *Wigwam*" of the village leader.[36] From this account, it seems that Eliot and his party approached Cutshamekin at home, presumably

[34] John Winthrop, *Journal*, 494.
[35] Eliot does not provide extensive details about his approach, but he does indicate that his second journey to Waban was "in the like" as the one he undertook six weeks earlier. Thomas Shepard, "The Day-Breaking" 83, 84. Craig White also uses Eliot's statement as a means of placing the two meetings in comparison. See Craig White, "The Praying Indians' Speeches as Texts of Massachusett Oral Culture." *Early American Literature* 38:3 (2003): 442.
[36] Thomas Shepard "Day-Breaking," 83.

uninvited, where they then proceeded to pray and preach to the sachem and his followers. Cutshamekin likely interpreted the party's approach as an imposition. By mirroring Algonquian diplomatic rituals, Eliot, consciously or not, invoked a history of diplomatic power dynamics with which the sachem was intimately familiar. In making the decision to visit Cutshamekin at home uninvited, and then essentially presenting a request to the sachem in the form of his sermon, Eliot effectively arrives in Neponset as a petitioner.

Eliot likely did not spend too much time dwelling on the best method with which to approach the Algonquian sachem. He saw his visit as religious and nature and his decision to directly approach Cutshamekin at home derived from his strong belief that his journey was sanctioned by both divine and colonial authority. At the same time, it was also in line with Eliot's own personal background as a leading Bay Colony minister and theologian who was used to being in a position of authority. By the time he took his first missionary journey, the 43-year old Puritan had been serving as a minister in Massachusetts Bay for 15 years.[37] His status gave Eliot authority not only in religious matters, but in political ones as well. Though the Bay Colony banned ministers from holding public office, it vested them with significant authority and influence. As the primary interpreters of scripture, ministers wielded influence as they advised political leaders, regulated church governance, and presided within church courts. Eliot's decision to approach Cutshamekin at home was one in line with his spiritual beliefs, social

[37] Eliot had likely converted to Puritanism during his studies at Jesus College, Cambridge. Following graduation, he worked at a private school in Essex under the tutelage of well-known Puritan minister Thomas Hooker. In November of 1631 Eliot arrived in New England and in the summer of 1632 he took a temporary position preaching in the Boston church while the pastor, John Wilson, was away. When Wilson returned, Eliot moved on to serve as the teaching elder at Roxbury – a position he held at the time of his first missionary visit and one he would retain until his retirement in 1688. For a good (albeit dated) timeline of Eliot's life see Ola Winslow's *John Eliot: Apostle to the Indians*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company), 1968.

position, and the political structures of Massachusetts Bay.

Eliot's actions upon his arrival at Cutshamekin's headquarters in 1646 served as further evidence to the sachem that Eliot was coming to him as a supplicant with a formal request. As Eliot explains, following their arrival, he and his fellow missionaries opened with a greeting and a prayer. Both acts served to confirm the fact that the meeting was friendly but formal with the greeting setting the tone and the prayer establishing the significance of the event. As Eliot writes, the Puritans themselves included these rituals to signify that their visit was one of heightened significance. They performed the prayer in English, "partly to let them know that this dutie in hand was serious and sacred."[38] Eliot's public prayer would not have seemed strange within a diplomatic meeting. In the same way that Bay Colony political practices were deeply intertwined with religious ones, Algonquian treaty-making was inextricable from larger Algonquian cosmologies of balance. This interrelationship is evident in Cutshamekin's actions during the 1644 treaty. Following his meeting with Winthrop, Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems presented the governor with "30 fathom of wampom" as a means of confirming their agreement.[39] As several scholars have noted, wampum had both a political and spiritual resonance. Used as a means of "effecting vital social transactions," wampum was believed to be a powerful force signifying a social, political, and spiritual obligation between giver and gifted.[40] Eliot, consciously or not, also invokes a similar transaction in his 1646 meeting. When preparing to leave, Eliot and his fellow missionaries handed out gifts, "giving the

[38] Thomas Shepard "Day-Breaking," 83.
[39] John Winthrop, *Journal*, 494.
[40] Alfred. Cave, *The Pequot War*, 52-53.

children some apples and the men some tobacco and what else we then had at hand."[41] Though Eliot's gifts do not have the same potency as wampum, they still serve to confirm for the Massachusett the diplomatic nature of the missionaries visit.

Despite the fact that Eliot frames his preaching as salvific in intent, the signals invoked by the manner of Puritans' approach, the formality that the ministers gave to the occasion, and their gift giving all coalesced to ensure that Cutshamekin and his fellow Massachusett interpreted the sermon as a diplomatic petition – an assumption that was confirmed by the sermon's content. Eliot explains that the sermon began as "one of our company ran thorough all the principall matter of religion" including the ten commandments, the wrath of God and the salvation offered by Jesus Christ, who was, as Eliot writes, "the only meanes of recovery from sinne and wrath and eternall death." In line with a formulaic salvation sermon, the Puritan ministers ended with a call for salvation in which they forwarded a Christian cosmology creation, proclaiming that God was "the maker of all things," an inclusion that was presumably intended to challenge Massachusett cosmological beliefs.[42] At the end of the sermon, Eliot's listeners faced a choice. Though Eliot had couched his transcript of the sermon in the language of individual salvation, Cutshamekin, the other Massachusett listeners (and likely many of the English in attendance as well) were aware that Algonquian acceptance of salvation larger social and political implications.

---

[41] Eliot's gift giving is a hard action to interpret. In the *Day Breaking*, he only specifically mentions that he gave gifts out at this meeting with Waban, although he does state that the two meetings took place in almost the same manner. My guess is that Eliot likely knew that gift giving was important to the Massachusett, indicated by his bringing of tobacco, and that he brought gifts as a sign of goodwill. However, I would guess that he was unfamiliar the role that gifts like tobacco played as spiritual and political signifiers. Thomas Shepard, "Day-Breaking," 87.

[42] Thomas Shepard, "Day-Breaking," 84.

The signs and symbols surrounding the sermon as well as the content of the sermon itself could not have helped by to remind Cutshamekin again of his 1644 treaty with the Bay Colony. During the public signing of the treaty at the Boston Courthouse, the Massachusetts Bay authorities had required the sachems to "pmise to bee willing from time to time to bee instructed in the knowledge & worship of God" as one pre-requisite to their receiving Bay Colony protection against the Narragansett.[43] Cutshamekin likely interpreted Eliot's visit and the familiar language of the missionary's sermon as a request for increased piety, beyond that which the Massachusett had already agreed to in 1644 – essentially, Cutshamekin saw Eliot's demands as an indication that the English were requiring greater allegiance from the Massachusett without offering any additional favors in return. Additionally, the political conditions between 1644 and 1646 had changed and were such that Cutshamekin was likely predisposed to reject the demands of the missionary. As Cogley explains, because of the 1644 treaty and a later 1645 treaty in which the Narragansett promised not to harm Cutshamekin and his followers, the Massachusett "no longer lived in fear of the Narragansetts" – a fear which had been primary impetus for their willingness to abide by Bay Colony conditions in the first place.[44]

The Diplomatic Function of the Post-Sermon Question

Even though Cutshamekin was in a position to reject Eliot's demands, the sachem still adhered to diplomatic protocol and conceded to discuss Eliot's appeals. The fact that

[43] Nathaniel Shurtleff, ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: Volume II*, 55.
[44] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 40-41.

Cutshamekin interpreted Eliot's visit as diplomatic in nature and his concurrent willingness to treat with the missionaries is most prominently evident in the sachem's responses to a series of questions initiated by Eliot following his sermon. Like the attendant rituals which surround the discursive exchange between the two parties, the particular form in which the questions are asked and answered is shaped by the two men's past histories and their respective positions within New England and Algonquian society. While Eliot instigates his interrogation as a Puritan minister deeply concerned with the spiritual and social formation of "God's Plantation" in New England, Cutshamekin responds to the missionary's prompting from his position as both an experienced sachem dedicated to sustaining the Massachusett and as a cross-cultural diplomat who has undergone a number of post-treaty questionings in the past.

As Eliot explains in *The Day Breaking*, after the sermons at Neponset and Nonantum, the Puritan party engaged the gathered Algonquian in a series of back and forth questions. First asking for clarifying questions from their potential converts and then posing their own questions to the gathered listeners, Eliot and his party intended the post-sermon interrogation as a means by which the gathered Puritans "might skrue by variety of meanes something or other of God into them."[45] In the text, Cutshamekin's responses to Eliot's questions serve as evidence of the sachem's hard-heartedness. Whereas Waban and his followers responded to the post-sermon questions using the language of Christianity provided by the missionaries asking questions like "How might wee come to know Jesus Christ," Cutshamekin and his followers pestered the missionaries with demands seemingly unrelated to the context of the sermon. These

[45] Thomas Shepard, "Day-Breaking," 84.

included inquiries such as "What was the cause of Thunder," the "Ebbing and Flowing of the Sea" and "the wind?[46] While Eliot praised Waban's questions as evidence of divine preparation, he is frustrated by Cutshamekin's questions because they "did not signal a desire to enter into Christian dialogue."[47] Discouraged by the sachem's seeming dismissiveness and questioning his own confident missionary calling, Eliot breaks off the question and answer session and leaves Neponset slighted and dejected.[48]

Scholarly analysis of Eliot's post-sermon question and answer session, a central trope Eliot uses in many of his later missionary writings, has located the practice in terms of its relationship to existing Protestant practices.[49] In construing the questions as spiritual in nature, Eliot himself locates his actions within a long line of Christian proselytizers who interrogate a potential or newly converted practitioner in order to prove the penitent's understanding of spiritual matters. These questions, often part of catechisms and conversion narratives, served as a means of publicly revealing one's private state. Thus they allowed outsider observers, and in this case English readers, to feel as if they had the ability to access and translate the otherwise inaccessible souls of the potential Algonquian converts. While Eliot's questions align him with a larger Protestant history, the specific form his questions take are shaped by his particular location and experience as a New England Puritan minister in early seventeenth-century Massachusetts Bay. As

---

[46] Ibid.
[47] Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons: Praying Indians in Colonial America*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004); 97.
[48] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 51.
[49] In addition to the sources listed, see Kathryn N. Gray, *"'How Might wee come to serve God?': Spaces of Religious Utterance in John Eliot's Indian Tracts." The Seventeenth Century* 24 (1)2009: 74-96; James Ronda, "'We Are Well As We Are': An Indian Critique of Seventeenth-Century Christian Missions." *William and Mary Quarterly* 24:1 (1977): 66-82; and Harold Van Lonkhuyzen, "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians," 396-428.

Sarah Rivett and Kristina Bross have shown, Eliot's questions were crafted and deployed in response to the specific conditions and textual practices of mid-seventeenth century New England. These included the emergence of Baconian empiricism and the recent transatlantic debates of the 1630s and 1640s, in particular the debates surrounding the New England Antinomian Controversy (1636-1637).[50] As Rivett explains, the publication of Eliot's missionary tracts coincides with the "formative decades of England's Scientific Revolution." Eliot's questions attempt to "conjoin…the enigma of grace and Baconian procedures of natural science such that a holy empiricism of sorts became a hallmark of Puritan practices of faith." Addressing the transatlantic context of Eliot's texts, Bross points out that Eliot's questions were profoundly shaped by the Antinomian Controversy and crafted with the transatlantic circulation of that controversy in mind.[51]

Though Eliot's questions are based in his religious practice, they are also shaped by his past experience as a political representative in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. One of Eliot's most prominent roles outside of the pulpit was that of a juror in Anne Hutchinson's church trial. The recorded transcripts of the Hutchinson trial show that both the civil and church trial consisted of a series of interrogations – interrogations which the Bay Colony leaders hoped would bring the hidden to light, or as Eliot charges during the trial, would force Hutchinson to "express her selfe playnly."[52] While the interrogators hoped that Hutchinson would publicly confess her heterodoxy and then face the

[50] Sarah Rivett, *The Science of the Soul in Colonial New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011), 128-129.
[51] Kristina Bross articulates the relationship between the Antinomian Controversy, transatlantic discourse, and Eliot's post-sermon questions more fully in her chapter "Algonquians and Antinomians: 'Spiritual Questions' and Dissent." Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones*, 84-111.
[52] David D. Hall Ed. "A Report of the Trial of Mrs. Anne Hutchinson before the Church in Boston." *The Antinomian Controversy,1636-1638: A Documentary History. Second Edition* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990) 381.

necessary punishment required to rehabilitate her back into society, Hutchinson responded with questions of her own – questions that often challenged the authority of the Bay Colony establishment in their appeal to scriptural authority as a higher power than that held by the magistrates and ministers.[53] Angered at Hutchinson's unwillingness to confess and repent, Eliot and the other authorities became increasingly accusatory in their questioning.[54] The result being that the trial reports and the related documentation surrounding the Hutchinson trial that circulated among English readers generally placed the Puritan orthodoxy in an unfavorable light. As Bross posits, Eliot deliberately fashioned his post-sermon missionary questions to his potential converts in an attempt to redeem the Bay Colony's image abroad by emphasizing the success of the Bay Colony's early forays into Indian missions.[55] Vested in both the Antinomian Trial and the development of the New England Algonquian mission, Eliot's questions are closely tied to larger colonial discursive practices which were carefully curated to achieve both spiritual and political ends.

While the questions can reasonably be traced to Eliot's shaping influence, they also point to Cutshamekin's own past experience and religious practice. Though penned by Eliot, Cutshamekin's actions and understanding play an irrevocable role in determining the contours of Eliot's first post-sermon question and answer session.

---

[53] Michael P. Winship, *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2005), 111.

[54] Repentance and public confession were an integral part of the New England Puritan communal and spiritual life. As Hall points out, confession, the ritual of repentance allowed the Puritans "a patterned means of connecting the natural and the social worlds to supernatural power." In her failure to confess, Hutchinson breaks the ritual process and upsets communal order. David D. Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New* England (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989), 168.

[55] Bross writes that Eliot used his questions to present "Praying Indian Christianity and culture…as metonymic of colonial Christian and gender practice: a 'native' New England faith is proffered as proof of the efficacy of the New England Way." Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones*, 110.

Returning back to the 1644 treaty, we can find evidence that the sachem had previous experience with post-sermon, or post-treaty, question and answer sessions. When Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems publically declared themselves to be under the jurisdiction of the Bay Colony at the March 8, 1644 meeting, the process consisted of two-parts: first, a formal statement, presumably read aloud, that declared the terms of the agreement which was followed by a session in which Bay Colonial officials asked "Certaine Questions" of the sachems intended as part of the process by which Bay Colony officials hoped to ensure that the sachems "understand the articles."[56] Like Eliot's post-sermon questions, the post-treaty questions clearly had Protestant roots. The Bay Colony officials focus their questions on assessing the sachems' willingness to follow Christian, specifically Puritan, moral conduct. This includes demanding whether or not the sachems would be willing "Not to swear falsely," "Not to do any unnecessary worke on ye Saboth day," to honor their parents & supiors," etc.[57] From the Bay Colony's perspective, these questions were intended to gain a sense of the Indians' ability and willingness to properly perform Christian civility as a condition of Bay Colony protection. Yet, despite the Protestant framework, a close look at the questions reveals that in 1644, like in 1646, Cutshamekin's presence and knowledge shaped the form by which the questions were both asked and answered.

The first evidence of Cutshamekin's influence is evident in the Bay Colony's decision to include these questions as part of the submission process in the first place. Though both the 1643 treaty with Soconoco and Pumham and the 1644 treaty with

[56] John Winthrop, *Journal*, 499.
[57] Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, Ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: Volume II*, 56.

Cutshamekin employ identical written statements, Bay Colony officials only include the question and answer session in their meeting with Cutshamekin. The omission of the question and answer session in the earlier treaty was likely one of practicality. As minor sachems, Soconoco and Pumham did not have the same established relationships with Bay Colony leaders as Cutshamekin – a relationship facilitated by both Cutshamekin's status and his command of the English language. In contrast to Cutshamekin, the signers of the 1643 treaty had a limited command of the English language, a fact reinforced by the Bay Colony's reference to the presence of English interpreter Benedict Arnold.[58] As a result of Cutshamekin's English proficiency, his experience with numerous prior treaties between the English and the Algonquian, and his diplomatic sagacity, Bay Colony officials either felt comfortable asking additional questions or felt that the questions were a necessary means of clarifying the sachem's intentions.

In either case, Cutshamekin and the other sachems in attendance used the formal, public nature of the question and answer session as a deliberately calculated means of protecting their right to continue Algonquian practice. Though the sachems provide responses that appease their English questioners, each response slightly adapts the language of the question in order to explicitly spell out additional rights for the Algonquian signers. For example, in the first question, the Bay Colony officials, in line with the scriptural commandment found in Deuteronomy 6:13, ask if the sachems are willing to "worship ye onely true God, wch made heaven & earth, & not to blaspheme him." When relying their answer back to the English, the sachems change the wording of

[58] As the *Records* indicate, the agreement with Soconoco and Pumham was signed "after clear interpretation of every perticuler by their owne interpreter, Benedict Arnold." Ibid., 41.

the question. They reply that they are willing to "*reverence* ye God…and to *speake well* of him" because, they see that the English God "doth better to ye English than othr gods do to others."[59] Through their slight but significant rewording, the sachems agree only to respect the English god, but not to worship him – an important distinction that corresponds to Algonquian cosmological understandings. For the Southern New England Algonquian, the world was full of power, often termed manitou. Manitou could reside in people, animals, nature, or function as a separate spiritual being. As Evan Haefeli explains, "Manitou was part of life, not above it."[60] The Algonquian maintained Manitou through proper performance. Performing prayers, rituals, fasts, and other ceremonies allowed them to gain Manitou or the favor of beings imbued with Manitou. A world out of balance, as evidenced by wars, suffering, diseases, etc. was an indication that the proper ceremonies had not been performed to the proper Manitou.[61] In agreeing to reverence the Christian God because of the favor that he has bestowed upon the English, Cutshamekin and the sachems consent to include God as one source of Manitou among the many other sources already present in Algonquian cosmology. Through their slight turn of phrase, the Algonquians avoid acquiescing to the Puritans's request that the Algonquian accept monotheism. Rather, they craft their response to locate Christianity with pre-existing Algonquian practice.

The sachems extend this process throughout the session, applying it not only to religious questions, extending the application to dictate not only Algonquian post-

[59] Ibid., 56. Emphasis added.
[60] Evan Haefeli, "On First Contact and Apotheosis: Manitou and Men in North America." *Ethnohistory* 54:3 (2007), 421.
[61] Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009), 31-32.

performance, but that of the English as well. When asked by Bay Colony authorities if they would be willing "To suffer their children to learn to reade Gods word, yt they may learn to know God aright, & worship him in his owne way," they again respond with stipulations. According to the sachems, Algonquian children can be instructed in Christianity under two conditions. First, the children's instruction will occur only "as opportunity will serve" and, second, only as long as the "English live among ym."[62] In accordance with the treaty, Cutshamekin and the other sachems realize the necessity of cultivating English favor. However, instead of providing the Bay Colony authorities carte blanche authorization to instruct their children, the sachems retain the right to determine the length and extent of English education. Further, the sachems only grant the English educational access as long as the English are living among them – meaning that the access to instruction is limited by the physical location of the participants. In this deft linguistic manipulation, the sachems transform the Bay Colony's original intentions for the post-treaty question process. Rather than having the questions serve as a means of providing public proof to the Bay Colony officials that the sachems understand the treaty, they used the question and answer process as a means of continuing to discuss the treaty's terms and publicly record their own stipulations.

In his 1646 meeting with Eliot, Cutshamekin approaches Eliot's post-sermon questions using a similar approach. Responding to Eliot's sermon as a petition, Cutshamekin's questions are a means of interrogating the terms of the request. When Eliot opens the floor for questions after his sermon, Cutshamekin demands that Eliot and his fellow missionaries explain several natural phenomena: the cause of "thunder," of the

[62] Ibid.

ebbing and flowing of the sea," and "the wind." Though the precise intentions behind Cutshamekin's demands ultimately remain obscure, we can posit that the aim behind these questions was more than merely reflective of the sachem's desire to know the European scientific origins of natural phenomena. Within a Southern New England understanding of the world, Manitou was strongly tied to natural elements, particularly prominent sites of Manitou included thunder, the sea, and the wind. As Kathleen Bragdon writes, these natural elements did not merely indicate power on their own, but were directly linked with formidable spirit beings. Thunder was an indication of the presence of the thunderbird, "a sacred and beautiful bird in many Algonquian cosmologies." The counterpart to the Thunderbird was "the giant horned or antlered, under(water)) world serpent" – a powerful creature that rendered the sea a liminal place. As Bragdon explains, the two beings though often antagonistic to one another, were "halves of the same unity."[63] Together, the two beings (one in the sky and one in the sea) represented the means by which the spiritual and physical worlds retained balance.

On the surface level, at least, Cutshamekin's questions seem to be an attempt to engage Eliot in a discussion about Algonquian cosmological beliefs – a response presumably prompted by Eliot's own discussion of cosmology.[64] However, in light of Cutshamekin's political experience and the surrounding circumstances of the 1646 meeting, these questions take on diplomatic significance. As the seventeenth-century English colonist William Wood records, thunder and the "ebbing and flowing of the

[63] Ibid., 187-188.
[64] Craig White first points out this connection writing that "when Cutshamequin's band asked 'the cause of Thunder' and other phenomena, they may have been urging Eliot to relate origin stories such as might have been exchanged if their guests had been visiting Indians." Craig White, "The Praying Indians' Speeches as Texts of Massachusett Oral Culture." *Early American Literature* 3, no. 3 (2003): 442

seas," were not only associated with powerful Manitou, but with the arrival of the Europeans in New England. In his 1634 *New England's Prospect,* Wood includes a story from among the New England Algonquian who recount their first encounter with arriving Europeans. As Wood writes, his native sources claim to have interpreted the arriving colonial boat as a "walking Island," taking "the Mast to be a Tree, the Saile white Clouds, and the discharging of Ordinance for Lightning and Thunder."[65] While several scholars have helpfully contextualized both the merits and the limitations of Wood's account, the tale posits a clear tie between thunder, the sea, and the arriving Europeans. This correlation does not mean that the Algonquian took the arriving settlers to be gods, but rather that the "natives (correctly) recognized the Europeans as dangerous and powerful."[66] In asking Eliot and his fellow missionaries about these specific elements, Cutshamekin is demanding that they articulate the relationship and role that the European colonists play within the existing Algonquian cosmological system.

By commencing his interrogation of Eliot with questions about "thunder," "the ebbing and flowing of the sea," and "the wind," Cutshamekin mirrors the interrogation process used by the Bay Colony officials during the 1644 treaty. Whereas Winthrop and the other leaders initiated their question session by asking if the sachems would be willing to "worship ye onely true God, wch made heaven & earth" – essentially requiring the sachems to subordinate Algonquian cosmologies to English ones – Cutshamekin asks a similar request of the English. Yet, significantly Cutshamekin inverts the terms of his question by requiring Eliot and his fellow missionaries to locate English cosmologies

[65] William Wood, *New England's Prospect* (London: By Tho. Cotes, for John Bellamie, 1634), Part II Chapter IX, 87.
[66] Evan Haefeli, "On First Contact," 434.

within Algonquian ones. Essentially, Cutshamekin's 1646 questions asks the missionaries to articulate the relationship between an English belief system (like the one described in the proceeding sermon) and an Algonquian cosmology of power (as evidenced in the Thunder, the sea, and the wind)? This demand is in line with Brook's description of "common pot" diplomacy. As she explains, in the wake of colonialism, native communities asked themselves "how to incorporate the 'beings' from Europe into Native space and how to maintain the network of relations in the wake of the consequences – including disease and resource depletion – that Europeans brought to Algonquian shores."[67] More than merely inquisitive or dismissive, Cutshamekin's questions require Eliot to first articulate the correlations, both spiritual and political, among the Algonquian and the Puritan systems before he will agree to further participate in the ever-encroaching English system.

The Education of a Minister

As Eliot's reaction to the sachem indicates, the Puritan minister is not ready to provide answers to the questions that the sachem demands. Following the 1646 meeting, Eliot left Neponset frustrated with what he took to be Cutshamekin's dismissive response and discouraged by his lack of missionary success. As Bross writes, when Eliot relates the account of his early missionary journeys in *The Day Breaking*, presumably written

[67] As Brooks explains, this system of balance was behind all European/Indigenous treaties in the first centuries of colonization. She writes that, "A central question that arose in Native communities throughout the northeast had to do with how to incorporate the 'beings' from Europe into Native space and how to maintain the network of relations in the wake of the consequences – including disease and resource depletion – that Europeans brought to Algonquian shores. This question would play an important role in the conversation among Native leaders in the northeast for four centuries, and that conversation would become manifest through one of the most powerful 'beings' brought over from Europe: the written word." Lisa Brooks, *The Common Pot*, 7.

several weeks after his meeting with Cutshamekin, the "poor reception [Eliot] received at Dorchester Mill [i.e. Neponset] seems still to rankle."[68] Yet, Eliot's actions in the wake of Cutshamekin's post-sermon questioning reveal that the minster walked away from his first missionary journey with more than just a sense of defeat – rather, the first-time missionary seems to have walked away with a nascent understanding of Algonquian diplomacy, or at least awareness of his need for increased learning. This nascent knowledge as well as his relationship with Cutshamekin would continue to develop in the years that followed in which Cutshamekin's teachings would serve as a significant guide for Eliot in his subsequent missions to the Massachusett and the surrounding Algonquian in the years to come.

Prior to his meeting with Cutshamekin, the few references we have regarding Eliot's relationship with the neighboring Algonquian seem to indicate the future missionary had relatively little by way of practice in cross-cultural diplomacy.[69] In large part, his experience paralleled that held by the majority of the Massachusetts Bay clergy – while he acknowledged that Indians missions were a part of Massachusetts Bay's charter, he saw missions as an event for a future time. In a September 1633 letter Eliot wrote to the wealthy English antiquarian Sir Simonds d'Ewes requesting funding "to erect a school of learning" in New England, Eliot assures his benefactor that his money

---

[68] Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones*, 93.
Though it is not clear exactly when Eliot recorded the letter that made up *The Day Breaking*, it seems likely that it was written after the conclusion of the last described meeting in the tract, the "fourth meeting" which took place on December 9, 1646. See Thomas Shepard, "The Day-Breaking," 99.

[69] There is an older strain of scholarship on Eliot that claims he began learning Wampanoag before his first missionary journey, indicating a pre-existing desire to preach among the Algonquian (for example, see Ola Winslow, *John Eliot: 'Apostle to the Indians,'* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), 93-94. Richard Cogley counters these claims by showing that Eliot did not start to learn Wampanoag until after his second missionary visit to Waban in November, 1646. As Cogley writes "The natives' response to this sermon led him to began his linguistic training. Eliot's commitment to the mission followed, rather than preceded, the sermon at Nonantum" Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 51.

would be safe because the colonists were "at good peace with the...natives." Eliot's letter suggests that the two parties have established close trading ties in which the Indians "doe gladly intertaine vs & give vs possession, for we are as walls to them, from their blody enemise, & they are sensible of it & also they have many more comforts by vs." Of course, at the time of his writing, the local Massachusetts Indians were in the midst of a devastating epidemic caused by imported European diseases – a factor that likely contributed to their "good peace." In his closing lines Eliot echoes the language of the Massachusetts Bay charter by assuring D'Ewes that "I trust, in Gods time [the Indians] shall larne Christ."[70]

In the only other pre-1646 reference we have to Eliot's interaction with the Algonquian, Eliot again approaches Indian relations from his background as an Englishman. In a November 27, 1634 journal entry Governor Winthrop discusses a sermon Eliot preached against a series of treaties forged by Massachusetts Bay leaders between themselves, the Narragansett, and the Pequot. In the aftermath of English trader John Stone's death, Governor Thomas Dudley and Deputy Governor Winthrop held secret, separate talks with Pequot and Narragansett leaders as they attempted to bring Stone's murderers to justice and maintain trade relationships with both parties at the same time. Winthrop and Dudley made the deal without consenting the larger Massachusetts Bay community – a fact that frustrated Eliot. In response, Winthrop writes that Eliot had "taken the occasion, in a sermon, to speak of the peace made with the Pekods, and to lay some blame upon [the ministry] for proceeding therein, without consent of the people,

[70]John Eliot, "September 18, 1633 Letter to Sir Simonds D'Ewes." *Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629 – 1638.* Ed. Everett Emerson (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976), 106.

and for other failings (as he conceived)."[71] Though the details are sparse and they come from Winthrop's hand, Eliot's response to the treaty seems to indicate his adherence to a decidedly English Puritan point of view. His desire for transparency likely stemmed from his frustration with the secrecy of the English government and a perhaps prescient fear that the Massachusetts Bay political authorities were gaining too much power.

At the same time at this incident reveals Eliot's desire for transparency, it also exposes his ignorance about local Algonquian tribal practices and trade relationships. While Eliot's sermon takes a stance that is clearly influenced by English political history, Dudley and Winthrop facilitated the treaty with both parties using their knowledge of local Algonquian kinship ties and trade relationships. Treating separately with the Pequot and the Narragansett – two parties at war with one another – the Massachusetts Bay leaders received wampum, beaver and otter skins, as well as a promise from the Pequot to turn over the two men responsible for Stone's death in exchange for peace, friendship, and trade.[72] In fact, Winthrop later draws on his detailed experience in political affairs and tribal relations to justify his censure of Eliot's sermon. Following Eliot's sermon, the Bay Colony leadership sent three ministers to convince Eliot of his error. As Winthrop explains in his journal, the ministers brought Eliot to contrition by describing the political details of the treaty. Eliot subsequently acknowledged his mistake by admitting that transparency was "for a peace only, (whereby the people were not to be engaged in a war,)" and that the "magistrates might conclude *plebe inconsulto*" in cases where war is eminent.[73] Though limited, the details of this case seem to confirm that Eliot's primary

[71] John Winthrop, *Journal*, 136-137.
[72] Ibid., 133-135.
[73] Ibid., 151.

concern in the 1630s was growing an English Puritan colony, rather than learning about Indian culture and customs for the sake of future missions.

Despite his initial deficiencies, Eliot seems to have gained an increasingly deft awareness of cross-cultural diplomacy following his 1646 meeting with Cutshamekin. The evidence for which is twofold. First, Eliot's growing knowledge is revealed in part by the missionary success he achieved as a result of his meeting with Waban and the other Massachusett residing at Nonantum in October 1646. Following his meeting with Cutshamekin, Eliot seems to have begun to grasp the hierarchies of Indian social order. Rather than attempting to persuade the most powerful sachem, Cutshamekin, to commit to Christian practice, he turned instead to a lesser leader, Waban, who had more to gain from a closer alliance with the Massachusetts Bay Colony. His efforts were a success. Waban and his fellow Massachusett at Nonantum were receptive to the Puritan message and desired that Eliot and his followers return for future visits – a request to which the Puritan ministers gleefully obliged. Waban and his followers, who likely had their own diplomatic reasons for joining with Eliot, continued to encourage Eliot's visits and eventually moved themselves closer to Puritan settlements and agreed to follow a code of conduct intended to enforce performance of Christian civility.[74]

Apart from his on-the-ground success, Eliot's developing awareness of cross-cultural diplomacy is also evident through a comparison of the language that Eliot uses to characterize his emerging Algonquian mission before and after his meeting with Cutshamekin. Rather than relating his missionary attempts as solely spiritual in nature,

[74] O'Brien writes, "In peddling his message, Eliot quickly grasped that persuading Indians to listen would be most effectively achieved by working through the Indian social order." Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees*, 28.

Eliot begins to echo the perspectives forwarded by Cutshamekin in their first meeting as he increasingly describes his mission in terms of its cross-cultural diplomatic aims. On September 24, 1647, almost exactly twelve months after his meeting with Cutshamekin, Eliot writes an updated account of the mission which was included in Thomas Shepard's 1648 missionary tract, *The Clear Sun-Shine of the Gospel*. Rather than framing his first encounter with Cutshamekin as a meeting resulting from his "having sought God" and which was "intended to make known the things of their peace to them" as he had in 1646, Eliot's 1647 account acknowledges that his initial meeting with Cutshamekin was an attempt "to convince, bridle, restrain, and civilize [the Massachusett], and also to humble them."[75] In this phrasing, Eliot reiterates the perspective of Cutshamekin who, from the start, had been aware that the Bay Colony's missionary visits were political and predatory in nature. Bay Colony leaders and missionaries demanded a particular performance from the Massachusett at the same time as they attempted to place increased constraints and restrictions upon the Indians who wanted to be allied in any way with the English colonists.

While it is clear that Cutshamekin was not the only factor contributing to Eliot's changed perspective on the nature of the Indian mission, Eliot's 1647 account acknowledges the fact that the Massachusett sachem was aware of the political and diplomatic nature of the Puritan mission from the start. Following his admission that his early missionary meeting was an attempt to "civilize" the Massachusett, Eliot provides further details to his readers. He explains that he "first began with the Indians of

[75] Thomas Shepard, *The Day-Breaking*, 83 and Thomas Shepard, "The Clear Sun-Shine of the Gospel Breaking Forth Upon the Indians in New-England." (1648), *The Eliot Tracts.* Ed. Michael P Clark (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003) 124.

Noonanetum, as you know; those of *Dorchester Mill* not regarding any such thing: but the better sort of them perceiving how acceptable this was to the *English,* both to Magistrates, and all the good people, it pleased God to step in and bow their hearts to desire to be taught to know God…"[76] In this somewhat convoluted statement, Eliot cedes the fact that Cutshamekin, and the others residing at Dorchester Mill, initially resisted Eliot's message because they realized that it was primarily intended as a means of gaining English favor rather than a message purely concerned with the state of Algonquian souls. In alluding to those "better sort," Eliot recognizes the fact that Waban, his followers at Nonantum, and other initial converts had more to gain from English favor and as such were more willing to "bow their hearts" to English demands.

The tone of these words makes it unlikely that Eliot intended them as praise for the Massachusett sachem. Yet the effect of Eliot's changed perspective coupled with his direct reference to Cutshamekin serves as his acknowledgement, however begrudgingly, of the sachem's foresight and continued influence among the Massachusett. In subsequent writings, Eliot continues to provide clues regarding the nature of Cutshamekin's influence as the relationship between the two men develops during the early years of the mission. Despite his clear antagonism for the sachem, Eliot's references to Cutshamekin indicate that the missionary was aware that he was highly dependent on the sachem's approval and instruction if he hoped to create a successful Indian mission. Cutshamekin, for his part, was also aware that the increasing growth of colonial power coupled with the rising number of Massachusett who were being drawn to Christianity meant that he too was dependent on Eliot for the survival of the Massachusett. Sometime

[76] Thomas Shepard, "Clear Sun-Shine," 124.

in 1647, the sachem agreed to become a part of Eliot's developing Praying Indian community. As Neal Salisbury posit, for Cutshamekin this move "was the only means of retaining authority within his shattered community."[77]

The Praying Sachem: Sustaining Algonquian Diplomacy

After Cutshamekin's decided to align himself more closely with Eliot, Eliot records a number of instances in which the sachem piously performs Christian ceremonies and rituals. In fact, Cutshamekin's performance of Christianity is so central to Eliot's missionary account that he makes the sachem's public confession a prominent set-piece in *The Clear Sun-Shine.* In focusing on Cutshamekin's performance of piety, Eliot seems to be attempting to prove to his English readers that the once-defiant sachem has now become a compliant convert. However, Eliot's narration tells a slant tale. Though Cutshamekin does seem to have performed Christian rituals, analysis of his performance in light of continued adherence to sachemic practices indicate that he retained his status among his fellow Massachusett and among the regional sachems as well. In essence, Cutshamekin's conversion was not necessarily evidence of capitulation, but rather serves to illustrate the fact that the cross-cultural diplomat was continuing the practices he had enacted throughout his life.

One instance in which Eliot attempts to showcase Cutshamekin's piety is when he describes a third set of public questions for his English readers. Repeating the format of his earlier tracts, Eliot again transcribes a question and answer sessions that he enacted among the Massachusetts as a means of verifying the success of his proselytization

[77] Neal Salisbury, "Red Puritans," 36.

efforts.[78] Clearly a feather in his cap, Eliot includes Cutshamekin's question to indicate to his English readers that, as a result of his missionary efforts, the powerful sachem has now been brought to the knowledge of Christian salvation. The sachem's transformation is evident in his new use of Christian dialogue. Rather than referencing Algonquian cosmology, the sachem now uses the language of Christianity, and of sin in particular, to ask Eliot about the state of his heart. The sachem begins his question by describing how he is plagued by his sinful heart, which is now "more sinful than ever it was before." Bemoaning the fact that he is not become less sinful as a result of his Christian practice, but rather more, Cutshamekin asks Eliot "whether is this a sin or not?"[79] In this question Cutshamekin acknowledges to Eliot that his knowledge of Christianity has produced within him an awareness of sin – something that he previously lacked. This new awareness makes him realize how sinful he was and still remains. His question for Eliot essentially asks: "Is it sinful to still be as sinful as I was now that I know how sinful I was?" Confirming the transformation from resistant sachem to repentant convert, Eliot glosses the question by affirming the sachem's sincerity, explaining that, "This question could not be learned from the English, nor did it seem a coyned feigned thing, but a really matter gathered from the experience of his own heart, and from an inward observation of himself."[80] For Eliot, the sachem's awareness of sin signals a significant first step in any Puritan conversion process. As part of the process of salvation, a potential convert must

[78] In this instance, Eliot begins with a disclaimer explaining that he has forgotten the majority of the questions asked over the past year, but he is able to recount a few. While Eliot likely employs this convention to underscore to his readers the sheer number of questions he has been asked by the eager converts, the effect of this statement also reminds us of the narrator's influence in the formation and response to the recorded questions.
[79] Thomas Shepard, "Clear Sun-Shine," 129.
[80] Ibid.

express an awareness of their need for salvation, or saving grace, which requires awareness of one's extreme depravity.

Yet, if we contextualize the question in terms of the sachem's past history and an understanding Massachusett cosmology, the question also serves as evidence that even after conversion, Cutshamekin continues to dialogue with Eliot about the relationship between Algonquian and English systems. Though Cutshamekin's question may be an acknowledgement of saving grace, it is also, at the same time, an interrogation of the effectiveness of Christian salvation. By locating the question within a Massachusett cosmology with prioritized the close ties between Manitou and humanity we can see evidence that his question is a means of demanding why the Manitou present in the Christian God is not working for himself and his people. With almost palpable desperation, Cutshamekin's question asks Eliot, "Why are things not getting better now that I am diligently performing Christian rituals?" Breaking down the question a bit more, we can see that the first part of the question evokes the time before he committed to joining Eliot's community: "Before I knew God…I thought I was well." Yet, instead of gaining Manitou after his conversion, Cutshamekin feels that he is losing strength: "my heart is but very little better then it was, and I am afraid it will be as bad againe as it was before."[81] Though cloaked in the language of Christianity, the question is also evidence that the sachem continues to be skeptical about the effectiveness of Christianity in relationship to Algonquian cosmology. "Why," he seems to be asking the missionary, "is it not working?"

Eliot's account of Cutshamekin's post-conversion words and performances cannot

[81] Ibid.

paper over the fact that Cutshamekin sustained his status and responsibilities as a powerful sachem even after his 1647 conversion. In a 1648 letter, Eliot briefly references the fact that Cutshamekin retained significant influence among his followers and tributaries. He writes that, "Our *Cutshamoquin* hath some subjects in *Marthas* Vineyard, and they hearing of his praying to God, some of them doe the like there."[82] The influential sachem also continued to maintain his authority among the other sachems. In 1651, four years after Cutshamekin aligned himself with Eliot's Praying Indians, the sachem is still called upon by the Algonquian and English alike to serve as a diplomatic envoy. As Eliot explains in his 1651 tract, *Strength Out of Weakness*, Cutshamekin was absent from the community because he "was in the Countrey neere *Narragansett,* about appeasing some strife among some *Sachems.*"[83] While Eliot does not tell us the nature of the strife, it is possible that Cutshamekin was again working on the continued land dispute between the Narragansett, the Pawtuxet, the Shawomet, and the English that had led to the 1644 treaty between the Massachusett and Massachusetts Bay in the first place.[84]

---

[82] Edward Winslow, "The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians in New England" (1649). *The Eliot Tracts.* Ed. Michael P Clark. (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 152.
While Eliot may have included this allusion to Martha's Vineyard out of a sense of rivalry with Mayhew, it is also very plausible that Cutshamekin's subjects were residing in the area. While the area around Martha's Vineyard is not traditionally Massachusett territory, the limited information we have about the extent of Massachusett networks makes it plausible that Cuthsamekin had subjects in the area (be they fellow Massachusett or tributaries). As I noted in earlier, at the time of the 1644 treaty, Cutshamekin had several tributaries (see note 28) and he also seems to have had some sort of agreement with the Pawtuxet and the Shawomet, tribes located in present-day Connecticut.

[83] Henry Whitfield, "Strength Out of Weakness: Or a Glorious Manifestation of the Further Progresse of the Gospel Among the Indians." (1652). *The Eliot Tracts.* Ed. Michael P Clark. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 228.

[84] Eliot mentions the fact that Cutshamekin and the other sachem's met with Gorton after their proceedings. According to the *Narragansett Historical Record*, among other sources, the land dispute that had contributed to the 1644 treaty between the Massachusett and Massachusetts Bay flared up again in the summer of 1651 when Massachusetts Bay received word back from an English court that their land claims to Gorton's land (via the Pawtuxet and Shawomet sachems) had been dismissed. James N. Arnold Ed., *Narragansett Historical Register* Volume II. (Hamilton, R.I, The Narragansett Historical Publishing Company, 1883), 234.

While Cutshamekin's participation in the talks illustrate his continued prevalence among the sachems, Eliot's actions in Cutshamekin's absence also reinforce the fact that Eliot himself continued to be aware of, and potentially threatened by, the sachem's sustained influence over his Massachusett converts. Eliot surreptitiously alludes to the fact that Cutshamekin's 1651 absence provided him with the perfect opportunity to hold elections among his Praying Indian followers in order to form the Praying Indian town of Natick. The elections, intended to determine a new "civill order and Government," served as the necessary first step in Eliot's plan to form a Praying Indian community. In August of 1651, Eliot explains that he gathered together his converts from both Nonantum and Neponset so that he might "forme them….into a visible Church-state." For guidance in this new commonwealth, Eliot instructed his Indian subjects "that they should looke onlely into the Scriptures, and out of the word of God fetch all their Wisedome, Lawes, and Government."[85] Eliot justifies his attempts to form them into a government as a necessary next step for a people whom he claims previously existed under a "scattered course of life." Of course, the fact that he waited to hold elections until Cutshamekin – the clearly established leader of the community was away – is tellingly convenient.

A conversation between Eliot and Cutshamekin recorded in the 1650 tract, *The Light Appearing More and More* makes it clear that Eliot's decision to hold elections in the sachem's absence was more than just a convenience. As Eliot explains, in the exchange, Cutshamekin "openly contested with me against our proceeding to make a Town." According to Eliot, Cutshamekin's opposition to the formation of a Praying Town stemmed from his fear that "Religion will make a great change" to existing

[85] Henry Whitfield, "Strength Out of Weakness," 226, 228.

Algonquian structures in part because it will curtail the sachem's powers, or in Eliot's words, it will "cut…off [the sachems] from their former tyranny." Eliot belittles Cutshamekin's concerns regarding social upheaval by explaining to his readers that sachem rule was akin to dictatorship in which the sachem's "hold their people in absolute servitude" and extract "tribute" according to their whims. The result of the servitude for Eliot was that the Massachusett were "*in great awe of their Sachem.*" Christianity, on the other hand, gives the Praying Indians a voice in that it allows them a framework within which to "admonish" the sachem to follow God's laws and at the same time as it diminishes the necessity of paying tribute to the sachem.[86]

However, hidden behind Eliot's heavy-handed narration, the text provides the more likely reason that Cutshamekin was opposed to the establishment of a Praying Town – his concern for Massachusett stability and Algonquian sovereignty.[87] As Eliot writes, Cutshamekin protests against Eliot's proposal to form a Praying Indian town on the grounds that "all the *Sachems* in the Countrey were against it." As Eliot writes, the Puritan missionaries desire to form a Praying Town stems from more than just missionary zeal, but it also serves as "a general way to be thought of to instruct all the Indians **in all parts.**"[88] The establishment of Indian polities controlled by the English would provide additional means of controlling Indian bodies and spaces thereby facilitating the spread of English civilization, colonization, and Christianity. Cutshamekin, and the other sachems,

---

[86] Henry Whitefield, "The Light Appearing more and more towards the Perfect Day." *The Eliot Tracts.* Ed. Michael P Clark. (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 202.
[87] Another important factor in Cutshamekin's opposition to Natick was likely the fact that it removed him from his land. Harold W. Van Lonkhuyzen makes this point in his chapter "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians: Acculturation, Conversion, and Identity at Natick, Massachusetts, 1646-1730" in *New England Encounters: Indians and Euroamericans, ca. 1600*-1850. Ed. Alden T. Vaughan, Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1999. 210.
[88] Henry Whitefield, "The Light Appearing more and more," 202. Emphasis added.

clearly deciphered the latent motives behind Eliot's proposal. As Eliot writes the sachems "were much troubled lest the Court of Commissioners should take some course to teach them to pray to God."[89] Experienced in English practice, the sachems knew that any English plans for further Christian instruction went hand in hand with increased English control.

Again, as earlier Cutshamekin does not take Eliot's 1650 proposal for increased subjection lightly. Instead, as Eliot relates, the sachem "openly contested with me against our proceedings to make a Town." Sensing the tension and as a result of their sustained respect for Cutshamekin, "all the other Indians were filled with fear, their countenance grew pale, and most of them slunk away." Realizing his power is being challenged, Eliot responds by chastising Cutshamekin, with "bold resolution" as he again justifies his actions by aligning them as spiritual in nature and not political: Eliot tells Cutshamekin, "it was Gods work I was about, and he [God] was with me, and I feared not him." In response to Eliot's show of force, Cutshamekin's "spirit shrunk and fell before me." As Eliot later claims, Cutshamekin's response stems from the sachem's loss of public puissance in which, "they [the Massachusett] account him that shrinks to be conquered, and the other to conquer; which alas, I knew not."[90] Eliot frames this episode as proof that he has "conquered" the sachem by diminishing his status among his Massachusett followers.

Though Eliot waited until Cutshamekin was absent to take hold the initial elections for Natick, Cutshamekin's presence was still prominently felt. As Eliot writes,

[89] Ibid., 202.
[90] Henry Whitefield, "The Light Appearing," 203.

"Before that day came, even then when it was appointed for *Cutshamoquin,* the chiefe *Sachem,* and therefore chosen the chiefe (for hee is constant in profession, though doubtfull in respect of the throughnesse of his heart)."[91] In this convoluted phrasing, Eliot acknowledges the fact that even though he tried to work around the sachem by waiting until he was absent, Cutshamekin's followers still chose their sachem to serve as their leader. Though Eliot is attempting to establish a "new" system of governance, he cannot evade the influence of Cutshamekin and the power of the "old" system. By continuing to instruct Eliot and the English in the ways of Algonquian practice, Cutshamekin and the Massachusett worked to ensure that Natick was, from its inception, "an Indian place."[92]

Coda: *The Christian Commonwealth* and the Transatlantic Cutshamekin

As the progression of Eliot's references to Cutshamekin reveal, the sachem and the missionary had a long history of conflict and cooperation. In fact, it was through conflict that cooperation occurred. Cutshamekin's willingness to challenge, to educate, and to negotiate with Eliot on both spiritual and political matters led the missionary to adopt gradually, if somewhat haphazardly, Cutshamekin's Algonquian practices as part of his own. Relatedly, Eliot's repeated descriptions of his antagonism towards the sachem reveal the power and influence that Cutshamekin had over both Eliot and his Massachusett followers. Though the process of exchange between the two men is often obscured by Eliot's narrative voice, between their first missionary meeting in 1646 and Cutshamekin's death in 1651, the Massachusett sachem played a significant role in shaping Eliot's

[91] Henry Whitfield, "Strength Out of Weakness," 226, 228.
[92] Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees,* 11.

thoughts, actions, and writings.[93]

Importantly, Cutshamekin's influence continues to be evident in Eliot's writings even after the sachem was no longer around to prod and persuade his Puritan counterpart. Sometime in the months following Cutshamekin's death and around the same time as he was finalizing the formation of the Natick community, Eliot was hard at work penning a proscribed governing system for the English nation. In his political treatise, *The Christian Commonwealth*, Eliot takes the governing system that he was attempting to incorporate at Natick and promotes it as a model for the recently established English Commonwealth. While the philosophies Eliot expresses in *The Christian Commonwealth* have unmistakable antecedents in English political and religious thought, they also have clear ties to the Algonquian Praying Indians and Cutshamekin's practices in particular.

Though relatively few scholars have undertaken in-depth studies of Eliot's *The Christian Commonwealth*, the tract has been noted for its significance as both a political treatise and a representative sampling of Puritan utopic thought in the wake of the English Civil War. As J.F. Maclear, James Holstun, and Theodore Dwight Bozeman argue, the tract and the governing system it details clearly both have strong roots in seventeenth-century English religious and political thought, namely the contemporary strains of millennialism and utopianism promoted by English Puritans like the Fifth Monarchists and New England minister John Cotton. [94] Written as Oliver Cromwell and

[93] Cogley cites the death as taking place "in late 1651 or early 1652" and other sources repeat this time frame. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 116.

[94] Paul Royster among others, celebrates the tract as the first "American" political treatise, "Preface" *The Christian Commonwealth"* np.
James Holstun describes Eliot's tract as "the single most ambitious utopian project within the larger Puritan utopia of New England." Relatedly, Theodore Dwight Bozeman celebrates the work as a "remarkable sketch of millennial polity." All three authors point out the influence of John Cotton on Eliot's writings. For Bozeman, Cotton's writings evoke a primitivist, rather than a strictly millennial sense. Maclear also

the Rump Parliament were determining the new future of the English Commonwealth after the conviction and beheading of King Charles I, the tract details a system of government that relies on the "Prophecies and Promises of holy Scripture" as the means of ruling "the Government and Administration of all affairs in the Commonwealth."[95] However, as Eliot notes in his preface to *The Christian Commonwealth*, his governing system is more viable than other post-monarchy alternatives being circulated because it is not hypothetical, but experiential in that it is taken from his recently established governing system at Natick. According to Eliot, proof of his systems' efficacy comes from its ability to transform his Indian coverts from their "wild and scattered manner of life" in one of "Civil Government and Order."

Though Eliot's proposed system is anchored by scriptural references reinforcing the fact that it was one "instituted by God himself in the holy Scriptures," many of the primary tenets bear an unmistakable resemblance to pre-contact Algonquian governing systems.[96] Among them are the process by which leaders were elected and the means by which justice was enacted. Advocating a hierarchical governing system, Eliot proposes that society be organized into kinship groups of tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands. Male members of each group would determine their own leaders who would then rule for

---

points out the parallels between Eliot's thought and the growing Fifth Monarchist movement in England while Holstun aligns the tract with a number of other Puritan utopias being written at the same time. Despite their differences, all three of the most detailed scholarly works on *The Christian Commonwealth*, primarily categorize the work as the product of Eliot's reflection on the role that New England plays within the larger English political landscape: James Holstun, *A Rational Millennialism: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 103; Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 266; J.F. Maclear, "New England and the Fifth Monarchy: The Quest for the Millennium in Early American Puritanism." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 32:2 (1975): 247.

[95] John Eliot, "The Christian Commonwealth: or, The Civil Policy Of The Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ. An Online Electronic Text Edition." (1659). Ed. Paul Royster. (Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries. Paper 19) iii.

[96] Ibid., iv.

life. Instead of a separate court system, the rulers of all polities, large and small, would serve as judges for those who had elected them. Rulers would rule and judge in both a religious and political capacity. Significantly, the two fundamental principles of governance which most closely echo Algonquian practices are also those in which Eliot most prominently diverged from existing English and New England systems. In advocating for an increased democratic approach to government in which the governed would have extensive say in determining their leaders and in which chosen rulers would not only keep peace but enact justice, Eliot transplants two of the most noticeable governing practices modeled by Cutshamekin onto his proposal for the English Commonwealth.

In the first two chapters of his treatise, Eliot lays out what he imagines to be the social organization and political structures necessary for a "Divine institution of civil Government that may suit the State of England."[97] As he explains, his ideal society was to be organized around kinship units. Every member of society would first be part of a smaller, primarily familial unit of ten. These units would then align themselves into larger units of fifty, one hundred, one thousand, etc. In each unit, small and large, "publick Free-men" would be "bound personally to act, in the choice of their publick Rulers" resulting in an elected leader of ten, fifty, one-hundred ect.[98] Once elected, the leader would then rule for life so long as he retained the favor of his followers and continued to adhere to Biblical principles. Eliot provides Biblical endorsement for this structure through marginal reference to both Exodus 18: 25 and Deuteronomy 1:15 – two

[97] Ibid., viii.
[98] Ibid., 6.

verses describing the process by which Moses organized the tribes of Israel. While Eliot's Biblical citations reinforce the numerical units promoted by Eliot, the verses do not provide support for the election of leaders. Rather, both verses describe Moses as the final authority in terms of leadership appointments. As God's chosen leader, Moses then determines the rulers of all societal units both small and large. This discrepancy – ultimately the difference between a monarchy and a republic – marks a significant diversion from Eliot's cited sources.[99]

James Holstun attributes Eliot's diversion as evidence of his "lifelong and seemingly unconscious democratic misreading of Exodus." Yet, while Eliot's interpretation may point to the influence of New England congregationalism, it is more than a mere democratic spin on Biblical precedent.[100] As Eliot explains in his 1633 letter to Sir Simonds D'Ewes, the Massachusetts Bay system was one in which the "governor and all the Court are yearly elected by the body of freemen, and changeable, according to their abilities and defects."[101] Eliot's utopic system is thus more democratic (it opens up elections to all male members of society, not just freemen) and more restricted (rulers do

[99] Exodus 18:25 (KJV) reads: And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." Deuteronomy 1:15, written by Moses, reads "So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes."

[100] James Holstun, *A Rational* Millennialism, 154.
Cogley summarizes the existing scholarship on this point explaining that "James Holstun notes that the settlement's nearly universal adult male suffrage departed from the Bay Colony's current practice of restricting the vote to communicant men, and Dwight Bozeman observes that Eliot's *Christian Commonwealth* 'not only ignored New England institutions, but also implied a severe critique' of them. Thus, the implications of Eliot's political program at Natick were that Massachusetts Bay should broaden its franchise and also replace selectmen, deputies, and assistants with rulers of tens, fifties, and hundreds. His extant sources, however, contain no explicit evidence that he hoped such would become the case" Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 113-114.

[101] John Eliot, "September 18, 1633 Letter to Sir Simonds D'Ewes." *Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629 – 1638.* Ed. Everett Emerson (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976), 105.

not change yearly, but remain for life) than the one practiced by Massachusetts Bay. Contrary to both Mosaic, English, and New England practice, *The Christian Commonwealth* points to a change in Eliot's conception of the individual's relationship to the communal. In Eliot's system, each man was individually responsible to vote for leaders and determine a leader's efficacy regardless of one's spiritual belief. This gestures towards an inherent (male) political right that transcends both status and the state of one's soul. At the same time, individual autonomy was kept in check through one's communal relationships and one's commitment to "orderly and seasonable practice of all the Commandments of God."[102] Though distinctly contextualized within English and Biblical rhetoric, Eliot's changed conception of governance finds its closet parallel among the system that Cutshamekin and Massachusett Algonquin had practiced before the formation of Natick.

Among the Southern New England Algonquian, society was organized into kinship units which would, at times, organize together into larger confederations or alliances. Leadership responsibility was determined by a combination of kinship ties, hierarchy, and individual responsibility. Though Algonquian sachems were often candidates for leadership because of their birth, new sachems were approved by a vote of the people or the governing council.[103] If members of a kinship group were dissatisfied with the new sachem or lacked confidence in a longstanding ruler, they could withdraw their support. They did this by either leaving the village and joining another kinship

[102] John Eliot, "The Christian Commonwealth," 19.
[103] See Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500-1650*, 142 and Michael Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans*, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 22.

group or forming a new one.[104] Dissatisfied villagers could also take their complaints to a member of the sachem's advisory counsel who could bring up the matter in council meetings. Those sachems that successfully sustained the support of their followers were those able to best maintain societal balance, and as such, would retain their position until their deaths. Like Eliot's proposed leadership appointments rulers in the *Christian Commonwealth*, the role of sachem was based on both hereditary status and popular election. And despite Eliot's disparaging rhetoric throughout his tracts that castigates the sachems as dictators, Eliot's experience with Cutshamekin and his reactions to the elections at Natick indicate that the missionary was aware of the fact that the Massachusett had a say in determining their own leaders. Even though Eliot attempted to give his Praying Indians the chance to replace Cutshamekin by holding elections in the sachem's absence, the sachem retained the favor of his people – he was "the chiefe *Sachem*, and therefore chosen the chiefe."

The parallels between Eliot's utopic system and the pre-contact Massachusett's one can also be glimpsed in the way that Eliot imagines the judicial system of his Christian Commonwealth. In his tract, Eliot's proposed a system for Natick and England in which the elected rulers would also serve as judges. Like his system of determining leaders, Eliot again deviates from Mosaic, English and New England precedent in that he allowed the governed, rather than the established leader, to appoint their own judges.[105] In fact, in his system, the elected leaders were to serve as the judges. As he writes, each

[104] This scenario played out during the Pequot War as increasing numbers of Pequot left and joined other tribes or formed new kinship groups after the appointment of Sassacus.
[105] In Exodus 18:21-22 (KJV) Jethro tells to "select capable men from all the people…and appoint them as officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens." These selected men would "serve as judges for the people at all times."

ruler of ten was to set aside a designated time in which he would "solemnly…hear and determine Causes, and guide the common Affairs" of his followers.[106] "Higher cases," that required "more time and deliberation" would be adjudicated by a combined court consisting of the elected ruler of fifty and each of the rulers of ten who served under his jurisdiction.[107]

While Eliot's concern with the formation of a new judicial system resonated with the larger English and New England drive for security in the face of a shifting political system, it can also be traced to his concern regarding the treatment of the Massachusett following their 1644 treaty with Massachusetts Bay. As Eliot writes in *Strength Out Of Weaknesse*, though the Massachusett had "formerly subjected themselves unto the English" the only benefit they received from this act was "protection." Because of "the difference of language, and paucitie of Interpreters" Eliot was concerned by the fact that the English had no established systems for resolving Massachusett disputes. Realizing that the only justice being performed among the Massachusett was that practiced by Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems, Eliot advocated for a transfer of judicial authority from Massachusetts Bay to the Praying Indians themselves.[108] In establishing this system, Eliot again works within existing Massachusett structures. As Cutshamekin's actions illustrate, among the Southern New England Algonquin, the sachem was the central judiciary figure within a community.[109] Arbitrating in inter-and intra-tribal disputes, Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems had an already established system of justice based on maintaining reciprocity and balance among the Algonquian and their allies.

---

[106] John Eliot, "The Christian Commonwealth," 11.
[107] Ibid., 12.
[108] Henry Whitfield, "Strength Out of Weakness," 226.
[109] Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775*, 153.

Despite the experiential authority Eliot claimed for his tract, *The Christian Commonwealth* was not widely read among an English audience. Though Eliot wrote his tract in 1651 and presumably sent it over to England subsequent to its completion, it was not printed until 1659 when the Fifth Monarchist Livewell Chapman published it as part of a larger push by the Fifth Monarchists to "rally the nation to their program" after Cromwell's death.[110] After the Restoration of Charles II, the anti-monarchical nature of the tract led New England authorities to view it with increasing concern. In May 1661, Eliot was brought before the General Court and his work was censored "for being justly offensive, and in special relating to kingly government in England." All copies of the work were ordered destroyed. A few days before the order, Eliot went before the court and humbly proclaimed the English monarchy "an eminent forme of government" to which the people of New England were "subjected unto."[111]

Yet, the fact that the tract was not successful in comparison to Eliot's other writings reinforces the fact that Eliot's ideas about political organization were contrary to those of the rest of the Puritan establishment. By implanting Cutshamekin's ideas into his utopic vision, Eliot illustrates the extent to which the sachem's proscriptions became embedded into his theoretical and political understandings. More than just a means of practically controlling the Massachusett or convincing English readers of the piety of colonial endeavors, Eliot employs Algonquian systems as a means of structuring his imaginary future and the future of the English nation. This points to a successful transfer of information from one leader to the next and it is in *The Christian Commonwealth*

[110] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 96. For more on the publication history, see J.F. Maclear, "New England and the Fifth Monarchy," 254.
[111]Nathaniel B. Shurtleff. Ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: Volume II*, 5-6.

where we see the completion of Cutshamekin's process of education. Though Eliot would go on to develop and change his ideas about Indian governance and the intentions of the Praying Towns, his early encounter with Cutshamekin grounded his missionary writings and shaped his future vision in ways that the missionary would never have imagined.

CHAPTER THREE
APOSTATES IN THE WOODS: QUAKERS, PRAYING INDIANS, AND CIRCUITS OF COMMUNICATION IN HUMPHREY NORTON'S *NEW-ENGLAND'S ENSIGNE*

In 1659 Quaker apologist Humphrey Norton published *New-England's Ensigne* as part of his protest against the Puritan treatment of Quaker missionaries in the New England colonies. Norton's work was written at sea as he was travelling back to England from New England where his status as a Quaker meant that he had been imprisoned, whipped, branded with the letter "H" for heretic, forced to sit with a metal key in his mouth and eventually banished.[1] Since the first Quaker missionaries stepped ashore in Boston harbor in 1656, the Puritans saw the Quakers as a threat to their colony because the newcomers refused to obey established authorities in favor of following their own inner light. Anxious and afraid, the Puritan leaders did everything in their power to stop the spread of the Quaker movement. In response, the persecuted Quakers waged a war of words against the Bay Colony authorities. Authors like Norton relied on a developing Quaker print network to inform others of their plight and plead with English authorities for protection. Using a literary form already established by Quaker authors in England, Norton's tract interspersed personal stories of Quaker persecution amongst reprinted sections of Puritan laws authorizing violence against Quaker bodies. This juxtaposition of personal stories and legal documents allowed readers to see the particular and painful ways that the letter of the law was made manifest upon Quaker bodies.[2]

---

[1] Charlotte Fell Smith, "Humphrey Norton." *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900*, Vol. 41 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1900), 212-213.
[2] Kate Peters, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) and Jonathan Beecher Field's Chapter "Suffering and Subscribing: Configurations of Authorship in the Quaker

Though Norton's literary format was developed in England, his subject matter was distinctly colonial. Focused on the events taking place in New England, Norton's tract not only told the story of travelling English Quakers, but also described the words and deeds of both Puritan settlers and indigenous people — including Praying Indians. One of the personal stories that Norton tells is of an encounter between a Puritan innkeeper and Quaker sympathizer, Nicholas Upshall, and a man whom Norton describes as "an Indian Prince."[3] In the winter of 1656 the Bay Colony authorities banished Upshall to the woods for publicly deriding the colony's first formal anti-Quaker law. Norton explains that while Upshall was in the woods he was helped by an Indian Prince who, having heard of Upshall's predicament, offered the elderly man food and shelter from the cold at the same time as he derided the Puritans' cruelty at having banished one of their own. For Norton the Indian Prince served as "an example of compassion towards the persecuted." Savage though Norton believed him to be, the Prince's kindness towards Upshall was in marked contrast to the "barbarous" treatment of the Boston authorities.[4] For Norton's English readers, the message was clear. The Puritan's persecution of the Quakers not only maligned Quaker bodies, but also derailed the Puritans from the "principal end of [their] plantation" which was to "win and incite the Natives of Country, to the knowledge and Obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind."[5]

Atlantic" in his book *Errands into the Metropolis: New England Dissidents in Revolutionary London* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2009), 90-115.

[3] In *New England's Ensigne*, Norton spells Nicholas's last name as "Upshall," a spelling I have kept in this article. However, the court records alternatively spell his last name as "Upsall" or "Upsal." According to Augustine Jones, the name on his tombstone is "Upsall": See Augustine Jones, *Nicholas Upsall*. (Boston: Press of David Clapp & Son, 1880), v.

[4] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne* (London: Printed for T.L. for G. Calvert, 1659), 14.

[5] Charles I, *A Copy of the Kings Majesties Charter for Incorporating the Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New-England in America*, 1628. (Boston: Printed for S. Green, for Benj. Harris at the London Coffee House, 1689), 22.

Subsequent generations of Quaker writers have continued to re-tell the story of Upshall's encounter with the Indian Prince in part because the tale serves as evidence that the first Quaker arrivals were sympathetic colonizers whose presence was not only accepted but sanctioned by the local inhabitants. Over time the story of Upshall's meeting with the Indian prince has functioned to buttress one of the foundational narratives of American Quakerism – that of the friendly Quaker and the welcoming American Indian. In this essay, I return to Norton's tale to address the story from a new perspective – that of the Indian Prince. Rather than contextualizing the story of Upshall and the Indian Prince within an emerging American Quaker discourse, I want to locate the narrative within an earlier seventeenth-century history of colonial contact and negotiation that took place between the arriving Quakers, Puritans, and the local indigenous leaders.

Drawing upon what we know about the New England Algonquian, the Puritan missionary project, and the development of New England Quakerism, I posit that the Indian Prince whom Upshall met in the winter woods in 1656 was not a rhetorical figure, or even an unnamed Indian, but was actually the Massachusett sachem Josias Wompatuck, nephew of the Praying Indian sachem Cutshamekin. In 1644, Wompatuck was one of the sachems who joined Cutshamekin to treat with the Bay Colony. And, after his uncle's death, Wompatuck served as the sachem at Punkapoag, the Praying Indian town established after Natick. In the mid-1650s, Wompatuck left the Praying Indians and relocated to his Massachusett territories south of Boston.[6] As the son of Chickatawbut and nephew of Cutshamekin, Wompatuck was part of well-known and influential family

[6] Josias Wompatuck is alternatively referenced as Josiah Sagamore, Josias Wompatuck, and Josiah Wampatuck.

within the political and social spheres of seventeenth-century New England. As I showed in the previous chapter, despite the influence of colonialism and disease, the Massachusett sachems retained significant authority and influence over a number of Massachusett Indians, both those who were part of the Praying Indian community and those who were not. Like Cutshamekin, Wompatuck was also a large landholder in the region whose land claims were recognized by the English settlers. As such, the sachem was courted by colonial authorities as part of their larger attempts to legitimize their settlements.

Several factors corroborate my speculations that Wompatuck is the Indian Prince, however Wompatuck's archival record within Quaker documents is thin. While the Puritans were anxious to document the words and deeds of their indigenous converts to prove the effectiveness of their mission, the early Quaker arrivals wrote about Praying Indians primarily to disprove the claims of the Puritans. Furthermore, by the time the Quakers arrived in the mid-1650s, the Bay Colony Puritans had already had over twenty years of experience with native people. More familiar with specific sachems and indigenous customs, the Puritan missionary writings convey an intimacy with native words and deeds that the Quaker tracts lack. As a result, the story that I tell in this chapter about Wompatuck and the Quakers requires more speculation than other chapters. Despite the inevitable speculation, the process of grounding Norton's narrative in specific New England people, places, and histories reveals the fact that the Quaker narratives of persecution not only represent an ongoing colonial contest among Protestant religious authorities in New England, but also illuminate an intersecting and complex history of negotiations between the Algonquian and the arriving groups of English settlers about

land, religion, and power. Naming Wompatuck as the Indian Prince allows us a means for re-framing the multi-faceted motivations behind Quaker/Indian relationships in seventeenth-century New England. Rather than simply being tenderhearted to the Quaker arrivals because of a shared antipathy to Puritan rule, Indian leaders like Wompatuck saw the Quakers as potential allies in their fight against expanding Bay Colony control. As alterative representatives of the English government, Quakers provided indigenous sachems with a means to gain new English allies who could provide them with access to high-ranking English officials and alternative methods for circumventing Puritan power.

In the same way that the last two chapters have focused on Wequash and Cutshamekin to reframe the popular narratives of the Puritan mission, this chapter explicates the life of Josias Wompatuck in order to provide what Lisa Brooks terms an "unfamiliar reading" of a familiar narrative" – namely the narrative of the friendly Quaker and the welcoming Indian. As Brooks notes, these unfamiliar readings "provide a lens to [a text's] multiple interpretive possibilities."[7] While the Quaker authors wrote for an English audience, they recorded their tales of encounter based on their observations of actual Indian people at the same time as they themselves were located in indigenous places. Thus their narratives, like those of the Bay Colony authors, are deeply intertwined with the strategies indigenous people used as they acted out of their own beliefs and narratives about kinship, diplomacy, and spirituality.

[7] Lisa Brooks, "Turning the Looking Glass on King Philip's War: Locating American Literature in Native Space," *American Literary History* 25, no. 4 (2013): 729.

"Firsting" and Norton's Narrative History

Upshall's 1656 meeting with the Indian Prince has continued to be retold by Quakers and non-Quakers alike because it represents a number of important "firsts" for the newly-developing Quaker movement and for American religious history as well. As the first person in New England to join the Quaker cause, Upshall's convincement illustrates the power that the Quaker message had to change hearts and minds.[8] The persecution Upshall received from his former Puritan community also made him an important proto-martyr in a number of Quaker writings. In 1659, Quaker founder George Fox included Upshall's tale as part of his petition to Parliament to stop the persecution of Quakers in New England. As Fox explains, the Puritan's willingness to banish "an ancient and weak man" like Upshall indicates the extent to which they are no longer fit to run the colony as "pitty is wholly departed from them."[9] In the nineteenth-century, Upshall's story was re-told for non-Quaker readers as his convincement and subsequent banishment were memorialized in John Greenleaf Whitter's 1880 poem "The King's Missive," and lauded in Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's 1868 play "John Endicott."[10] As the first New England Quaker convert and proto-martyr, Upshall's story has had lasting influence as a narrative about the early American religious experience.

Upshall's narrative is also foundational to American Quaker narrative because of its inclusion of native people. In another first, Upshall's 1656 meeting with the Indian

[8] See Carla Gardina Pestana, *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 123.
[9] George Fox, *The Secret Workes of a Cruel People Made Manifest* (London, 1659), 2.
[10] Longfellow's play was part of his two-play series *The New-England Tragedies*. John Greenleaf Whittier, *The King's Missive, Mabel Martin, and Later Poems* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington, 1881) 9-16 and Henry Wordsworth Longfellow, "John Endicott." *The New-England Tragedies* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1869), 5-95.

Prince marks the earliest recorded encounter between the Quakers and New England's Native people. In 1661 George Bishop's published a version of Upshall's meeting with the Indian Prince as part of his appeal to Charles II for Quaker protection. In Bishop's rendering of the tale, the Indian Prince is "compassionate" and responds to Upshall's sufferings when his fellow English do not.[11] Over time, the story became a staple in narratives describing the relationship between Quakers and native people. Eighteenth-century Quaker writers cloaked the story in the language of sentimentalism which rendered the Indian Prince a sympathetic observer of Puritan violence who is filled with compassion for the suffering Quakers. William Sewel's 1722 version of the tale portrays Upshall as a weak and helpless figure upon whom the Indian takes pity.[12] In Joseph Besse's 1753 account of the encounter, the Indian Prince's actions are those that stem from a "compassion" that was "naturally arising from his Observation of the old Man's Case."[13] Eighteenth-century authors deployed sentimentalism in their renderings of the tale create a narrative in which the suffering Quaker is recognized as a friend by the uncivilized Indian and the two outsiders bond through shared feeling.

Nineteenth-century Quaker authors were likewise fascinated with the 1656 encounter between Upshall and the Indian Prince. Adapting the eighteenth-century's language of sympathy to the developing discourses of race, nineteenth-century Quakers

---

[11] Bishop's rendering of the encounter describes the Indian Prince not only condemning Puritan violence but also condemning the English God as he exclaims, "'What a God have the English who deal so with one another about the worship of their God?" George Bishop, *New England Judged, Not By Man's, but the Spirit of the Lord.* Part 1 (London: Printed for Robert Wilson in Martins Le Grand, 1661), 32-33.
[12] William Sewel, *The History and Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People Called Quakers Intermixed with Several Remarkable Occurrences.* (London: Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle, 1722), 161.
[13] Joseph Besse, *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers* (London: Printed and Sold by Luke Hinde, 1753), 181.

transformed the Indian Prince into a noble savage, or a "Red Indian" memorialized by the Quakers for his kindness. The most well-known version of the tale is told by Wilson Armistead as part of the paratextual comments to his 1852 edition of George Fox's *Journal*. Contextualizing a section of the journal where Fox describes his 1672 stay in an Indian town, Armistead reinforces the fact that Quakers and Indians have a history of good relations by penning a poem memorializing Upshall's Indian Prince. Asking his readers to "See here the Red Indian's kindly care./ Though he the name of *savage* bear," Armistead's invokes an abolitionist undertone that portrays the Indian's kindness to Upshall as more authentic than those who claim to be Christian yet perpetuate violence. As his closing lines explain, the Indian is "More Christian he than they who thus pollute / Their faith, and for their God a brother persecute."[14] Taken out of its original context, the story has become part of one of the foundational narratives of American Quakerism – that of the friendly Quaker and the welcoming American Indian.

---

[14] The entire poem is as follows:

> See here the Red Indian's kindly care.
> Though he the name of *savage* bear.
> Christian, more savage thou than he,
> Blush for thy cruel deeds of infamy:
> The Indian's unmasked cup of charity
> Is larger than as mixed by thee.
> The white man ag'd, through frost and snows
> A banish'd exile to his country goes,
> Full many a welcome does he say,
> To his warm house whate'er the day.
> More Christian he who thus does prove
> By practice kindred with a God of love.
> More Christian he than they who thus pollute
> Their faith, and for their God a brother persecute.

George Fox, *A Journal or historical account of the life, travels, sufferings, Christian experiences and labour of love in the work of the ministry of George Fox* Volume 1. Ed. Wilson Armistead (London: W. AND F.G. Cash, 1853), 109 n.1.

In its emphasis on firsts, however, the story of Upshall's meeting with the Indian Prince has become deeply entangled with narrative strategy that historian Jean O'Brien has coined "firsting." Like many other New England histories that emphasize colonial firsts, the repeated tellings of Upshall's tale work to create a narrative of modernity that begins with the ancient, savage Indian who then disappears in order to make way for future settlers. In asserting that Upshall, the first Quaker, was kindly received by the Indian Prince, the story works to authorize and legitimize the Quakers' presence among New England's native people and their location upon native lands. At the same time, as the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century versions of the tale indicate, it is the Quakers who survive while the unnamed "Red Indians" vanish. The narrative effectively works to replace the Indians with the Quakers as the rightful occupants of New England's lands. As O'Brien writes, the "political and culture work [of these narratives] is to appropriate the category 'indigenous' away from Indians and for themselves."[15] The repeated tellings of Upshall's encounter with the Indian Prince thus serve to sanction Upshall and his Quaker successors as the legitimate colonial heirs who have been given the blessing of a nameless and absent Indian.

Tracking Down the "Indian Prince"

A re-reading of the meeting between Upshall and the Indian Prince requires a return to the story's origins – the version of the encounter first printed in 1659 by Humphrey Norton in *New-Englands Ensigne.* Norton was one of Fox's earliest Quaker

[15] Jean O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England.* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 6.

converts and, after a being jailed in England and Ireland for his beliefs, he arrived in Rhode Island in August of 1657 eager to spread the Quaker message. Between 1657 and early 1659, Norton travelled through Rhode Island, Massachusetts Bay, and Plymouth Colony alongside of the other Quaker missionaries where he was often thrown in jail and eventually branded with the letter "H" for heretic.[16] Norton's trek through Quaker communities and New England jails almost certainly put him into contact with Upshall, who, by 1657, was also residing among the Quakers in Rhode Island. It was likely then that Norton heard the story of Upshall's encounter with the Indian Prince from Upshall himself. Interested in portraying Quaker persecution for English readers, in *New-England's Ensigne* Norton's focuses primarily on Upshall's persecution by the Puritan authorities and only gives his encounter with the Indian Prince a few lines. However, the historical details of Upshall's life coupled with the narrative particulars that Norton gives about Upshall's journey through the New England woods provide several interesting clues that can be productively used to recover the name and location of the mysterious Indian Prince.

Both narratively and historically, the impetus for Norton's story about Upshall starts with the October 1656 Bay Colony law that authorized the authorities to imprison, whip, fine, and, if necessary, banish the arriving Quakers.[17] Fearful that the Quaker's ideas would quickly spread, the Bay Colony not only sanctioned the persecution of professed Quakers, but anyone within the colony who took "upon them the hereticall

[16] Charlotte Fell Smith, "Norton, Humphrey." *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885-1900, Vol. 41. Ed, Sidney Lee. (London: Smith, Elder, & Co, 1895), 212-213.
[17] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 13.

opinions of the sd Quakers, or any of their books or papers…"[18] In order to ensure that the entire town heard their new law, Bay Colony officials marched through the streets of Boston "with the beating of a Drum" stopping in various places around town to read the new edict out loud. One of the locations where the officials stopped was on the steps of the Red Lion Inn where Upshall served as the proprietor.[19] As Norton explains, when Upshall heard the law, the angry innkeeper "did bear witness against" it, calling it "the fore-runner of a judgement upon the Countrey" and warning the authorities to "take heed what they did lest they were found fighters against God."[20] For his words, Upshall had the unfortunate distinction of being the first to feel the effects of the Bay Colony's new law. Fined, then imprisoned, Upshall was finally banished from the Bay Colony for his sympathy towards the Quakers and the beleaguered man left the colony sometime in November or December of 1656.[21]

Banishment was one of the most extreme punishments available for Puritan colonists at the time as it entailed separation from friends, family, food, and shelter. Norton emphasizes the extremity of Upshall's punishment by employing the rhetoric of Quaker martyrdom. In Norton's account, banishment serves as both a testament to the

[18] Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, Ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*: Volume III, 1644-1657 (Boston: From the Press of William White, 1854), 416.
[19] The Red Lion Inn is not associated directly with Upshall until later accounts, however, he is mentioned as an Innkeeper in several later sources. For example, see Oliver Robert Ayer, *History of the Military Company of the Massachusetts Now Called The Ancient and Honorably Artillery Company of Massachusetts, 1637-1888.* Volume I (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1895), 43-44 and Edwin Bacon, *Bacon's History of* Boston (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1886), 394.
[20] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 13.
[21] I estimate that he left in November or December because the law first went into effect October 14, 1656 which was also the date of Upshall's first offence. As Norton writes, Upshall was first fined, then put into prison, then ordered banished "within the space of one moneth." His banishment could have occurred later in the year or even January, but the text is clear that his banishment took place sometime in the winter months. Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 13.

cruelty of the Puritans and an attestation to the veracity of the Quaker cause.[22] As Norton writes, the Puritans' willingness to banish one of their own, "a member among them for many yeers," because he stood up for the persecuted indicated the frenzied and vindictive nature of the Puritan leaders.[23] At the same time, Upshall's willingness to stand up for the Quakers in the face of banishment reaffirms the authenticity of the elderly man's Quaker commitment. Further characterizing Upshall as a proto-martyr, Norton describes him as being "much refreshed at the coming of [the first Quaker missionaries]" at the same time as he was "much troubled at the cruel actions of the Magistrates and people of Boston towards them."[24]

In using the term "refreshment," Norton aligns Upshall's religious experience with that of the Quaker founder himself. In his journals, George Fox uses the term "refreshment" to describe his own experience with state-sanctioned violence. When recounting a 1652 episode in which he was beaten and bloodied after standing up to the English authorities, Fox explains that the physical violence led him to be "refreshed" by "the Eternal Refreshings" of God.[25] As literary historian Hilary Hinds writes, "The violence intended by its perpetrators to demonstrate their power over [Fox] instead provides a means for the exercise of God's power to 'refresh', a power of which Fox partakes and from which he benefits but which is manifestly not his own, and which only demonstrates the failure of his opponents' power."[26] In referencing Fox's journal, Norton

[22] For more on the logic and rhetoric of Quaker martyrdom at this time, see Adrian Chastain Weimer's *Martyrs' Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 101-115.
[23] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 13.
[24] Ibid.
[25] George Fox, *A Journal:* Volume 1, 134-135.
[26] Hilary Hinds, *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture* (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 2011), 74.

characterizes Upshall's persecution as indisputable evidence that the Puritans were threatened by the truth of the Quaker message and its influence upon potential followers.

Despite the spiritual optimism of Norton's narrative, the reality of Upshall's prospects for surviving the 1656-57 winter were bleak. Anxious to find an English community, Norton tells us that Upshall first headed to "Sandwitch, in Plymouth-Patent" where he hoped to be taken in by "some that were more readier to entertain the persecuted."[27] When Governor Bradford got wind of the elderly innkeeper's impending arrival, he issued a warrant forbidding anyone to give Upshall shelter and ordered instead that the Quaker sympathizer be brought to Plymouth to face trial.[28] It is as he is stranded between Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay that Upshall comes into contact with the Indian Prince. Norton's text does not explicitly list where the encounter took place, however, the location of the story within the large narrative of Upshall's journey makes it likely that wandering Innkeeper met the Indian Prince sometime between his leaving Boston and his arrival in Sandwich – a trip that would have taken him right by Wompatuck's tribal headquarters which were located at the Mattakeesett Ponds, (near present-day Pembroke, MA) and about 25 miles south east of Boston.

Though the lands around the Mattakeesett Ponds had always been part of Massachusett territory, Wompatuck had only claimed them as his tribal headquarters a few years before Upshall made his 1656 trek through the woods. Wampanoag tribal historian Russell Herbert Gardner estimates that Wompatuck moved to the Mattaskeesett Ponds around 1647, after he had sold off Massachusett lands around Boston and

[27] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 13.
[28] Upshall refused to go to Plymouth and eventually Sandwich authorities allowed him to remain there throughout the winter.

Braintree.[29] Historian Richard Cogley places Wompatuck's move to the Ponds a bit later, sometime in the mid-1650s.[30] In either case, Wompatuck's decision to relocate to Mattaskeesett Ponds was tied up in his relationship to the Puritan missionary John Eliot and the Praying Indians. Following a lengthy proselytization effort on Eliot's part, Wompatuck's uncle and guardian, Cutshamekin, joined the Praying Indians in 1646 or 1647. Cutshamekin became the sachem of the Massachusett after the 1633 death of Wompatuck's father, Chickatawbut. In 1650, the Praying Indians elected Cutshamekin as the chief sachem at the first Praying town of Natick.[31] With Cutshamekin's death in 1650 or 1651, Wompatuck himself succeeded his uncle as the chief sachem of both the Massachusett and the Praying Indians.[32] However, it was not long after Cutshamekin's death that Wompatuck "turned apostate" and left the Praying Indians taking a number of his followers with him.[33] After leaving, Wompatuck and his followers took up a more permanent residence at Pembroke, a location where his descendants continued to remain until the early twentieth century. Wompatuck was thus residing at the Mattakeesett Ponds, about a 9-10 hour walk south east of Boston, when Upshall made his 1656 trek through the woods.

While the map of Upshall's journey and the historical records regarding Wompatuck's location make it reasonable to assume that the two men were in the same

---

[29] Russell Herbert Gardner, "Last Royal Dynasty of the Massachusetts," *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 57, no.1 (1996), 19.
[30] Cogley suggests that Wompatuck did not move to Pembroke until after he had left the Praying Indians. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War.* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 141.
[31] This was presumably because Wompatuck was too young to take his father's place as sachem.
[32] John Eliot, *A Late and Further Manifestation* (1655). *The Eliot Tracts.* Ed. Michael P Clark. (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 305.
[33] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War.* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 141.

place at the same time, my claim that Wompatuck was in fact the Indian Prince is reinforced by the language that Norton uses to characterize the exchange. Norton's description of the indigenous man as a "prince" implies that the man was likely a sachem, or a member of the sachemship, as the English often incorrectly translated indigenous social structures in terms of European royalty.[34] At the time of Upshall's journey through Massachusett territory, Wompatuck was the clear sachem of the Massachusett and his designation as prince may have been in part the result of the lasting legacy of Wompatuck's father, Chickatawbut, long known by arriving settlers as the principle sachem, "or King," of the Massachusett.[35] When the Plymouth settlers first arrived in 1622, Chickatawbut had jurisdiction over the coastal plain of southeastern Massachusetts including the area around Boston and Plymouth.[36] In 1630, it was Chickatawbut who treated with John Winthrop to found the Bay Colony and the sachem was later a well-known figure at Governor Winthrop's dinner table.[37] Colonial warfare and European diseases had eroded the power and territory of the Massachusett, however the English settlers still recognized the Massachusett sachems as the owners of significant portions of land well into the 1670s and beyond. In the 1650s, Wompatuck's uncle, Cutshamekin had ceded the lands outside of Dorchester to John Eliot to found the Praying Indian town of

---

[34] As historian Michael Leroy Oberg explains, "English observers, making the easy comparison to their king, consistently overstated the powers of the sachem. Sachems like Uncas could not rule without the consent of their followers, an important limit on their supposedly sovereign powers."
Michael Leroy Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 22.
[35] Russell Herbert Gardner, "Last Royal Dynasty of the Massachusetts," 18.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.
The Bay Colony and the Massachusett leader remained allies until Chickatawbut's death from smallpox in 1633 as evidenced by their reciprocal willingness to prosecute community members who disregarded the established ties between the two parties. John Winthrop, *Journal of John Winthrop 1630-1649 Volume II.* Ed. Richard S Dunn, James Savage, and Laetitia Yeandle. (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1996), 50-51, 57, 78, 101.

Natick, and Wompatuck himself is often mentioned in colonial land transactions.[38] Though diminished in power since the arrival of the settlers, Wompatuck and his family remained significant and influential within the power structures of both colonial and indigenous New England.

In *New-England's Ensigne*, Norton indicates that Upshall identified the Indian as a prince because of his performance, specifically his linguistic performance, writing that, the Indian "appears [to be a Prince] by his speech."[39] While Norton does not directly indicate what it was about the man's speech that denoted his elevated status, it may have been the man's ability to converse in English as well as in the Massachusett language. As Norton writes, "when hearing of [the Puritans'] dealings with this ancient, weak man, [the Indian Prince] called them Wicked men, and said unto him, Ne.tup, which is to say, Friend, if thou wilt live with me, I will make thee a good warm house." Adding a final clause, Norton clarifies, "this he spoke in his own language." The placement of the final clause makes it unclear whether the whole exchange took place in Massachusett, or rather it was just the greeting, "Ne Tup," that was in the sachem's language, but I would guess that it would be the latter option. As sachem of the Massachusett and a former Praying Indian, Wompatuck was long used to interacting with English settlers and missionaries. Born sometime in the late 1620s or early 1630s, Wompatuck had always lived in and around the emerging settlements and would have likely been at least conversant, if not fluent, in the English language. His uncle, Cutshamekin, had a documented history of

[38] Samuel Drake provides an overview of Wompatuck's land holdings. Samuel G. Drake *The Aboriginal Races of North America: Comprising Biographical Sketches of Eminent Individuals, and an historical Account of the different tribes, from the first discovery of the continent to the present period,* (Philadelphia, C. Desilver, 1859. 15th Ed.), 108-109.
[39] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 14.

speaking English and, since Wompatuck was raised under his uncle's care, it would not be at all surprising if he had obtained the same linguistic fluency.[40]

If we presume that the majority of the conversation between the two men was in English, then Norton's emphasis that the prince spoke "in his own language" draws attention to the sachem's use of the term "Ne Tup" – a term that may have been recognizable to Norton's English readers if they had been following the literature coming out of the New England missionary project. Sixteen years prior to Norton's publication, the New England Separatist minister Roger Williams had included the term Ne tup, or "Netop" as Williams spells it, in *A Key Into the Language of America* (1643)."[41] As Williams explains the term was an indication of friendship. He writes that, "*What cheare* Netop? *is the general salutation of all English toward them,* Netop *is friend.*"[42] Norton himself also glosses the term in *New-England's Ensigne* writing, "Ne.tup, which is to say, Friend."[43] Norton's emphasis on the fact that "Ne Tup," was the address that the Indian Prince used to refer to Upshall is politically and spiritually strategic. By employing a term that Norton's English readers would have associated with the first wave of Protestant missionaries to a Quaker sympathizer like Upshall, Norton plants the idea that it is the Quakers who will be able to fulfill England's missionary attempts to

---

[40] Cutshamekin's English fluency is evidenced by the fact that his engagements with the English were performed without the use of translator, while other tribal leaders had documented translators. His English language skills are also referenced by Eliot, and historian Richard Cogley suggests that Cutshamekin was Eliot's first choice for proselytization because of his ability to speak English.
Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 40.

[41] Roger Williams, *A Key Into the Language of America*, (1643). (Bedford, MA: Applewood Books, 1936), A3.

[42] Ibid., 2.

[43] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 14.
Joy Howard talks more about the use of the term "Ne.Tup" in Norton's tract in her dissertation, "Spirited into America: Narratives of possession, 1650—1850." (Purdue University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing, 2011. 3507244), 33-34.

reach native people where others have failed. The Quakers, whom the Indians like the Indian Prince clearly recognize as friends, are the kinder, gentler option for spreading English civility and spirituality among New England's native people than the cruel Puritans. Conveniently, the term "friend" also alludes to the Quakers status as "Friends," the name that the Quakers preferred to call themselves, and reinforces the fact that the Quakers are the only true "friends" of the Indians.[44]

In the logic of Quaker martyrdom narratives, the Indian Prince's use of the term "Ne Tup" places him in a position of a witness able to attest to the veracity of Upshall's Quaker faith. Norton notes that the Indian Prince's acknowledgement of Upshall as a friend comes with a concurrent dismissal of the Puritans as "wicked men." In pointing out the wickedness of the Puritans and the goodness of the Quakers, the Indian Prince serves as the eyes and ears of Norton's English readers helping them to clarify the distinctions among the New England Protestants striving to achieve credibility as the true New England missionaries. As an on-the-ground witness, the Indian Prince can see with his own eyes the distinction between the Puritan abusers and the abused bodies of the suffering Quakers. While this act of witness clearly puts the Quakers in a favorable light, it also alludes to the potential conversion of the Native people. As Hinds writes, the early Quakers did not set out to proselytize new believers, rather, the Quaker doctrine of the Indwelling Christ meant that Quakers sought "to discover in all lands those who were true fellow-member with them."[45] In recognizing Upshall's inner light, and rejecting the

[44] Though not specifically mentioned in *New-England's Ensigne*, Norton likely intended this note as a jab against Williams as well. Despite being ousted by the Bay Colony, Williams remained strongly convinced that the Quakers were not true believers. See Edmund Morgan, *Roger Williams: The Church and the State*, 2nd Ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006), 56-61.
[45] Hilary Hinds, *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture*, 38.

hypocrisy of the Puritans, Wompatuck alludes to his own potential for Quakerism. Already aware of the light, the Indian prince serves as a potential proto-Quaker himself ready to be convinced by the Quaker message.

Yet, while Indian Prince's use of "Ne Tup" conveniently reinforces the justness of the Quaker cause to an English readership and implies the missionary potential of native people, there is another possible meaning behind the Indian prince's use of the term "friend" – that is the more practical reality that Upshall and Wompatuck may have been actual friends, or at least have known each other from previous meetings. As Norton's text points out, Nicholas Upshall was a long-time resident of the Bay Colony. Arriving as part of the Winthrop Fleet on the *Mary and John* in 1630, Upshall had landed near present-day Dorchester, Massachusetts some two weeks before John Winthrop and the *Arabella* made their way to shore.[46] And, though he is better known in later writings as a Quaker, Upshall was at one time, a prominent Puritan, who had, as Norton writes "endeavored out of his zeal to build a little Bable by them called the Church at the new meeting-house in Boston."[47] Though Wompatuck was a young child at the time of Upshall's arrival, Upshall and the other Dorchester residents would likely have met Womaptuck's father, Chicatawbut, because of his status as owner of the land in and around the Boston region.[48] While there are no references suggesting a meeting between the Massachusett sachems and Upshall, we have several records of Wompatuck's

[46] Oliver Ayer Roberts, *History of the Military Company of Massachusetts,* 43.
[47] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne*, 13.
[48] We have no information regarding Wompatuck's birth though I would estimate that he was born sometime in the early 1620's. When his father died in 1633, Wompatuck was not old enough to take over the duties of the sachem and as such, his uncle Cutshamekin, was appointed as his guardian. By 1644, Wompatuck seems to be acting in his own rights as sachem because he is listed as a sachem when he visited Winthrop as part of the treaties between the Massachusett and the Bay Colony. He died in 1669 meaning that if he was born in 1620 or so, he would have been around 49 years old at the time of his death.

meetings with Winthrop and other Bay Colony leaders. In February of 1644, Wompatuck and his uncle Cutshamekin treated with Winthrop as part of their arrangement offering to pay tribute to the Bay Colony in exchange for protection.[49] In 1666, the residents of Dorchester petitioned Wompatuck for a deed to the land around the Dorchester region, which he granted. These exchanges clearly indicate that Wompatuck had long been familiar to the English settlers at the same time as he was recognized as a prominent landholder in the region.[50] Upshall's own colonial land transactions may have put him in touch with Wompatuck as well. First, as a prominent resident of Dorchester and later as a Boston landholder, Upshall would have likely come into contact with the sachem upon whose lands he was residing.

More than just neighbors, the two men may have also encountered one another along the routes of information and exchange that connected the relatively small New England region. In 1640, the largest city in the region, Boston, was estimated to have around 1,200 English inhabitants.[51] In a 1638 letter Roger Williams mentions Upshall's Inn as a location where letters were circulated. After the Pequot War, Williams wrote to Winthrop to inform the Governor that Wequash and Uncas were re-gathering the scattered Pequot. At the close of his letter, Williams requests that Winthrop "…send [his] letter to Richard Collicut's, that so a native may convey it, or else to Nicholas Upshall's."[52] Williams's request may have been a result of his changing post-war

---

[49] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 38, 41.
[50] Oliver Ayer Roberts, *History of the Military Company of the Massachusetts*, 43-45.
[51] In 1650, it is estimated at 2,000. Lawrence W. Kennedy, *Planning the City Upon a Hill: Boston Since 1630.* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 255.
[52] Roger Williams, *Letters of Roger Williams* 1632-1682. Ed. John Russell Bartlett (Providence: Printed for the Narragansett Club, 1874), 93.
Williams himself was protective of Indian missions and despite his antagonism towards the Bay Colony, he did not support the Quaker's missionary attempts. As Baldwin explains, Williams refused a Quaker request

relationship with Wequash. While Williams had previously used Wequash to send his letters, he may now have needed a new route of exchange as he was no longer as trusting of Wequash's motivations. What Williams's letter indicates, however, is that Upshall's Inn was a place of circulation connecting Boston and the surrounding villages. Circulating news both in letter form and through verbal interactions, Upshall's Inn served as a prominent node in the nexus of community relations and trade, between both indigenous people and English settlers. Significantly, Upshall's status as an Innkeeper was also potentially the way he became one of the first Puritans to come into contact with the arriving Quakers. As proprietor of an inn located on the Boston harbor, Upshall was likely aware of who was coming and going on in and out of Boston. When Ann Austin and Mary Fisher came into the harbor in July of 1656, the Boston authorities arrested them on the ship and threw them in jail – an event that Upshall himself may have witnessed. As George Bishop suggests, Upshall knew about the arrest of the two women within a fairly short time because he immediately went to the jail and attempted to bribe the jailor with five shillings a week in order to pay for their food.[53] Though Norton's text downplays Upshall's role as an innkeeper, his influence within Boston's circuits of communication and exchange may have been another reason why Upshall's opposition to the Quaker law garnered such an immediate and decisive response. As longtime citizens

---

to translate a paper into Algonquian because "he said it wasn't the truth." Meredith Weddle Baldwin, *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century*. (London: Oxford University Press, 2000), 104.
Jones also suggests that Upshall and Williams were friends – although I'm guessing that their friendship was challenged by Upshall's conversion to Quakerism. Augustine Jones. *Nicholas Upsall*. (Boston: Press of David Clapp & Son, 1880), 5.

[53] George Bishop, *New England Judged, Not By Man's, but the Spirit of the Lord.* Part 1 (London: Printed for Robert Wilson in Martins Le Grand, 1661), 9. See Pestana's description of the women's arrival and her note on Bishop's text for more information. Carla Gardina Pestana, "The City upon a Hill Under Siege: The Puritan Perception of the Quaker Threat to Massachusetts Bay, 1656-1661. *The New England Quarterly* 56:3 (1993): pg. 323, n. 1.

and landowners in nations that claimed the same space, Upshall and Wompatuck would have been bound to encounter one another as part of colonial New England daily life which meant that their meeting in the Boston woods was likely a meeting between two acquaintances rather than a chance encounter between strangers.

Diplomatic Relations: Re-Thinking Wompatuck's Motivation

While Norton's account gives us ample reasons why Upshall would have been anxious to receive the aid of the Indian Prince in the middle of winter, the *Records of the Bay Colony* open the door for some potential reasons that Wompatuck himself may have been inspired to seek out an alliance with Upshall and the arriving Quakers. At the same October session in which the Puritan authorities passed the law authorizing the imprisonment, torture, and banishment of the Quakers and their sympathizers, they also passed a law regulating the circulation of indigenous bodies. As the October 14, 1656 record states:

> This Court, takeinge into consideration the necessitie of restrayninge from the Indians whatsoeuer may be a meanes to disturbe or peace & quiet, doe order, & by the authoritie of this Court it is enacted, that henceforth no pson or psons inhabiting within this jurisdiction shall, directly or indirectly, any ways giue, sell, barter, or otherwise dispose of any boat, skiff, or any greater vessel unto any Indian or Indians whatsoeuer, under penalty of fifty pounds, to be payd to the country Treasurer, upon legall conviction, for every such vessel so sold or disposed off as affordsd (sic).[54]

For indigenous New Englanders, the ocean and riverways connecting the southeastern coast were a primary means of transportation, trade, and migration. In controlling their access to the waterways, the Bay Colony was attempting to explicitly limiting indigenous

[54] Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, Ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England*: Volume III, 1644-1657. (Boston: From the Press of William White, 1854), 416-417.

New Englander's abilities to conduct their affairs and sustain their communities – a prohibition that the Bay Colony had tried many times before.

As sachem of the Massachusett, Wompatuck was particularly effected by the prohibitions placed on native transportation. Because he was the figure responsible for conducting trade, determining land claims, and negotiating with other nations, Wompatuck needed to be able to move freely up and down the New England coast. The Bay Colony's 1656 prohibition was one in a long line of attempts that colonists had made to limit sachem authority. It was, in fact, his earlier frustration with the Bay Colony's prohibitions that had likely led Wompatuck to leave the Praying Indians in the first place. In 1650, Wompatuck's uncle, Cutshamekin, had protested Eliot's proposal to form a Praying town because the town represented a threat to sachem sovereignty.[55] Though Cutshamekin and Wompatuck both eventually joined Eliot's Praying Indians, they only remained members for a short time. Cutshamekin's participation was short-lived because of his death while Wompatuck willingly left the community.[56] While there is not a direct source aligning Wompatuck's apostasy with sachem sovereignty, a statement Wompatuck made later in life makes it likely that the two were connected. In 1668, the year before Wompatuck's death, the Puritan missionary John Cotton Jr. tried to convince the sachem to re-accept Christianity. However, Wompatuck again rejected the Puritan message because, as Cotton Jr. relates, "many of his Indians would then forsake him, &

[55] Henry Whitefield. "The Light Appearing more and more towards the Perfect Day." *The Eliot Tracts.* Ed. Michael P Clark (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 202.

[56] Eliot and Cutshamekin have a number of discussions about the role of sachem power with the Praying Indian community as well. While Eliot tries to curb Cutshamekin's power, Cutshamekin maintains his authority to trade and negotiate with other indigenous communities at the same time as he continues to collect tribute from his Praying Indian followers.
See Henry Whitefield, "The Light Appearing more and more," 202-203.

he should loose much tribute."[57] Wompatuck's winter 1656 exchange with Upshall then, may have been motivated in part by the Bay Colony's continued attempts to restrict sachem sovereignty. As part of his larger fight against the Bay Colony, Wompatuck may have sought out Upshall, a fellow Puritan outsider, as part of his attempts to form alliances that undermined the authority of the "wicked men."[58]

Both Wompatuck's desire to undermine Bay Colony authority and his responsibilities as a sachem serve as potential explanations for the sachem's subsequent actions in his exchange with Upshall. As Norton writes, after greeting the wandering innkeeper, the Indian Prince offered him hospitality, stating "if thou wilt live with me, I will make thee a good warm house."[59] For Norton and subsequent Quaker writers, Wompatuck's willingness to house the wandering innkeeper illustrates the extent to which the sachem was touched by Upshall's suffering at the hands of the Puritans. As Norton writes, the Indian Prince's offer was the tangible means by which he "preach[ed] condemnation thereby to the English Christian, teaching them an example of compassion towards the persecuted, whom they of Boston had barbarously banished in the winter season."[60] While the sachem's willingness to house Upshall is clearly in contrast to the Puritans' banishment, Wompatuck's actions may not have been motivated by Christian charity. As the sachem of the Massachusett, Wompatuck was responsible for greeting guests and providing them with hospitality. More than a mere kindness, Wompatuck's hospitality was a means of practicing indigenous diplomacy. As Lisa Brooks' oft-cited

[57] John Cotton Jr. "The Missionary Journal of John Cotton Jr." Len Travers, Ed. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Third Series 109 (1997), 91.
[58] Humphrey Norton, *New-England's Ensigne* (London: Printed for T.L. for G. Calvert, 1659), 14.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.

metaphor of the "common pot" suggests, among the southeastern Algonquian, every member of the community who resided within shared space was responsible for maintaining communal balance. As Brooks explains, "In the common pot, shared space means shared consequences and shared pain. The actions of the newcomers would affect the whole."[61] Offering shelter to the wandering Upshall was a means of practicing reciprocity at the same time as it established Wompatuck's sovereignty as a leader able to offer aid and gifts to one who had none. As the sachem in charge of the lands upon which Upshall was wandering, Wompatuck's kindness to Upshall reflects both his authority and his status.

Wompatuck's reception of Upshall can also be seen as a strategic means by which the sachem strove to further the alliances of the Massachusett nation. As someone who had often participated in treaties, trade negotiations, and land transactions with the various colonial factions, Wompatuck would have been aware of the different functions and alliances that existed among the English settlers.[62] For Wompatuck, the Quakers likely fit into a larger web of English municipalities represented by the Bay Colony, Plymouth Colony, and Providence Plantation all of whom operated under the purview of the English King. Indeed, the Quakers themselves often emphasized their political status as Englishmen. In his 1659 tract, *The Secret Works of a Cruel People Made Manifest*, George Fox includes several examples of Quakers appealing to the Puritan authorities for

[61] Lisa Brooks *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 5.
[62] In 1644, Wompatuck was one of the sachems that took part in what Richard Cogley terms the "submission of the sachems" in which the Massachusett leaders agreed to pay tribute to the Bay Colony in exchange for protection. See Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, Ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: Volume II: 1642-1649* (Boston: From the Press of William White, 1853), 56.

liberty on the grounds that they were "free-born English men."[63] As historian Jenny Hale Pulsipher suggests, New England tribal leaders like Wompatuck paid attention to the distinctions among the English and used this awareness in their negotiations with different English parties.[64]

Wompatuck's offer of friendship to Upshall may have been a sign of the Massachusett leader's desire to form a new alliance. Wompatuck may have seen a coalition with Upshall and the Quakers as a means by which he could potentially circumvent Puritan control. As Carla Gardina Pestana and Pulsipher have shown, from their very first days in New England, the Quakers set themselves up in opposition to the Bay Colony leaders and thus served as an imminent threat to Bay Colony authority.[65] Challenging Bay Colony structures and undermining their religious and civil authority, the Quakers offered Wompatuck a new avenue for English alliances. The Massachusett sachem may even have seen the Quakers as a means by which he could obtain access to the English King – a powerful ally in the colonial world. Colonists and native people alike had a long precedent of directly appealing to the English king when they were being shut out by the Bay Colony. Indeed, Roger Williams had appealed directly to the King to legitimize his land sale from the Narragansett in 1643. A year later the Narragansett

---

[63] George Fox, *The Secret Workes of a Cruel People Made Manifest*, 3.

[64] Pulsipher writes that "While the English understanding that Indians stood beneath them on the hierarchical ladder informs the dealings of Plymouth and, later, Massachusetts with the Indians in seventeenth-century New England, there is evidence that the Indians did not see their position in relations to the English as inferior at all. Plymouth, established ten years before the larger and stronger Massachusetts Bay Colony, was the first colony to treat with the Indians, and the terms of their 1621 league of peace did not make the Plymouth colonists' assumptions of superiority over the Indians clear. It could as easily be read as an alliance of equals as a submission of one people to the other." Jenny Hale Pulsipher. *Subjects Unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 18.

[65] Ibid,, 43.
Carla Gardina Pestana, "The City upon a Hill under Siege: The Puritan Perception of the Quaker Threat to Massachusetts Bay, 1656-1661." *New England Quarterly* 56:3 (1983): 323-353.

themselves had appealed to King Charles I for the return of their lands claimed by the United Colonies.[66] Wompatuck himself is also documented as appealing directly to the king. Around the same time as he encountered Upshall, or shortly after in 1656 or 1657 Wampatuck had leased some of his lands near Dorchester to English settler Richard Thayer. After a number of disputes with Thayer and the Bay Colony about the status of the land, Wompatuck had eventually found a way around the disputes by leasing the land directly to King Charles II. In 1666, Wompatuck signed a lease to Charles II "promising him a yearly payment of five pounds (collectible from Richard Thayer)," at the same time as he requested the protection of the king.[67] Though Wompatuck's alliance with the King took place several years after his encounter with Upshall, his sagacity when it came to land and negotiations and the fact that he treated with Thayer just shortly after his meeting with Upshall indicates the strong possibility that the Massachusett sachem saw Upshall as more than just a stranded traveler.

The Persistent Prince

In Norton's version of the events, we never learn the outcome of the Indian Prince's offer to Upshall and it is unclear whether the stranded innkeeper stayed the night with the Indian sachem or whether he was somehow reunited with his fellow Englishmen. Eventually, we know that Upshall did make his way back to Boston where he was again imprisoned and finally released to the custody of his brother-in-law, John Capen of

[66] Jenny Hale Pulsipher, *Subjects Unto the Same King*, 54-55.
[67] Ibid., 58.
For a copy of the deed see: Josiah Wampatuck, "Deed for Land near Blue Hills Given by Josiah Wampatuck to the Crown of England" (4 October, 1666), ed. Paul Grant-Costa et. al. *Yale Indian Papers Project* (New Haven: Yale University), http://hdl.handle.net/10079/digcoll/1018378

Dorchester. He died in 1666.[68] Wompatuck continued to live out his life as a Massachusett sachem making the Mattakeeset Ponds his headquarters. In 1669, he was killed in battle while leading a contingent of Mahican and Massachusett warriors against the Haudenosaunee at Caughnawaga. After his death, his son Charles Josiah and his daughter Abigail, with their descendants, continued to live on their family's lands until the mid-twentieth century.[69]

However, the re-insertion of actual native people and places into Upshall's tale opens the door for a new reading of other Quaker narratives as well. In 1658 Josiah Coale, another wandering Quaker, followed in Upshall's footsteps as he passed by Wompatuck's headquarters. When describing his travelling through New England to his fellow Quaker George Bishop, Coale writes that when he was walking "nere Plimmouth Colony," he came to an "Indian Sagamores hous." Coale's description suggests that the sachem has clearly encountered Quakers before. When Coale arrives, the sachem first shows his familiarity with the various English settlers. As Coale writes, the sachem greets the wandering Quaker by explaining that "the English men did not Loue quakers, but…quakers are honest men and doe noe harme." In these words, the sachem establishes his knowledge of colonial relationships at the same time as he indicates that he has not taken the side of the English settlers – but makes his own choices. His decision to treat with the Quakers is based on his authority as a sachem. As he informs Coale, "this is noe English mans sea nor Land and quakers shall Com here and welcom."[70] This powerful

[68] Augustine Jones, *Nicholas Upsall*, 8.
[69] Russell Herbert Gardner, "Last Royal Dynasty of the Massachusetts," 19.
William Sturtevant, ed. *Handbook of North American Indians: Northeast*. V. 15, Washington, D.C., Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 204.
[70] My thanks go to Geoffrey Plank and Evan Haefeli for directing me to Coale's account.

statement not only illustrates the sachem's sovereignty, but also shows his adept diplomacy. As the sachem, he decides who receives hospitality within his lands and all negotiations are done upon his terms. While Coale, like Upshall, leaves the sachem unnamed, it seems likely that the sachem Coale meets is Wompatuck. Maintaining his distance from both the English and the Quakers, Wompatuck works out of his established sovereignty as ruler of the Massachusett.

Placed alongside of one another, these two accounts give us a picture of a sachem who is neither savage, nor vanishing. Rather they point to a sachem acting out of his diplomatic responsibilities as he controls his lands and protects his people. These stories show Wompatuck actively approaching the arriving Quakers from his position as a leader. In doing so, he establishes his authority at the same time as he offers the Quakers the possibility of diplomatic ties that benefit both parties. The story of Upshall's meeting with the Indian Prince is deeply embedded in the national narratives of native people. Native diplomacy practices, native conception of land, and indigenous communal roles are all evident in the stories told by both Upshall and Coale. As such, these early narratives of encounter between Quakers and native people are not evidence that native people were making way for the Quakers, but instead they were making room.

By naming the Indian Prince in these stories, we change their function. The repeated narrative of the friendly Quaker and the welcoming American Indian relies on maintaining the anonymity of the Indians involved. As a nameless figure, the Indian Prince is described only through the pens of the Quaker authors. In the logic of firsting

---

Josiah Coale, "A Letter of Josiah Coale, 1658." *Bulletin of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia* 6:1 (1914), 4.

narratives, the Prince functions primarily to condone and even encourage a Quaker presence. However, in restoring Wompatuck's name, we also restore a voice. This transforms the story of Upshall and the Indian Prince from a narrative of firsts to one of indigenous persistence. It also challenges us to rethink the larger narrative that has been told about Quakers and American Indians. Despite the lasting influence of colonial histories, the story of early New England is one of complex interactions between multiple nations. All of whom, legitimately or not, were attempting to assert their rights to land, religion, and sovereignty within the space of colonial New England. At the same time as the Quakers were striving to set themselves up in opposition to the Puritans, the indigenous nations in New England were endeavoring to negotiate for their own rights and representation. In this light, it was not only, or even necessarily, the kindness and meekness of the wandering Quakers that attracted the sympathy of the New England Indians. Rather, native leaders like Wompatuck may have been drawn to the Quakers because they represented strategic opportunities for native people to make new alliances and friendships that would allow them to better secure access to their lands as well as the ability to continue their own spiritual practices based on kinship, community, and reciprocity.

CHAPTER FOUR:
TREATIES, RECIPROCITY, AND PROVIDENCE: INDIGENIOUS DIPLOMACY AS A FRAMEWORK FOR DANIEL GOOKIN'S *DOINGS AND SUFFERINGS*

In 1677, nearly twenty years after Humphrey Norton condemned the Bay Colony's Indian mission for its hypocrisy, the mission was once again a target for public criticism. However, this time the challenge came from within. In 1677, the prominent Ipswich minister William Hubbard cast doubt on the veracity of the Praying Indian's conversion. As he writes, though "Many [English] have endeavoured by kindess to convert [the Indians]," they have "found nothing from them, but *derision* and *Ridiculous Answers.*"[1] While Hubbard applauds the valiant efforts of the Bay Colony missionaries, in his view, their energies are misplaced. After nearly thirty years of proselytization attempts, the New England Indians remain "natural[ly] Persidious…" Until the Indians be "reduced to more *Civility,"* Hubbard suggests, "some wise men are ready to fear Religion will not take much place amongst the body of them."[2] In Hubbard's logic, all Indians, Praying or not, are too "savage" for any conversion attempt to truly succeed.

Hubbard's claim that all Indians lacked civility not only dismissed the Bay Colony's missionary efforts, it had a more practical application as well. Hubbard's critique came at the end of his 1677 tract *The Present State of New England Being a Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New England.* The tract was written to

[1] William Hubbard, *The Present State of New England. Being a Narrative Of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England, from the first planting thereof, in the year 1607, to this present year 1677: But Chiefly of the late Troubles in the two last years 1675, and 1676. To which is added a Discourse about the War with the Pequods in the year 1637* (London: Printed for Tho. Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside, 1677), 87.
[2] Ibid.

justify English actions during King Philip's War – the 1675-1676 war that allied the Pokanoket, Wampanoag, Nipmuck, Pawcatuck and Narragansett against the English. In claiming that all Indians were savage, Hubbard provides justification for the English to break their former agreements with the Praying Indian converts. During King Philip's War, also known as Metacom's Rebellion, many longstanding prejudices against the Praying Indian came to the fore.[3] English settlers who had always been suspicious about the authenticity of indigenous conversion saw the converts' participation in the war, or lack thereof, as inherently duplicitous. As Hilary Wyss writes, during the war the Praying Indians were "valuable to both sides as translators and scribes, yet [their] liminal identity left them mistrusted by both."[4] Fearful that the Praying Indians would choose conversion over kinship, many of the English settlers treated them with contempt. In October of 1675 the English authorities rounded up most of the Praying Indian converts and sent to an internment-like camp on Deer Island. Lacking food and resources in the middle of winter, numerous Praying Indians died from hunger and cold while others were killed or enslaved during the fighting.

Sanctioned by the Bay Colony authorities as the official narrative of the war, Hubbard's *A Narrative of the Troubles* shows the extent to which animosity towards the Praying Indians permeated the colony. However, *A Narrative of the Troubles* was just one of many documents that New Englander's produced justifying their treatment of the

[3] Kristina Bross points out that pre-war mission literature was itself rife with prejudices against Indians constantly describing them in bondage and slavery to Satan. During the war, writers who wished to discredit the Praying Indians simply re-hashed the missionaries' own rhetoric in service to their claims that Indians could not be converted. Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons*: *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons*: *Praying Indians in Colonial* America (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 149-150.
[4] Hilary Wyss, *Writing Indians*: *Literacy, Christianity, and Native Community in Early America* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), 38.

Indians during the war. As historian Jill Lepore writes, King Philip's War "was remarkable for how much the colonists wrote about it: more than four hundred letters written during the war survive in New England archives alone, along with more than thirty editions of twenty different printed accounts."[5] Lepore points out that the majority of the colonists who wrote about the war positioned the conflict as one in which "their lives, their land, and their sense of themselves" was at stake.[6] Literary scholar Patrick Cesarini notes that like *A Narrative of the Troubles,* many of these colonial war accounts "understood the war in providential terms, primarily as a drama of God's restoration of his favor to the English, and secondarily, of his disfavor to the Indians."[7] In making sense of the war, these accounts collectively took an "us versus them" approach in which they defined Indians (converted or not) as inherently heathen and savage at the same time as they defined Europeans as naturally civilized and saved.

In the midst of these proliferating anti-Indian narratives, one account stands out—Daniel Gookin's 1677 *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England, in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677*. Gookin was John Eliot's friend and fellow missionary. In 1661, he was appointed as the Superintendent of the Praying Indian towns – a position in which he was responsible for overseeing the Praying Indian judicial courts. As one deeply vested in the Bay Colony's mission, Gookin used his experience as Indian Superintendent to tell the story of King Philip's War from the Praying Indian perspective. As Lepore writes, "in noticing the war

[5] Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1998), xiii.
[6] Ibid.
[7] J. Patrick Cesarini, "'What Has Become of Your Praying to God?" Daniel Gookin's Troubled History of King Philip's War, *Early American Literature* 44, no. 3 (2009), 496.

narratives' neglect of Indians (albeit only Christian Indians), Gookin was not only more perceptive than most of his contemporaries, he was also more perceptive than most of the historians who succeeded him, many of whom failed to consider even the possibility of an Indian perspective."[8]

While *Doings and Sufferings* is often cited by historians of King Philip's War for the details it provides about the Praying Indians, scholars have largely ignored the narrative elements of Gookin's text. As Cesarini points out, this lack of analysis is in part the result of the text's hybrid form. The combination of history, providential interpretation, petition, diplomatic relation, and personal narrative that Gookin employs within *Doings and Sufferings* makes the text "difficult to 'place' or categorize."[9] In this chapter, I show that Gookin's text has been largely overlooked because it has not been fully contextualized. By unpacking both the content and the form of Gookin's narrative, I locate *Doings and Sufferings* within the longer history of engagement between Indigenous converts and English missionaries that I have traced up to this point. I argue that Gookin's defense of the Praying Indians is derived from his close relationships with indigenous people and his extended exposure to indigenous diplomatic practices. Relying on the Biblical language of covenants alongside of legal records and documentary accounts of Praying Indian actions, *Doings and Sufferings* attempts to convince English readers that throughout the war the Praying Indians have continued to maintain their treaties and agreements with the English.

Part of the confusion surrounding *Doings and Sufferings* lies in the fact that the

[8] Jill Lepore, *Name of War*, 46.
[9] J. Patrick Cesarini, "What Has Become of Praying to Your God," 490.

content of Gookin's account is derived from his relationship with the Praying Indians, while its narrative form and intended audience are English. As Gookin's Epistle Dedicatory indicates, his account was written for the English supporters of the Puritan mission, specifically Robert Boyle and the Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. In writing to the mission's supporters, Gookin was attempting to counteract the effects of Hubbard's official narrative of events. Gookin's preoccupation with countering Hubbard's account is not only found in the content of the text, but in its form as well. *Doings and Sufferings* is an almost point-by-point rebuttal of *Narrative of the Troubles*. Using alternative legal documents, theological interpretations, and personal narratives, Gookin sets up a counter narrative that seeks to challenge Hubbard's claims that the Praying Indians are inherently savage and untrustworthy. As part of his strategy, Gookin uses his narrative to develop a new definition of civility. Using personal narratives, stories, and legal documents, Gookin re-defines the Praying Indians as civil evidenced by their willingness to keep their treaties with the English. He not only uses his new definition of civility as a marker of Praying Indian civility, but he applies it to the English as well. As part and parcel of his argument for Praying Indian civility, Gookin illustrates the failure of English leaders to keep their own treaties with the Praying Indians, thereby implicitly questioning the civility of the English magistrates. For Gookin, good Christians, be they English or Indian, are those who keep their promises.

Gookin's claims that the Praying Indians are civilized not only challenges Hubbard's account, it is also distinct from the descriptions of Praying Indians found in

previous missionary literature.[10] However, it echoes the spiritual and social beliefs of the Bay Colony's Algonquian converts. Algonquian diplomacy defined relationships and alliances using treaties and agreements. For Gookin's Praying Indians, treaties were a staple of an organized and civilized society. Not only important for diplomacy, treaties also had a spiritual role. A treaty marked a means by which the Southern New England Algonquian maintained social and spiritual balance; the breaking of a treaty was a spiritual breech that yielded disorder, violence, and warfare. Though Gookin's aim as a missionary was to convert and civilize, his position as Superintendent in charge of approving indigenous judges and enacting judicial rulings meant that Gookin was necessarily well-versed in Algonquian philosophies of war, spirituality, and justice. His education on these matters was performed by the indigenous sachems with whom Gookin adjudicated legal decisions. Most prominent among these sachems was Waban, the Praying Indian who took over as ruler at Natick after the death of Cutshamekin. While Gookin was at the head of the Praying Indian judicial system, effective governing of Praying Indian communities depended on his working within the existing cultural practices of the Praying Indian converts who were rooted in a cultural system in which legal rights were defined through treaties. Thus, as I argue, *Doings and Sufferings* is not merely the articulation of Gookin's personal opposition to prevalent colonial perspectives, rather it is a natural result of the New England missionary project's almost thirty years of indigenous diplomatic influence.

[10] Bross writes that the unique tone of Gookin's text "can be used to measure just how thoroughly the image [of the Praying Indian] was discredited by literature created during and just after the war." Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons*, 157.

Judges, Rulers, and Converts: The Formation of Gookin's Judicial System

Gookin is most often referenced by scholars in association with his participation in King Philip's War, however, by the time the war began Gookin had already spent several years working in both English and Praying Indian legal systems. His location at the intersection of English and indigenous colonial politics is key to understanding his narrative perspective in *Doings and Sufferings*. Throughout his account, Gookin repeatedly invokes legal precedents and court decisions to defend Praying Indian actions. Gookin's knowledge of legal procedures and colonial law came in large part from his position as a political insider. The first member of the Gookin family to arrive in New England was Daniel's father, Daniel Sr., who arrived in 1621 as part of his business trading cattle with the Virginia settlers.[11] In 1631, the younger Gookin made his first trip to Virginia to manage his father's Newport News plantation. In 1641, at the age of 30, Daniel Gookin began his long career in colonial politics when he was elected as a member of Virginia's House of Burgesses.[12] A year later, in one of the earliest recorded actions of Gookin's political career, Gookin legislated a dispute between his brother, John Gookin and the local Nansemond tribe.[13] As archeologist Luke Pecoraro points out, the Gookin family's plantation Newport News was located at the confluence of the James and Nansemond Rivers which placed it "in close proximity to the Nansemond's ceremonial center of Dumpling Island."[14] From the start of his political career, Gookin

[11] Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin, 1612-1687, Assistant and Major General of the Massachusetts Bay Colony: His Life and Letters and Some Account of His Ancestry* (Chicago: Privately Printed, 1912), 38, 42.
[12] Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin*, 65, Luke Pecoraro, "'Mr. Gookin, Wholly Upon His Owne Adventure:" An Archeological Study of Intercolonial and Transatlantic Connections in the Seventeenth Century," (Boston University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing, 2015), 12.
[13] Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin*, 66.
[14] Luke Pecoraro, "'Mr. Gookin, Wholly Upon His Owne Adventure,'" 12.

found himself negotiating between the people whose lands he was upon and the people whose lands he was from. In 1643, Gookin left Virginia and headed for Maryland after the Virginia Colonial Governor William Berkeley expelled dissenters. Only in Maryland for a short while, Gookin arrived in Massachusetts Bay in 1644.[15] In 1649, Gookin again became part of the colonial government when he was elected to serve as a Cambridge representative to the General Court. He was re-elected in 1651. From 1652 until his death in 1687 Gookin was elected almost continually as an assistant to the Court. The exception to this was in 1676 when Gookin was voted out of office for a year because of his support for the Praying Indians in King Philip's War.[16]

Gookin's political career and his spiritual devotion eventually led him to participate in Eliot's Indian mission. When Gookin moved to the Bay Colony in 1644, he lived next to the John Eliot in Roxbury. The two became friends and in 1666 Gookin's daughter married Eliot's son. Gookin also began to accompany Eliot on his trips to the Praying Indian towns. Though we don't have clear evidence of when Gookin first started working with Eliot, it is possible that he was part of the missionary project from the beginning.[17] Gookin is first formally mentioned in the missionary literature in 1651 when he joins with other church leaders in questioning Indian converts to determine their

[15] Pecoraro explains that Gookin left Maryland because he found "the political situation in Maryland to be as oppressive as Virginia." Luke Pecoraro, "Mr. Gookin, Wholly Upon his Owne Adventure," 13-14. Cogley, on the other hand, seems unsure whether Gookin actually lived in Virginia or just bought land there. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 227.

[16] Frederick Gookin explains that an assistant was "one of the Council of eighteen magistrates to whom, with the Governor and the Deputy Governor, the government of the colony was entrusted." Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin*, 82.
Gookin was also active in the colonial militia, first as a captain in the Cambridge band and later in 1676, he was chosen as a sergeant-major in the Middlesex regiment. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 227.

[17] Cogley posits that he may have been present at the start. Ibid., 226.

spiritual readiness to forming the Praying Indian church at Natick.[18] In the 1650s, Gookin utilized his political expertise to help establish English judicial practices among the Indians when he was appointed as the Indian Superintendent. The position was created at the behest of Eliot. In 1656, Eliot requested the General Court to appoint "some agents…in Massachusetts [Bay] to promote and forward the work among the Indians, both in respect of their government and encouraging some meet instruments for their further help and instruction." In 1657, Eliot again made his request, this time proposing Gookin serve in the role of Indian Superintendent.[19] When the role was finally approved in 1658, Gookin was in England where he was recruited to work on behalf of the English Protectorate. Between 1655 and 1660, Gookin was back and forth between England and the colonies after being commissioned by Oliver Cromwell to recruit English settlers to colonize the newly-obtained island of Jamaica.[20] After the Restoration of Charles II in 1660, Gookin settled back into colonial life and in 1661 he finally took up the role of Indian Superintendent. He remained Superintendent until his death in 1687. By the time of King Philip's War, Gookin was an established leader in both colonial and Praying Indian governance.

The Praying Indian judicial system, like the larger missionary project, was derived from combination of indigenous law, English law, and Puritan religious concepts

[18] John Eliot, "Strength Out of Weakness" (1651). *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*. Ed. Michael P. Clark (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003), 245.
[19] As Cogley points out, the court made the position official in 1658, although Gookin claims in his Historical Collections, that he began the role of commissioner in 1656, before he left for his English voyage. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 224-225.
[20] Louise Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises Among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630*-1692 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 156
Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin,* 87-88, 93-95.

of Christian civility.[21] For Gookin and Eliot, the Praying Indian court system was a necessary first step towards enacting their larger missionary vision. The court served as a means for the missionaries to deploy and enforce English-style rules intended to promote "civilization" among the Algonquian converts. Regulating things like clothing, sexual relationships, and religious practices, the courts gave the missionaries a means to enforce a particular performance of Englishness among their converts – a performance that they hoped would lead the Indians to adapt English forms of civility. Yet, despite the court's imperial aims, many of the Praying Indians also petitioned for the missionaries' judicial system. Within the increasingly constrained power dynamics of colonial New England, the court system provided a way for the Praying Indians to participate in colonial governing processes and, most importantly, obtain the protection of the Bay Colony.

The naissance of Praying Indians court system came from the 1644 Treaty between Cutshamekin and the Bay Colony in which Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems agreed to be "under the government & *jurisdiction*" of the Bay Colony in return for protection.[22] As historian Jean O'Brien points out, Praying Indians like Cutshamekin and Waban agreed to be part of the English missionary project in part because "they sought a course of peaceful coexistence holding the promise that an Indian future could be negotiated within the context of English expansion."[23] The establishment of the judicial system offered a means for the Praying Indians to strengthen and regulate their

[21] As Jean O'Brien points out, in Eliot's political system, "The potential for molding the political order remained in the hands of experienced Native leaders, who may have lost some existing institutions to wield power (tribute, which leaders probably adapted to fit tithing schemes), but gained others (legitimized access to colonial officials)." Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees: Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts, 1650-1790* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 49.
[22] Nathaniel Shurtleff, ed. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: Volume II 1642-1649*, (Boston: From the Press of William White, 1853), 55. Emphasis added.
[23] Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees,* 63.

communities within a colonial system at the same time as provided them with strong diplomatic ties to the English colonists.

While Gookin was appointed to the role of Superintendent for his political experience, his ability to govern was dependent on the Praying Indians themselves as it was the Praying Indian leader Waban who both created and served as one of the primary enforcers of the Praying Indians' judicial system. Not long after Eliot's first visit to Waban at Nonantum in October 1646, the two men set about adapting indigenous legal practices to conform to English Christian conventions. In November of 1646, Waban helped Eliot draft The Nonantum Code, which was a detailed a series of laws and proscriptions that attempted to guide the Indians towards English civility. The codes included rules for domestic relationships, work habits, sexuality, and hygiene.[24] An essential first step on the path to Christianization, the Nonantum Code was written almost five years before the town of Natick was formed. Following the Nonantum Code, Waban helped draw up another set of laws in 1647. This time he wrote the laws for the sachem Attawans and the Praying Indians residing at Musketaquid.[25] The reasons for Waban's participation in the mission are hard to decipher, but were likely a combination of his desire for survival, coercion of the missionaries, and perhaps, Christian conviction.[26] Thus Waban's writing of the codes does not necessarily signal his complete approval of

[24] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 52-54.
[25] Ibid., 58.
[26] As Jean O'Brien points out, Waban's participation in the missionary project was vexed. In one of his confession recorded in Eliot's 1660 tract, *A Further Account of the Progress of the Gospel,* Waban explains that at the story of his participation in the missionary project, he performed for the missionaries because if he did not, he thought "the *English* might kill us." Jean O'Brien, *Dispossession by Degrees*, 52.
John Eliot, *A Further Accompt of the Progress of the Gospel in New England* (1660), in *The Eliot Tracts with Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter,* ed. Michael P. Clark (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), 375.

their content or function. However, Waban's central role in the code's formation indicates the extent to which the missionaries were at the behest of native people for the progression of their mission.

After the codes were written, Waban and his fellow Praying Indians were tasked with enforcing them. In 1647 Waban and Attawans were "authorized" by the Massachusetts authorities to "hear minor civil cases in monthly sessions, to appoint constables, and to rule on criminal cases referred to them by English magistrates."[27] In many ways, this was a perfunctory assignment because as leaders, Waban and Attawans had already been determining communal justice for years.[28] In his first meeting with Waban, Eliot describes him to the English readers as "the chief minister of Justice" among the Nonantum Indians.[29] As the mission progressed, the Praying Indian judiciaries were accorded more formal powers. According to the English court records, indigenous judges were eventually given the right to "determine all such matters that do arise among themselves, as one magistrate may do among the English." As Cogley explains, "This provision presumably meant that Indian commissioners, like Puritan magistrates, were empowered to hear civil suites under 20 shillings and to punish minor criminal

[27] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*, 59.
[28] Waban's status within the Massachusett community prior to the arrival of the missionaries is unclear. Francis Jennings see Waban as a pawn of Eliot and the Bay Colony. Cogley also points out the fact that Waban seems to have been chosen apart from the established protocols of Massachusett governance, however, as Cogley points out, "[Waban's] commission as 'chief minister' of justice…apparently did not constitute a coup d'etat within the ranks of the Massachusett Indians." I am of the opinion that Waban had some sort of authority before the arrival of the missionaries — he may have been a member of the sachemship – because it does not seem likely that Eliot could have forcibly convinced the Massachusett to appoint him as a sachem and get them to follow a new leader at this very early period in the mission. Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of* Conquest (New York: Norton, 1976), 239-240; Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philp's War*, 54.
[29] Thomas Shepard, "The Day-Breaking, if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospell with the Indians in New England. *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*. Michael P. Clark, ed., (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003), 83.

infractions such as drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, and petty theft."[30] While the Praying Indians determined smaller cases, Gookin held quarterly sessions to hear larger cases that were referred to him by the Algonquian judges. However, Gookin's schedule as a magistrate meant that he was not able to spend extensive time adjudicating Praying Indian cases.[31] Many, if not most, of the judicial rulings among the Praying Indians were made by Waban and his fellow Algonquian.

In a recorded transcript from one of Gookin's court sessions, we can see the close working relationship between Gookin, Waban, and the Praying Indians themselves. Of course, while Gookin relied on indigenous judges for many of the minor judicial decisions, he still retained the final authority as the English colonial representative. He was also the one who transcribed the cases giving him narrative authority as well. Nevertheless, Gookin's transcripts give us a glimpse into the ways that Praying Indian judicial systems may have worked. In 1668, Gookin transcribed the case of Sarah Ahhaton, a Praying Indian woman accused of adultery by her husband William Ahhaton. As Gookin indicates, the case started in Waban's court. In 1666, "around planting time," Sarah appeared before Waban after her husband "chardged her that shee loved other men." Specifically, the transcript explains that William claimed that Sarah "did sometimes speak alone with Joseph a married man of Packemit."[32] Not content to verbally accuse her, Gookin explains that William "did beat [Sarah] severall times, as

---

[30] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*., 224.
[31] Ibid., 229.
[32] Sarah Ahaton, "The Examination of Sarah Ahhaton October 24, 1668," Paul Grant-Costa et al. eds., *Yale Indian Papers* Project (New Haven: Yale Divinity School, 2011), 152, http://hdl.handle.net/10079/digcoll/3641

som other Indians of the place do know." William's accusations about Joseph and Sarah may have been motived by William's desire for vengeance. It seems that the his ire was raised after Sarah was warned by Joseph's mother, aunt, and another woman that William "did love, and keepe company with other women." A largely internal affair, Waban's court relied on the testimony of others in the Praying Indian community. It was other Indians who testified to Sarah's beatings and it was also Indian women, primarily Joseph's family members, who informed Sarah that her husband was cheating. Though we don't know the details of the case, it seems that Waban made the decision in favor of William. After hearing the case, Gookin writes that Waban "did then chardge [Sarah] that she should not at any time after bee alone in company of the said Joseph."[33] William seems to have gone unpunished.

This was not the end of the case. A few months later, "about weeding time," Sarah and William found themselves in court again. As Gookin recounts, they were present at "an indian court kept at pakemitt at the house of squamock the Ruler." Pakemitt, also known as Punkapoag, was the home of Joseph and his family. It was also the community headed by William's father, Old Hahawton.[34] The fact that this second court session was held in William and Joseph's home community seems to have influenced the court's proceedings. Though the text is unclear, it is possible that the reason Sarah and William were back in court for the same charge may have been the fact that community wanted to have its own hearing regarding the affairs of its members. The courts' ties to the community also allowed Sarah to escape punishment because Joseph,

---

[33] Ibid.
[34] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 257.
Ann Marie Plane, *Colonial Intimacies: Indian Marriage in Early New England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 1.

her purported paramour, had inside knowledge of the court's deliberation. As Gookin explains, Joseph's "uncle William" told him that Sarah was going to be "whipt erelong" for "wch shee was before Waban." Attempting to protect her, Joseph sent her to his mother's wigwam to hide. After three days, Sarah went to her own home, "nere Pawtuckett, wher her father and mother lived." When Sarah's family heard her about situation, they also took matters into their own hands. As Gookin writes, "Her father & mother wth some other friends came downe wth her to Packemit, & by their endevors a reconciliation was made between her and her husband."[35] This peace continued, but only for a short time – "about seven or 8 weeks until about hilling time."

By that time, the beatings and suspicions from William had taken their toll on Sarah: they "did weaken and alienate her former affections to him."[36] Actualizing her husband's accusations, Sarah finally "lay[s]" with Joseph who comes "to her wigwam" while William was "at the Sea Side." As Gookin explains, in this instance it is Joseph's mother who works to protect Sarah by insisting that she "withdraw herselfe & go to Philip's wigwam Sachem of mount hope neare Secunck, wheare shee should bee entertained."[37] Not long after her departure, Joseph joined Sarah and the two carried on as a couple. Up to this point in Gookin's transcript of the case, the primary mechanisms of justice are communal and internal. As Ann Marie Plane points out, "the English-style magistrates Sarah Ahhaton faced in the Indian court were probably members of the original elite families, who largely continued pre-Christian roles in the new enclaves."[38] Both the indigenous courts and the Praying Indian communities in which Sarah finds

[35] Sarah Ahaton, "The Examination of Sarah Ahhaton," 152.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid, 153.
[38] Anne Marie Plane, *Colonial Intimacies,* 77-78.

herself are connected. As the narrative explains, the court at Punkapoag intended to punish her because she broke the ruling that she had received in Waban's courtroom. Further, Sarah and Joseph's family members in both Natick, Punkapoag, and Pawtucket worked with (and at time against) one another. At the second hearing, Joseph's kinship networks trumped the judicial rulings as Sarah escaped from the court's sentence because of Joseph's uncle and mother. Kinship may also have been a reason why she was sent to Philip as Joseph's family likely had kinship ties to Philip or some of his followers who could offer Sarah and Joseph protection. Attempting to resolve the case internally, the Praying Indian community used a mix of both formal and informal mechanisms.

It is only when Sarah finally turns herself in to the Punkapoag court that she receives judicial punishment from the English. Leaving Joseph, Sarah first returns to Punkapoag where "from thence [she] was carried to Natick before Wabun." Perhaps realizing that the English rules cannot overcome kinship ties, or perhaps for some other reason, Waban, sends the case to Gookin who finally metes out Sarah's punishment. Gookin "committed her to prison." In Gookin's narrative, the punishment is divinely ordained as it was Sarah's choice to turn herself in after it "pleased God to smite her hart wth the Sence of her Sinne."[39] Plane explains that after lingering in prison for at least a month, Sarah was "finally sentenced by the Massachusetts General Assembly to stand on the Boston gallows with a noose around her neck for one hour on a Sabbath day and to be 'severly' whipped at Natick by the Indian constable."[40] Made a public example by both Waban and Gookin, Sarah's punishment was severe while William got away unscathed.

[39] Sarah Ahaton, "The Examination of Sarah Ahhaton," 153.
[40] Ann Marie Plane, *Colonial Intimacies*, 77.

Despite the clear colonial undertones of the case, the case illustrates the fact that Gookin was dependent on indigenous people for any judicial rulings to be enforced. When making his ruling, Gookin presumably heard the facts of the case from Waban, and later from Sarah herself using an Algonquian interpreter, Andrew Boughow.[41] Even Gookin's transcription seems to carry traces of indigenous narrative conventions as the events of the case are recounted using agrarian markers. Moving from "planting time," to "weeding time," to "hilling time," the story of Sarah's case proceed alongside of the events of the growing year. Not present at any of the events save the final court hearing, Gookin has to rely on the memories of native participants as the testimony of the case was related to Gookin almost two years after Sarah first appeared in Waban's court. Despite Sarah eventual treatment in the English courts, the actions of her family and Joseph's family show how kinship ties and indigenous communities played a substantial role in determining communal justice even after the arrival of the English.[42]

Notwithstanding the imposition of English Christianity, the Praying Indian judicial systems retained Algonquian social and spiritual beliefs as well. At the heart of Algonquian spirituality was the concept of manitou. As Kathleen Bragdon explains, manitou was an "impersonal force that permeated the world, observable in anything marvelous, beautiful, or dangerous." As a force, manitou was "not uniformly distributed in the world" and while it could inhabit "natural phenomena, objects or people," it was

[41] Sarah Ahaton, "Examination of Sarah Ahhaton," 153.
[42] The language of the transcript is unclear, but Ahhaton explains that the troubles with her husband began "about two yeares since" and she also explains that right after the initial troubles, she "was brought before Waban the Ruler" which was "about planting time last." It seems that the "two years" refers to the date of the transcription, October 1668.

"not necessarily a permanent quality."[43] Judicial rulings, alongside of treaties, and ceremonies, worked to redistribute, balance, or maintain manitou in order to ensure societal flourishing. As Jeffrey Glover explains the "notion of *manitou* in all things was at the center of coastal practices for marking agreements and building political order."[44] In participating in Algonquian communities, Europeans like Gookin and Eliot became part of the indigenous network of relations or the common pot. As such, they were beholden to, and influenced by Algonquian spiritual practices. Abenaki scholar Lisa Brooks explains that "Europeans were in the common pot, whether they knew it or not, and they had brought with them ideas, behaviors, and materials that could potentially disrupt or destroy it."[45]

Rushing to Print: Competing Narratives of King Philip's War

Gookin's dependence on Praying Indians is not only found in his judicial rulings, but also extends to Gookin's defense of the Praying Indians recounted in *Doings and Sufferings.* Reliant on Praying Indians stories and actions to complete his narrative, *Doings and Sufferings*, like the Praying Indian judicial system, mixes native beliefs with missionary motivation. Written in 1677, *Doings and Sufferings* was Gookin's attempt to respond the accounts of the war promulgated by other Bay Colony leaders, namely the two most popular histories of the war, Increase Mather's *A Brief History of the War with*

[43] Kathleen Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500-1650* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 184-185.
[44] Jeffrey Glover, *Paper Sovereigns: Anglo-Native Treaties and the Law of Nations, 1604-1664* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 15.

[45] Lisa Brooks, *Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Spaces in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 7.

the Indians in New England (1676) and William Hubbard's *Narrative of the Troubles* (1677). As Gookin explains in his introduction, the problem with Mather and Hubbard's "historical narratives" was that they said "very little" about "the Christian Indians, who, in reality, may be judged to have no small share in the effects and consequents of the war."[46]

More than just an attempt to vocalize the Praying Indian experience during the war, Gookin's narrative attempts to justify and defend the Praying Indians whom Hubbard and Mather have largely dismissed. Like many in the Bay Colony, Hubbard and Mather's narratives are largely suspicious of Praying Indian motivation in the war as they are convinced that the Praying Indians will choose kinship over conversion. Their suspicions extended to Gookin and Eliot as well. Wary of the missionaries' claims that the Indian converts were "civilized," most of the English colonists assumed that "the entire Indian population, regardless of prior allegiances or protestations of friendship, had risen against the colonies."[47] In their attempts to give significance to the war, Mather and Hubbard folded the inscrutability of Indian conversion into their larger providential renderings of the war's significance.

In Mather's *Brief History* the attack on the Indian mission is somewhat subdued. As Mather explains, *A Brief History* was his attempt to "methodize such scattered Observations" as he had about King Philip's War.[48] In Mather's estimation, King Philip's

---

[46] Daniel Gookin, "An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677." *Archaeologia Americana: Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* Volume II (Cambridge: Printed for the Society at the University Press, 1836), 433.
[47] Kristian Bross, *Dry Bones*, 155.
[48] Increase Mather, "A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New-England (1676): An Online Electronic Text Edition," *Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries* Paper 31. Ed. Paul Royster (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Digital Commons), 3. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libraryscience/31

War was divine punishment for the degradation of New England's second generation. As Anne Kusener Nelsen points out, Mather did not view the war as an exceptional occurrence, but rather as a "scourge in a succession of scourges."[49] One impetus for the Lord's scourging was the Bay Colony's failure to grow its' Indian mission. As Mather suggests, "the Lords Holy design in *Warr*" was "(in part)…to punish us for our too great neglect in [converting the Indians]."[50] For Mather, the missionary project was not a complete failure. He acknowledges the efforts of the first generation of founders particularly, the "Reverend Mr. *Eliot*" who "hath taken most indefatigable pains" in his efforts to preach to the Indians. However, the second generation has not followed in Eliot's footsteps and "It cannot be long, before that faithful, and now aged Servant of the Lord rest from his labours." Once Eliot is gone, "sad will it be for the succeeding Generation."[51] For Mather, the missionary project, like the rest of the New England colony, has lost its way. The second generation cannot live up to the faithfulness of the first. Though Mather does not reference Gookin directly, as Eliot's successor, Gookin may have seen Mather's words as dismissive of the continuing efforts he was making in growing the Indian mission.

As the first of the three histories that was published, Mather's account was a pre-emptive response to Hubbard's narrative. However, Mather had heard the content of Hubbard's forthcoming account during Hubbard's 1676 election sermon.[52] As Nelsen

[49] Anne Kusener Nelsen, "King Philip's War and the Hubbard-Mather Rivalry." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1970): 626.
[50] Increase Mather, *A Brief History*, 7.
[51] Increase Mather, *A Brief History*, 7-8.
[52] Hubbard first gave his providential interpretation of the war when he was chosen to give the Election Sermon of 1676 – a sermon that Mather himself wanted to give. Nelsen, Anne Kusener Nelsen, "King Philip's War and the Hubbard-Mather Rivalry," 619.

explains in her oft-cited account of the dispute, Hubbard and Mather differed greatly on the war's providential meaning. While Mather saw the war as providential punishment for New England's sins, Hubbard blamed the war on individual actors – namely "Satans Instruments" or the Indians, whose "shew of Religion" is "no doubt…learned from the *Prince of Darkness."*[53] Like Mather, Hubbard also provides his opinion on the New England missionary project. However, where Mather praises Eliot as the product of a dying generation, Hubbard dismisses Eliot and instead sets himself up as Eliot's successor. In the account's prefatory poem, Benjamin Thompson makes a direct contrast between Eliot, whom he terms the Indians' "grand Apostle" who writes of "their return" and Hubbard, who writes about "how they burn, / Rob, kill and Roast, lead Captive, flay, blaspheme."[54] As Lepore explains, the poem suggests that Eliot's writing "had been rightly replaced by Hubbard's account of the Indian's barbarity."[55] The claim that Hubbard was attempting to replace Eliot as the spokesperson for Indian affairs was not ill founded. While Mather account is dismissive of the Praying Indians, Hubbard's stands out in its attempts to create a calculated argument against the authenticity of Praying Indian conversion.

Like Mather, Hubbard's account also contains an indirect indictment of Gookin, albeit a much more pointed and personal one. On the final pages of his narrative, Hubbard addresses the Praying Indian question directly for any who may be wondering "what is become of the *Conversion of the Natives*, so much *famed abroad*." Employing Mather's rhetoric of divine inscrutability, Hubbard acknowledges the possibility of

[53] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles*, iv, 48
[54] Ibid., xi.
[55] Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Knopf, 1998), 45-46.

Praying Indian conversion. As he writes, "it is supposed that there are some [Indians] that do make *a serious profession* of the Christian Religion."[56] Yet, while this statement suggests the possibility of true conversion, his account quickly cast foreclose this suggestion. Relying on a discourse of civility versus savagery, Hubbard argues that "never any notable work of Religion was known to take much place, where some kind of Civility, and *Culture of good manners,* had not gone before." In Hubbard's historical view, "we rarely find any *Gentill Nation* turned *Christian* before they became *Humane.*"[57]

Making the connection explicit, Hubbard describes the efforts that have been made to civilize the Indians in New England as ones that are bound to fail as evidenced by the events of King Philip's War. For Hubbard, the New England mission has failed because the missionaries have taken too gentle of an approach. As he writes, "The Civility that is found amongst the *Natives* of this Country; hath hitherto been *carried on* and obtained, only by the gentle means of *Courtesy, Familiarity,* and such like *civil behaviour,* which in other places was never yet attended with any *eminent Success* that way." To illustrate his claims that Indians cannot be truly converted, much less civilized, Hubbard ends his narrative with a story about previous English missionary attempts among the Powhatan Indians in Virginia. In his final pages, he reminds his readers of the 1622 uprising in Virginia by the Powhatan sachem Opechancanough. In the uprising, Opechancanough and his followers attacked English plantations and killed a number of settlers. The attack came after the Powhatan had made repeatedly attempted to persuade the English settlers to leave their territory.

[56] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles,* 85.
[57] Ibid., 86.

Among the dead was the English missionary George Thorpe, an enthusiastic proselytizer who had attempted to befriend Opechancanough and had even built the sachem a house.[58] In Hubbard's version of the events, Thorpe's ardent defense of the Indians made him blind to the threat they posed. In a description almost certainly aimed at the defenders of the Bay Colony mission, Hubbard writes that Thorpe, "out of his good meaning was so full of Confidence and void of Suspicion, that he would never believe *any hurt* of [the Powhatan], till he *felt their cruel hands imbrued in his own blood.*"[59] Hubbard then explains that "the geneality of the Indians in New England are in their manners and natural disposition, not much unlike those in Virginia, living much in the same clime."[60] In this parallel, Hubbard not only points to the inherent contradiction of a Christian Indian, he also critiques anyone who defends them.

Interestingly the particular story that Hubbard chose to illustrate the impossibility of conversion seems to have been a veiled attack on the Gookin family.[61] The 1622 uprising occurred four months after Daniel Gookin Sr. arrived in Virginia to set up his cattle trade. Though only recently arrived, Gookin Sr.'s plantation, Marie's-Mount at Newport News, was one of the few not attacked by Opechancanough's forces.[62] While it is hard to determine why Marie's-Mount was not attacked, it may have been that Gookin

---

[58] Eric Gethyn-Jones, *George Thorpe and the Berkeley Company: A Gloucestershire Enterprise in Virginia* (Gloucester, UK, Alan Sutton Publishing, 1982), 189-190.
Thorpe was also in the process of establishing an Indian school, Henrico College, which Eric Gethyn-Jones describes as "the first major attempt at the civilization and conversion of the Indian." Eric Gethyn-Jones. *George Thorpe and the Berkeley Company*, 180

[59] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles*, 87.

[60] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles*, 88. Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin*, 43-44

[61] Schutlz and Tougias note that Hubbard's book was full of criticisms of colonial officials, however, because his "text needed to pass muster with Massachusetts Bay authorities" many of its criticism "are well veiled." *King Philip's War: The History and Legacy of American's Forgotten Conflict*. Eric B. Schutlz and Michael J. Tougias. (Woodstock, VT: The Countryman Press, 1999) 396

[62] John Smith, *The Generall Histories of Virginia, New England & the Summer Isles*, Volume 1 (Glasgow: J. MacLehose and Sons, 1907), 272.

Sr.'s status as a merchant and trader gave him some sort of value to the tribal leaders.[63] While we have limited evidence of Gookin Sr.'s indigenous trading networks, we do know that Daniel Gookin himself regularly established ties with native people through trade. In 1632, English Capt. Henry Fleet encountered the younger Gookin while he was looking to trade beaver pelts with the Indians on the upper Potomac River. Gookin was travelling with a group of Algonquians. As Luke Pecoraro explains, "Fleet describes Gookin Jr. as an 'interpreter,' and learned from Gookin about a powerful tribe called the Massawomecks whose chiefdom was at the head of Chesapeake Bay, with whom he might be able to trade."[64] Though trade may not have been the sole reason why the Gookin family survived the 1622 attack, Hubbard decision to include the story reminds his readers that the Gookin family has a long history of relationships with Indians and insinuates that the Gookin family's ties to the Indians are ones that may challenge their loyalty to the English settlers. As Hubbard seems to be saying, Gookin is, and always has been, too trusting of Indian converts.

Hubbard's personal jab at Gookin along with his larger critique of Gookin's missionary work was enough of a reason for Gookin to feel the need to defend himself. However, the timing of Gookin's text in relation to Hubbard's also suggests that *Doings and Sufferings* was a direct rebuttal to *Narrative of the Troubles.* As Gookin's epistle dedicatory indicates, *Doings and Sufferings* was written for an English audience, specifically for Robert Boyle and the Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England. Though clearly intended to update the company on the state of their

[63] Frederick Gookin and others suggest that the Gookin family survived because they had a better defense system in place. This argument seems ill fetched because they only been there for four months and there were a limited number of people at the plantation to provide defense. Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin*, 43.
[64] Luke Pecoraro, "Mr. Gookin Out of Ireland, Wholly Upon His Owne Adventure," 45.

mission, the fact Gookin's narrative was written to an English audience in late December 1677 suggests that Gookin also hoped his account would be a counter to Hubbard's own. Having already received the official sanction of the Bay Colony for his original publication in March of 1677, Hubbard travelled to England in early 1678 to "superintend" the publication of *Narrative of the Troubles* for an English audience.[65] His trip was taken only a few weeks after Gookin's narrative was written, and Gookin's narrative may have travelled to England on the same boat as Hubbard himself. Though Gookin's account was never published, its timing suggests that Gookin was hoping to mitigate the effects of Hubbard's account and maintain the favor of his English benefactors by providing them with an "impartial" account from one "well acquainted with that affair."

Point/Counterpoint: Reconfiguring the Diplomatic Relation

When read as a response to the existing historical accounts of the war, Hubbard's account in particular, Gookin's narrative format begins to make sense. As part of his strategic response to Hubbard, Gookin retains the general form and order that Hubbard uses, albeit in service to a very different end. Both *A Narrative of the Troubles* and *Doings and Sufferings* are written in a form that literary scholar Jeffrey Glover terms a "diplomatic relation." As Glover notes, the diplomatic relation was a genre that captured "both official acts of ratification and the many behaviors and negotiations that surrounded them." The form's intent was to provide Europeans readers with "potential evidence of

[65] Day explains that Hubbard went over in early 1678. Edward Warren Day, *One Thousand Years of Hubbard History, 866 to 1895. From Hubba, the Norse Sea King, to the Enlightenment Present* (New York: HP, Hubbard, 1895), 181-182.

[indigenous] consent."[66] Glover explains that "the English crown and its colonists sought to demonstrate possession of foreign territories" by detailing the treaties that they had made with Native people.[67] Native treaties were not intended to showcase indigenous sovereignty, but were rather reprinted to provide evidence that the English colonists were "carrying out a supposedly peaceful conquest" – in this light, the majority of colonial authors only emphasized treaties when they aligned with European aims.[68] In Hubbard's account, descriptions of native treaties provide evidence to English readers that the Bay Colony has performed its colonial conquest correctly, and is now justified in its attack on Metacom and his followers.

In *Doings and Sufferings*, Gookin employs the diplomatic relation form to another end – that of proving the trustworthiness of his Praying Indian converts. By revisiting and revising many of the same events that Hubbard describes in *Doings and Sufferings*, Gookin creates an account filled with documents and behaviors that verify his claims, and indeed those of the larger New England mission, that the Praying Indians are true converts and, as such, deserve the rights accorded to them in previous treaties and negotiations. It is this strong adherence to Hubbard's format that at times makes Gookin's narrative difficult to follow. As largely minor players in a war between the English soldiers and the Wampanoag and their Narragansett allies, the Praying Indians' actions during the war fail to fit into the same narrative structure as the one Hubbard employs for the war's larger events. Nevertheless, Gookin's focus on the Praying Indians strategically disrupts one of Hubbard's primary ends – that of justifying English actions during the

[66] Jeffrey Glover, *Paper Sovereigns*, 17.
[67] Ibid., 3.
[68] Ibid., 9.

war. As Gookin shows, in failing to differentiate between Indians, the English have not only turned their back on their allies, they have also abandoned their "covenant with our King, in our charter, to use our best endeavours to communicate the Christian religion to the Indians." [69]

The point/counterpoint nature of Gookin's narrative is evident from the start. Both accounts start with a map that locates readers within the space of the war. For Hubbard, it is a physical map which he includes in his account following the title page. Intent on justifying English conquest, Hubbard's map defines the terrain of the battle using English names at the same time as it prioritizes English villages. Hubbard's naming conventions are part of his larger strategy to identify the space upon which King Philip's War takes place as English space. As Hubbard's caption to the map suggests, the intent of the map is to mark the English villages which "have been assaulted by the *Indians*" effectively supporting his larger narrative in which the English are victims attacked in their own lands.[70] The symbols of Hubbard's map reinforce his narrative. The map marks the English towns using tiny houses and church buildings while the locations of the Narragansett, the Pocasset, the Pequot, and the Nipmuck are indicated by trees or blank spaces. As Lepore notes, the trees and blank spaces invoke the larger logic of *vacuum domicilum* – the idea that Indians did not properly use the land and therefore held no claims to it.[71] Hubbard's map is not merely a political statement, but it also reinforces his

[69] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 468.
[70] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles*, xiii - xiv,
[71] Lepore explains that, "In the first decades of settlement, the Indians' supposed oneness with the woods (and their corresponding lack of ownership of the land) had served the colonists well in claiming New England as a *vacuum domicilum* – during King Philip's War it made those same Indians frightful enemies." Jill Lepore, *Name of War*, 85. Adrian Chastain Weimer also discusses the ways that Hubbard and Gookin's accounts re-define the concept of martyr. For Hubbard, the English are martyrs, unfairly attacked, while Gookin employs the concept of martyrdom for the Christian Indians. See Weimer Chastain, Chapter 7

claims that the war is a spiritual one between the forces of evil and the forces light. Attacked in their own lands, Hubbard's map positions the colonist as "religious martyrs" who are justified in their treatment of the "savage" Indians.[72]

Not surprisingly, the Praying Indians have no place in Hubbard's map – an omission that Gookin's account seeks to rectify. As part of his attempts to counter Hubbard and re-tells the war as an event focused on Praying Indians, Gookin follows his own epistle dedicatory with a map as well – albeit a verbal and not a visual one. Gookin's map fills in Hubbard's blank spaces. Explaining that before he can give a "particular and real account of this affair," he must first "premise some things necessary to be understood for the better clearing of our ensuing discourse," Gookin begins by describing all of the Praying Indian towns in terms of their location, history, leaders, and the members' acceptance of Christianity.[73] Gookin starts with the Praying Indians on Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard, then moves on to talk about the Cape Indians in New Plymouth, and the Praying Indians in Connecticut Colony. Finally, he ends with the Praying Indians who live in the Bay Colony explaining that these are the Indians on whom his account focuses because they "have felt more of the effects of this war than all the rest of the Christian Indians."[74] By mapping the Praying Indian villages throughout the New England colonies, Gookin defines the entirety of New England as being anchored by Praying Indian towns thereby setting the stage for his larger narrative.

"'Devilish Enemies of Religion' In King Philip's War." in *Martyr's Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[72] Matthew Edney and Susan Cimburek. "Telling the Traumatic Truth: Hubbard's Narrative of King Philip's War." *The William and Mary Quarterly* Third Series 61, no. 2 (2004), 325.

[73] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 433

[74] Ibid., 435.

Gookin continues to mimic Hubbard's narrative form in the pages following his map. After strategically positioning their readers within a particular space, both Hubbard and Gookin describe the war's backstory by moving through a number of past legal agreements between the Indians and the English. Following his map, Hubbard reinforces his claims of English authority using a brief history of New England land transactions. Starting with the English crown, Hubbard explains that the first settlers in New England "obtained a Patent, under the great Seal from King James." It was from this "grand and Original Patent" that "all other Charters and grants of Land from Pemmaquid to Delaware Bay, along the Sea coast, derive their Linage and Pedigree."[75] First establishing the authority of the English crown, Hubbard then chronologically lists the English patents and treaties up through the commencement of King Philip's War to show his readers that the English had faithfully and authoritatively conducted their colonial project. At the same time as Hubbard abdicates blame for the war from the English, he uses his history to place it one the Indians.

Intertwined with Hubbard's history of English patent claims is another narrative of Indian perfidy. While Hubbard describes the English as having scrupulously kept their end of the deal, he concurrently shows the Indians as incapable of keeping theirs. Drawing a line between Miantonomi's failure to keep the 1638 post-Pequot war treaty by attacking the Mohegan and Metacom's failure to keep both the 1621 treaty that his father, Massasoit, made with Plymouth as well as his own 1671 treaty with the English, Hubbard establishes King Philip's War as the result of the Indian sachem's inability to keep their

[75] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles*, 2.

promises.[76] Using the examples of Miantonomi and Metacom, Hubbard establishes that both the Narragansett and the Wampanoag have been led by inherently warlike sachems who have rejected all English attempts at peace. In Hubbard's version of the events, King Philip's War was the natural output of the English attempting to make treaties with Indian sachems whose hearts are filled only with "inveterate hatred" and "malice."[77]

In *Doings and Sufferings,* Gookin also employs Hubbard's discourse of treaties to characterize the war's events, but crucially, Gookin's account show that it is not always Indians who break treaties and it is not only the English who keep them. Maintaining his desire to differentiate between Praying Indians and non-Praying Indians, Gookin devises a philosophy of treaties based on a Biblical principal of covenants. In Gookin's rendering, there is a difference between a covenant and a treaty. The former is an agreement made between spiritual equals while the latter is a political agreement. In contrast to treaties, which can be broken, Gookin explains that "a covenant…is a very binding thing, and the breach of it sorely punished by the Lord."[78] As part of his further attempts to translate the idea of covenant to the Praying Indians, Gookin establishing a Biblical precedent. Condemning the English (and Hubbard's) inability to differentiate between "one Indian and another," Gookin lists several instances in which the Israelites make and keep covenants with their "heathen" neighbors. As he explains, "the Scriptures do record that sundry of the heathen in Israel's time, being proselyted to the Church, proved very faithful and worth men and women; as Uriah the Hittite, Zeleg the Ammonite, Ithmah the Moabite…And Rahab the harlot, and Ruth the Moabitess, and

[76] Ibid., 6, 8.
[77] Ibid., 6, 11
[78] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 468.

divers others, men and women."[79] In all these examples, the "heathen" participant in the treaty kept both their spiritual and social obligations to the Israelites, despite the fact that the Israelites (like the English) did not always keep their own promises. In Gookin's rendering, covenants are not merely political, but are also spiritual acts and concurrently entail spiritual obligations.

Countering Hubbard's localized history of treaties and patents with a larger spiritual and typological history, Gookin moves the war out of New England and into a larger history of Christian engagement with outsiders in which he typologizes the English as the nation of Israel forging ahead in the New England wilderness. However, in contrast to the typical New England Puritan typology in which the English colonists are distinctly separate from the Indian savages, Gookin formulates a typological reading of history that weaves the Praying Indians into the larger city on a hill. Through covenant-making with the English, the Indians have become as deserving of God's favor as the English themselves. Grafted into the English Christian community, the Praying Indians are now covenanted members deserving of all the protections and divine favors that the other members enjoy. And as Gookin illustrates throughout the rest of *Doings and Sufferings*, the Praying Indian's inclusion into the English community cannot be undone.

Gookin's distinction between covenants as agreements with spiritual implications and patents or treaties which are solely political undergirds the entire logic of *Doings and Sufferings*. On one hand, his conception of covenants allows him to justify the English's broken treaties with the Narragansett, the Wampanoag, and the Pokanokets because, as Gookin reasons, these tribes have not honored the spiritual obligations of their covenants.

[79] Ibid., 454.

When listing the providential reasons for the war, Gookin echoes Hubbard as he posits that one intended end of the war was "the punishment and destruction of many of the wicked heathen," especially the "Pakanahats [Pokanokets] and the Narragansetts."[80] Yet, while Gookin agrees with Hubbard that retaliation is justified, his reasoning is different. For Hubbard, Indians in general, and the Narragansett in particular, are full of "Subtilety, malice, and Revenge," so much so that they seem "to be as inseparable from them, as if it were part of their *Essence.*"[81] Their inherently vengeful nature thus justifies English warfare. However, for Gookin, English warfare is the consequence of the sachems' decision to reject Christianity. As evidence, Gookin refers to a 1675 treaty between the Bay Colony and the Narragansett in which the "their chief Sachems malignantly rejected and opposed [the Gospel]." By rejecting Christian instruction, the sachems have made a conscious decision to forego the spiritually binding element involved in a covenant. While Gookin's logic is inseparable from his Puritanism, his thinking allows for Indian free will. Rather than being intractably evil as Hubbard claims, Gookin sees the sachems' as having made a choice – a choice not dependent on their identity as native people and importantly, a choice that they can change.

Treaties and Covenants: Making Sense of the War

In order to illustrate the covenanted relationship that the English have with the Praying Indians, Gookin both begins and ends the story of the war with Waban. Beginning in April 1675, two months before any battles had taken place, Gookin explains

[80] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 438-439.
[81] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles*, 29

to his readers that at that time Waban "came to one of the magistrates on purpose, and informed him that he had grounds to fear that Sachem Philip and other Indians…intended some mischief shortly to the English and Christian Indians."[82] Ignored by the magistrates, a month later, Waban once more warns the authorities of an impending attack. Ignored a second time, Gookin records that six weeks later, Waban came a third time to plead with the English to prepare for the attack. From the beginning of the war, Gookin shows Waban prioritizing his loyalty to the English above his ties to his fellow Indians.

Detailing Waban's actions not only allows Gookin to show that the Praying Indians keep their promises, it also provides him with an opportunity to illustrate the unique value that the Praying Indians bring to the English war efforts. Waban's warning about the attack's timing is derived from his indigenous knowledge. As Gookin explains, Waban and the other Christian Indians entreated the magistrates to take pre-emptive action immediately, because "when the woods were grown thick with green trees then it was likely to appear." One June 20, likely only a short time after Waban's third warning, the first battle of the war began as Metacom's Pokanoket followers attacked Plymouth Colony. And, as the Praying Indians had predicted, Metacom's followers attacked when the summer growing season was at its height, and the English could "see no enemy to shoot at" because of "the thick bushes."[83]

Emphasizing Waban's persistent warnings to the Bay Colony about the Wampanoag attack not only establishes Waban as an English ally, it also allows Gookin to counteract Hubbard's claims that Indians are unable to keep their promises. As Gookin

[82] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 440-441.
[83] Ibid., 441.

shows, Waban's actions are in response to a specific agreement that the Massachusett sachems made with the Bay Colony – the 1644 treaty between Cutshamekin and the Governor John Winthrop. As the language of the 1644 treaty states, the Massachusett agreed "to give speedy notice of any conspiracy, attempt, or evill intention of any which wee shall know or hereof against the same."[84] Warning the magistrates of the impending attack, Waban and his fellow Indians not only display their loyalty to the English, but also act out of their covenant agreement – proving that Indians can keep their promises.

The 1644 treaty that the Bay Colony made with Cutshamekin and four other Algonquian sachems is central to *Doings and Sufferings*'s defense of the Praying Indians. Following his description of Waban, Gookin lists a number of other examples showing that the Praying Indians have kept their covenant with the Bay Colony by acting as guides, interpreters and generally aiding the English war efforts. To illustrate their motivation, at the center of his text Gookin reprints the entirety of the 1644 treaty.[85] As Gookin suggests, both the Praying Indians' actions in the war as well as their willingness to "be instructed in the knowledge of God" are derived from their treaty with the Bay Colony. Ensuring that his readers are aware of the connection he is making, Gookin explicitly follows the treaty with a clear defense of the Praying Indians writing:

---

[84] Nathaniel Shurtleff, Ed., *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: 1642-1649*, 55.

[85] Cogley explains that the sachems were mostly from the Boston-area. Chickatawbut, the sachem of the Massachusett, the Squaw Sachem and Masconomo were Pawtucket sachems, and Nashowanon and Wossamegon were Nipmuck sachems. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 36-37.

> The praying Indians, confined to Deer Island, are the people with whom the above written agreements were made, wherein subjection and mutual protection are engaged; and these Indians, as is before declared, made discovery of what they knew of the plottings and conspiracy of the enemy, before the war began; also most readily and cheerfully joined with, and assisted the English in the war; as is before in part touched, and will more clearly appear in the sequel of this discourse; also they submitted themselves to the laws of God and the English government, and desiring themselves and children to be taught and instructed in the Christian religion; and have in all other points, so far as I know, (for the body of them,) kept and performed the articles of their covenant above expressed.

In reprinting the 1644 treaty with the Praying Indians, Gookin provides the motivation for Praying Indian loyalty at the same time as he drives home a point that he has been making throughout the narrative: while the Praying Indians have held up their end of the bargain, the English have failed to keep their covenant with the Praying Indians. As the treaty states, in return for their compliance, the Praying Indians were supposed to receive governance and protection– things that Gookin shows the Bay Colony has failed to provide.[86]

By pointing out the Bay Colony's failure to keep its word, Gookin again challenges Hubbard's providential interpretation of the war. Whereas Hubbard claims that the English are martyrs unjustly attacked by vengeful Indians, Gookin shows that the English are culpable for the war's events because they have failed in God's calling – to protect the Praying Indians. English culpability goes beyond their lack of protection for the Praying Indians and extends into their active attempts to attack and destroy the converts' homes and bodies. As Gookin shows, "through the harsh dealings of some English," the Praying Indians have been falsely accused setting barns on fire, unfairly

[86] Jenny Hale Pulsipher also lists a number of other instances in which the Bay Colony failed in their agreement with the Praying Indians. Jenny Hale Pulsipher, *Subjects Unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 139.

charged with aiding the enemy, and falsely imprisoned as well.[87] Eventually, as he writes, "the animosity and rage of the common people increased against [the Praying Indians]" to the extent that the General Court further broke its agreements with the Praying Indians when it forced the converts onto Deer Island – a clear failure of its covenant. The war, as Gookin claims, is punishment for the English' treatment of the Praying Indians. As he writes, breaking a covenant is a breech that will be "sorely punished by the Lord."[88]

While Gookin could not stop the Praying Indians from being sent to Deer Island, he does use his authority as a magistrate to try and stop them from further persecution. As Gookin notes in *Doings and Sufferings,* he not only reprinted the treaty in his text but also had the treaty read aloud in the General Court at a special session in February 1675.[89] The session was ostensibly held to determine what to do with the Praying Indians who had been sent to Deer Island. Gookin explains that at the session "there were several motions and applications made to them touching the poor Christian Indians at Deer Island. Some would have them all destroyed; others, sent out of the country; but some there were of more moderation." In a bid to convince those "of more moderation," Gookin reminds the court of its pre-existing covenant relationship with the Praying Indians and insists that the magistrates re-read the 1644 treaty aloud. In this instance, Gookin's efforts seem to have been successful. As he writes, "When the General Court had read and considered this agreement, it had this effect (through God's grace) in some degree to abate the clamors of many men against the Indians."[90]

---

[87] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 449,
[88] Ibid., 442.
[89] In my research, I have not yet been able to find a copy of the official records for this court session.
[90] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 500.

In both printing a copy of the treaty for his metropolitan readers and physically bringing a copy of the treaty before the General Court, Gookin further supports his larger claims. Emphasizing the fact that the court was convinced by his argument gives his English readers a clear example of the argument's efficacy. At the same time, Gookin shows the redemptive possibilities of the English colonists. Though they have been misguided in their treatment of the Praying Indians, Gookin shows that the magistrates are willing to revisit their treaties and once again follow their covenants with the Praying Indians. Perhaps optimistically, Gookin shows his English readers that the magistrates are still civil leaders. Attempting to reassure his benefactors, Gookin fashions King Philip's War as a minor detour for a missionary project that has, and will continue to, create loyal and faithful indigenous converts.

Tracing Praying Indian Influence in *Doings and Sufferings*

Gookin's description of the February 1675 court session suggests that Gookin's fellow magistrates were unfamiliar with the 1644 treaty and its implications. As Gookin explains, when bringing up the treaty in court, it is not enough for him to reference the treaty generally, but rather the magistrates must go back, search the records, and find the treaty. Once the treaty is found, it was read aloud in front of the court.[91] The reading comprised not only the main body of the treaty, but the treaty in its entirety including the post-treaty question and answer session that the Bay Colony officials had with Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems. Once read, the treaty seems to have played a role in changing the General Court's attitude towards the Praying Indians. Additional evidence

[91] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 500.

that Gookin's decision to read the treaty aloud was an effective one is found in the response of some members of the Bay Colony towards Gookin in the special session's aftermath. On February 28, 1675, only five days after the treaty was read aloud, the Massachusetts private Richard Scott was brought before the court for his tirade against Gookin. As the records indicate, Scott had barged into the Blue Anchor Tavern in Cambridge and loudly derided Gookin as "an Irish dog" who was "never faithful to his country, the sonne of a whoare, a bitch, a rogue" and "the devil's interpreter."[92] Though Gookin had been defending the Praying Indians since the start of the war, his argument in front of the General Court came at a moment in the war when antipathy towards the Praying Indians antipathy was at its height. The intensity of Scott's response suggests the threat that Gookin's defense of the Praying Indians posed to those who wanted to remove and destroy the Bay Colony's Indian converts.

Gookin's decision to use the 1644 treaty in defense of the Praying Indians may have been inspired by his long career as a politician. However, it is also possible that Gookin's decision to use the treaty came from another source – Waban and the Praying Indians themselves. In 1644, when the original treaty was made, Gookin had just arrived in the Bay Colony and was not yet a member of the General Court meaning that he may have been unfamiliar with the treaty's particulars. By contrast, as a leader of the Massachusett, Waban would have been intimately aware of the treaty's details and its implications. Waban was in his early 40s at the time the treaty was signed and his

[92] Frederick Gookin, *Daniel Gookin*, 153. Breen lists the date of the event as 1676, however, the court records of Massachusetts and Frederick Gookin list the date as February 28, 1675. See Louise Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630–1692* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 145-146 and Massachusetts Archives, Boston, Series 2044: Records: Court of Assistants, 1675-02-28: http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ArchivesSearch/RevolutionaryDetail.aspx?VolNbr=030&Page=193

leadership role among the Massachusett may have meant that Waban had even attended the formal court session. When Waban later became sachem of the Praying Indians after Cutshamekin died, he was responsible for knowing and enforcing the terms of the treaty. As a tribe diminished by disease and at war the Narragansett, Waban and the other Praying Indians saw the treaty's promise of protection as one of their primary recourses for communal survival.

In agreeing to the 1644 treaty with the Bay Colony, Cutshamekin and his fellow Algonquian signatories were attempting to facilitate the creation of a new kinship ties. Essentially, they were trying to find a way to bring the Bay Colony missionaries into the common pot. Long before the Europeans arrived, native societies employed treaties as a central means of organizing and stabilizing their societies. As historian Colin Calloway points out, treaties were associated with "rituals of respect and reciprocity, that allowed, indeed required, [Native people] to resolve conflicts, establish mutual trust, and come together in peace." Not only a means of maintaining intertribal ties, treaties also defined intratribal relations as well. Through treaties, Calloway explains, "Native peoples extended or replicated kinship….to include people with whom they were not related by birth or marriage, bringing them into community by adoption, alliance, and ritual."[93] Signing the treaty created new ties between the Massachusett and the English. Despite several failures on the part of the English, Cutshamekin, Waban, and the other Praying Indians took their agreement with the English seriously.

[93] Colin Calloway, *Pen and Ink Witchcraft*: *Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 12-13.

The way in which Gookin interprets both the 1644 treaty and his relationship with the Praying Indians in *Doings and Sufferings* points to the fact that on some level, Gookin had been instructed in Southern New England Algonquian treaty-making practices. Throughout his text, Gookin attempts to convince the missionary supporters of their responsibility to the Praying Indians using the language of spiritual kinship. In his opening letter, Gookin addresses Boyle and his fellow members of the Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England as "nursing fathers" to the Indian converts. Eliot's letter of introduction, placed at the introduction to *Doings and Sufferings*, echoes this same trope. Eliot addresses the Corporation members as "foster father" who, like "natural fathers," are "pleased to hear well of their children."[94] Later in the text, Gookin reaffirms the parent-child relationship by referring to John Eliot as the "spiritual father in Christ" of the Praying Indian Joseph Tuckapawillin.[95] As Gookin indicates, in signing the treaty and following its dictates, the Praying Indians have become part of the English family. For Gookin, as for Waban, the treaty between the Praying Indians and the English facilitates the formation of new kinship ties.

As scholars like Laura Stevens and Abram Van Engen have convincingly indicated, invocations of familial bonds between the English and the Indians were a foundational trope of Puritan missionary writings. Attempting to invoke pity among their English readers, missionaries like Eliot and Gookin used sentimental terms to reinforce a transatlantic British community that could pride itself on its "right feeling" towards the poor Indians.[96] While Gookin's use of familial terms harkens back to this earlier mission

[94] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 431.
[95] Ibid., 504.
[96] See Laura Stevens, *The Poor Indian: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006) for an extensive discussion of pity and sympathy in

history, Gookin employs kinship terms in *Doings and Sufferings* with a different end in mind. Rather than attempting to invoke English pity and reinforce the power differences between the English and the Praying Indians, Gookin uses the language of kinship to bring the Praying Indians into an English community and prove that they are equal members and, as such, they deserve equal protection.

Alongside of the language of kinship, Gookin also uses the language of English law to define the Praying Indians as civil. In an earlier appearance before the Court, Gookin presented a paper in which he offered a seven-fold defense of the Praying Indians. In the paper, Gookin defines the Praying Indians as civil using the English's own practices of land claims. As he explains, "The General Court hath granted those Indians lands and townships, and thereby confirmed and settled them therein as the English; so that, besides their own natural right, they have this legal title, and stand possessed of them as the English are."[97] In this estimation, it is not only the missionaries who claim Indians civility, but in conferring land upon them, the court itself gave them legal recognition and legal rights analogous to those held by the English.

While the court's agreement with the Praying Indians was intended as a means of gaining control of Praying Indian lands, Gookin upholds it here in his quest to prove Indian civility. Gookin's decision to re-interpret the court's claims may have been another concept that Gookin derived from the Praying Indians themselves. Indeed, for the Praying Indians, one's ability to make and keep treaties was a marker of one's civility. Treaties defined civil order at the same time as they identified indigenous citizenship. As

---

the Puritan missionary project. Also see Abram Van Engen's Chapter 5 in *Sympathetic Puritans: Calvinist Fellow Feeling in Early New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

[97] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings, 469.* Abram Van Engen, *Sympathetic Puritans*, 144

Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark explains, the ability to make a treaty with indigenous nations was the basis of international law: "Treaty making was the primary apparatus utilized among nations to recognized each other's national character. International law – defined through the colonial enterprise of territorial expansion and land acquisition – was predicated upon the recognition of treaties as diplomatic agreements between nations."[98] Using Southern New England Algonquian concepts of kinship and diplomacy, Gookin attempts to convince his readers that the Praying Indians' ability to make treaties with the English regarding land claims inherently defined them as civil.

Figuring Civility

Gookin's narrative extends beyond the direct events of the war to include examples of other Praying Indians showing loyalty to the English both before and during the war. Essentially, Gookin populates his narrative with examples of loyal, "civil" Indians. One of these vignettes is of Passaconaway and his son, Wannalancet, sachems of the Penacook Indians. Gookin's decision to include the two sachems was, like the rest of his narrative, a direct response to Hubbard. In *A Narrative of the Troubles*, Hubbard uses Passaconaway to show that it is not just Metacom and Miantononi who fail to keep treaties, but rather numerous sachem's have failed to keep their promises with the English. The depictions of the sachems effectively enforce his narrative claims that all Indians partake in "perfidious Treachery, and falsehood in breaking Covenant with the English."[99] In taking Passaconaway as an example, Hubbard also provides another slight

[98] Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, "Marked by Fire: Anishinaabe Articulations of Nationhood in Treaty Making with the United States and Canada." *American Indian Quarterly* 36:2 (2012), 125.
[99] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles*, Part II, 14.

to the Bay Colony mission. Passaconaway was a well-known sachem and powwaw, or spiritual leader, who John Eliot claimed to have converted sometime in the mid-1640s.[100] A clear source of pride for the missionary, Eliot explains that his attempts to convert Passaconaway specifically were evidence of his aim to "engage the *Sachims* of greatest note to accept the Gospel, because that doth greatly animate and encourage such as are well-affected, and is a damping to those that are scoffers and opposers."[101]

In Hubbard's rendering, Passaconaway has clearly not been "engage[d]" to the gospel, but rather has only acted interested out of fear. Quoting a 1660 speech of Passaconaway's, Hubbard explains that the sachem counseled his followers, "take heed how you quarrel with the English, for though you may do them much mischief, yet assuredly you will be destroyed and rooted off the earth if you do."[102] For Hubbard, Passaconaway's words are evidence that the sachems "intimat[e] some secret awe of God…although they bare no good affection to their religion." Making a Biblical analogy, Hubbard compares Passaconaway to Balaam, the Moabitte prophet whom an angel prohibited from prophesying against the Israelites.[103] Like Balaam, Passaconaway's treaty with the English was the result of him being "under the awful power of divine illumination, yet when left to himself, was as bad an enemy to the Israel of God as ever before."[104] In using Passaconaway as an example, Hubbard claims that any favor that the sachems' show to the English is only the result of their fear of a powerful English God

[100] John Eliot, *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel,* 153.
[101] Ibid., 153-154.
[102] William Hubbard, *Narrative of the Troubles,* 49.
[103] Numbers 22, KJV.
[104] William Hubbard, *A Narrative of the Troubles,* 48.

and thus lacks sincerity. His example conveniently reinforces the spiritual superiority of the English God, while cautioning English readers not to mis-read sachem actions.

In a direct challenge to Hubbard, Gookin re-reads the story of Passaconaway using his philosophy of Praying Indian civility. Establishing his authority as a reader, Gookin emphasizes the fact that his knowledge of the sachem comes from his own experience whereas Hubbard's information came from a secondhand source – someone Hubbard claims was "much conversant with the Indians about *Merimack* river." As Gookin explains, he is a better source as he himself "saw [Passaconaway] alive at Pawtucket, when he was about 120 years old." Acknowledging Hubbard's analogy between Passaconaway and Balaam, Gookin writes that Passaconaway "possibly might have such a kind of spirit upon him as was upon Balaam." However, he then provides an alternative explanation. For Gookin, God's sending an angel to Passaconaway (as he did to Balaam) is only further evidence that God's was preparing the Indian powwaw for conversion. Providing context, Gookin reminds his readers that in 1644, ten weeks after Cutshamekin and his fellow sachems treated with the English, Passaconaway also "agreed to 'such articles as Cutshamekin and others have formally accepted.'"[105] For Gookin, the sachem's willingness to sign a treaty with the English is evidence of his developing civility. Drawing a line between civility and conversion, Gookin also indicates that Passaconaway's signing of the treaty signals his interest in English Christianity. For Gookin, the speech that Hubbard records in *Narrative of the Troubles*, is not evident of malevolence, but rather evidence of Passaconaway's "peace and good correspondency" with the English. In cautioning his followers against warfare,

[105] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 30.

Passaconway manifests his desire to "keep and maintain amity and friendship with the English" by teaching his followers to "never engage with any other Indians in a war against them."[106]

Echoing the Algonquian idea that treaties are kinship affairs, Gookin shows Passaconaway's burgeoning civility as further evident in the actions of his son, Wannanlancet. Like his father, Wannalancet maintains the treaty that his father made with the English. In Gookin's estimation, the civility of the father has transferred to the son and Wannalancet's ability to keep his father's treaties is evidence of his readiness for Christianity. As Gookin writes, "about four or five years since," Wannalancet did "embrace the Christian religion, after some time of very serious consideration." Again, Gookin can speak with authority about Wannalancet's conversion because he and Eliot were the two present at its occurrence. As Gookin explains in *Historical Collections,* in May 1674, he and Eliot visited Wannalancet's Pawtuckett home. It was at this visit, which came after many year of attempts by Eliot and Gookin, that the sachem finally decided to "pray to God." As Gookin explains, Wannalancet described his conversion as a change of allegiance. The sachem explains that, "all my days, used to pass in an old canoe….and now you exhort me to change and leave my old canoe, and embark in a new canoe, to which I have hitherto been unwilling: but now I yield up myself to your advice, and enter into a new canoe, and do engage to pray to God hereafter."[107]

In Gookin's rendering, creating Christians is not only good spiritually, but politically as well. While Hubbard sees Passaconaway and his son as a threat, as Gookin

[106] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 433.
[107] Daniel Gookin, *Historical Collections*, 437.

shows, during the war Wannalancet remains loyal to the treaty his father signed with the English. As Gookin writes, when the English were attacking his village Wannalanset "restrained his men, and suffered not an Indian to appear or shoot a gun," despite having "advantage and opportunity enough in ambushment, to have slain many of the English soldiers, without any great hazard to themselves." As Gookin continues, "They were very near the English, and yet though they were provoked by the English, who burnt their wigwams and destroyed some dried fish, yet not one gun was shot at any Englishmen. This act speaks much for them." In contrast to Hubbard, Gookin shows that Praying Indians make good allies because they have "principles of Christianity to fix them to the English."[108]

Despite the narratives of both Gookin and Hubbard, the actions of Passaconaway and Wannalancet were likely the result of their sachem obligations. As Richard Cogley explains, Passaconaway's decision to sign a treaty with the English was likely the work of Cutshamekin, who may have been "trying to extend his influence to Indians who had never been under the control of the Massachusetts."[109] And while Gookin sees Passaconaway's request to have Eliot visit was the result of his thirst for the Christian God, Cogley suggests that Passaconaway's desire to have a missionary presence was also tied to his sachem responsibilities. As Cogley explains, Passaconaway desired an English missionary presence to 1: "prevent the loss of subjects through a Christian secessionist movement" and 2: "to increase English settlement in the area as a way of discouraging marauders."[110]

---

[108] Ibid.
[109] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War,* 38-39.
[110] Ibid., 147.

However, in re-reading Passaconaway and Wannalancet, Gookin presents the two sachems as transformed by their treaty obligations. Alluding to the power of kinship ties, Gookin shows how the treaty that Passaconaway signed brought him into a long-lasting alliance with the English. As Gookin shows, Passaconaway and Wannalancet have invited the English into their space and at the same time as they respected English teaching. The civility initiated by the treaty cannot be undone and the ties that the Penacook Indians now have with the English are binding.

The challenge of Gookin's narrative strategy comes into focus in his final vignette of *Doings and Sufferings*. In attempting to translate Algonquian kinship and treaties into a form Christian civility that is recognizable to Gookin's English readers, Gookin has a created an idealized vision of an English-Praying Indian community in which neither the Christian Indians nor the English colonists want to take part. Recounting a court session that he and Eliot held among the Praying Indians after the war was ended, Gookin again turns to Waban this time recounting a speech that Waban gave to encourage his fellow Indians. In the speech, Waban explains that despite the being "hated" by the "enemy Indians" and cut off from the English, God has still shown his goodness to the Praying Indian followers. The goodness Waban cites, came from "many godly persons in England, who never saw us, yet showed us kindness and much love, and gave us some corn and clothing, together with other provision of clams, that God provided for us."[111]

Waban's words create a personal link between Boyle and the members of the Corporation. A quote clearly cherry-picked for his English readers, Gookin implicitly uses Waban's words to reinforce the strong bond that he claims exists between the

[111] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 522.

Praying Indian children and their English fathers. At the same time, however, Waban's words point to the imagined nature of the relationship. As the sachem explains, the supporters in England, "never saw us." Conversely, the Praying Indians have never seen their English benefactors. The ties between the two groups are imagined. Furthermore, as the treatment that the Indians have received during the war shows, the good feeling of the English in the metropole, if it exists, does not translate to their English counterparts in New England. The English community of believers that Gookin has sold to the Praying Indians cannot be found in New England. Rather, for the Praying Indians, it is a community that only exists through Gookin's claims.

Attempting to explain the discrepancy between the members of the Corporation and the colonists, Gookin tells Waban: "You know all Indians are not good; some carry it rudely, some are drunkards, others steal, others lie and break their promises, and otherwise wicked. So 't is with Englishmen; all are not good, but some are bad, and will carry it rudely."[112] In these words, Gookin excuses the English from the accusations he leveled at them in the beginning of the text. In attributing the harsh treatment of the Praying Indians to the failure of individuals, Gookin creates a double standard as he moves away from a discourse of kinship. While Waban and the Praying Indians have "endeavour[d] to do all we could to demonstrate our fidelity to God and to the English, and against their and our enemy," English can choose to be loyal or not without facing a threat to their civility.

The difference between the standards for English and Indian civility comes into play again in the text's fine lines. Addressing his English readers, Gookin closes with an

[112] Ibid., 523.

image that they would recognized as the epitome of civility – the image of a martyr. As Gookin writes, "these poor, despised sheep of Christ," are the "first professors, confessors, if I may not say martyrs, of the Christian religion among the poor Indians in America."[113] For the English Puritans, martyrdom was the highest form of Christian practice as it represented the complete identification with one's Christian self to the disregard of one's body. Collectively identifying the Praying Indians as not only civilized, but as martyrs, Gookin claims them as the ultimate example of Christian profession. He also exonerates them from the violence that Hubbard attributes the rest of the war's Indian participants. As Adrian Chastain Weimer muses, "a martyr was, by definition, not a persecutor."[114] Yet, in claiming them as martyrs collectively rather than individually, Gookin merges kinship with Christianity. As in the rest of the narrative, the Praying Indians are described as a unit, a descriptive convention that was likely a result of their kinship ties, but also, and maybe more so, as a result of their difference from, and inscrutability to the English readers. As martyrs "of the Christian religion among the poor Indians in America" the Praying Indians maintain a status of difference from their English counterparts. Their faith is exemplary, but remains circumscribed by categories of race and space.

[113] Ibid.
[114] Adrian Chastain Weimer, *Martyr's Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England*, 119.

Epilogue

Despite Gookin's best attempts to show that the Praying Indians were valuable members of the English Christian community, *Doings and Sufferings* was not widely read by the English Christians that Gookin was attempting to convince. The manuscript was never published. It doesn't even seem to have been given a spot in the archives of the Corporation. Rather, Gookin's manuscript was lost to posterity until a clergyman in England found it and passed it onto the Reverend Mr. Campbell of Pittsburg sometime in the 1820s.[115] The good reverend alerted the historian and Unitarian minister Jared Sparks who then had the manuscript printed for the American Antiquarian Society in 1836. The fact that there seems to have only been one missing copy of Gookin's work indicates that few, if any, of his intended audience read his work.

This publication history makes *Doings and Sufferings* a good fit for my project which is filled with text in which indigenous people and indigenous influence was largely ignored or misread. Like *Doings and Sufferings*, Eliot's *Christian Commonwealth* fell on deaf ears. While *A Key Into the Language of America, New-Englands First Fruits* and *New-Englands Ensigne* garnered more readers, the native voices in the texts were largely unnoticed and, in the case of *New-Englands Ensigne,* the native people remained unnamed. Contemporary scholars have continued to largely avoid many of these texts in their writings about New England. While *A Key Into the Language of America* has received attention both for its unique form and the distinctiveness of its author Roger Williams, the rest of the texts do not fit neatly the larger narratives told about the relationship between colonists and native people.

[115] Daniel Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings*, 428.

As I've tried to show, a proper reading of these works requires attention to the agency of native people at the same time as it requires us to take the susceptibility of the colonizers into account. Colonialism was a messy endeavor, and as these texts show, the English were changed by their colonial endeavors at the same time as they were acting to change colonial people and places. In ascribing agency to native people, I am, of course, not trying to justify or mitigate the coercion of colonial systems. As Joshua David Bellin so succinctly explains, "It is dangerous to argue that violence can be compensated for by acts of sympathetic identification or creative appropriation."[116] However, to make space for native voices, we must return native agency to our scholarly analysis – an agency that exists regardless of the contents of the archive. In other words, as I have tried to show, even though native people were not creating written accounts in English, they were leaving their marks on their lands, on their communities, and upon the colonizers. These marks can, and should, be read.

[116] Joshua David Bellin, *The Demon of the Continent*: *Indians and the Shaping of American Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2001), 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahaton, Sarah. "The Examination of Sarah Ahhaton, October 24, 1668." In *Yale Indian Papers Project*, Edited by Paul Grant-Costa et. al. New Haven: Yale Divinity School, 2011. http://hdl.handle.net/10079/digcoll/3641

Andersen, Chris and Jean O'Brien. Introduction to *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies*: *Routledge Guide to Using Historical Sources*, Edited by Chris Andersen and Jean O'Brien. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Arnold, James N. Editor. *Narragansett Historical Register* Volume II. Hamilton, R.I, The Narragansett Historical Publishing Company, 1883.

Atwater, Edward Elias. *History of the Colony of New Haven to Its Absorption into Connecticut.* New Haven, Printed for the Author, 1881.

Ayer, Oliver Roberts. *History of the Military Company of the Massachusetts, Now Called The Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts. 1637-1888.* Volume 1. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1895.

Baldwin, Meredith Weddle. *Walking in the Way of Peace: Quaker Pacifism in the Seventeenth Century.* London: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wendy Belcher, *Abyssinia's Samuel Johnson: Ethiopian Thought in the Making of An English Author*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Bellin, Joshua David. "Apostle of Removal: John Eliot in the Nineteenth Century." *The New England Quarterly* 69, no.1 (1996): 3-32.

-----. *The Demon of the Continent: Indians and the Shaping of American Literature.* Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2001.

Besse, Joseph. *A Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers.* London: Printed and Sold by Luke Hinde, 1753.

Bishop, George. *New England Judged, Not By Man's, but the Spirit of the Lord. Part 1.* London: Printed for Robert Wilson in Martins Le Grand, 1661.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Bragdon, Kathleen. *Native People of Southern New England, 1550-1650*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.

Breen, Louise. *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprises among the Puritan Elite in Massachusetts, 1630–1692*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Brooks, Lisa. *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008

-----. "Turning the Looking Glass on King Philip's War: Locating American Literature in Native Space." *American Literary History* 25, no. 4 (2013): 718-750.

Bross, Kristina. *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons*: *Praying Indians in Colonial America.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Burnham, Michelle. *Folded Selves: Colonial New England Writing in the World System*. Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2007.

Calloway, Colin G. *Pen and Ink Witchcraft: Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

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

Cesarini, J. Patrick. "'What Has Become of Your Praying to God?" Daniel Gookin's Troubled History of King Philip's War. *Early American Literature* 44, no. 3 (2009): 489-515.

Charles I. *A Copy of the Kings Majesties Charter for Incorporating the Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New-England in America* (1628). Boston: Printed for S. Green, for Benj. Harris at the London Coffee House, 1689.

Chapin, Howard M. *Sachems of the Narragansetts*. Providence: Providence Rhode Island Historical Society, 1931.

Coale, Josiah. "A Letter of Josiah Coale, 1658." *Bulletin of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia* 6, no. 1 (1914): 2-5.

Cogley Richard. *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Cohen, Matt. "Lying Inventions: Native Dissimulation in Early Colonial New England." In *Native Acts: Indian Performance, 1603-1832*, Edited by Joshua David Bellin and Laura L. Mielke, 27-52. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2011.

Connole, Dennis A. *The Indians of the Nipmuck Country in Southern New England, 1630-1750: An Historical Geography*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc, 2007.

Cotton, Jr., John. "The Missionary Journal of John Cotton Jr." Edited by Len Travers. *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Third Series. 109 (1997): 52-101.

Cremer, Andrea. "Possession: Indian Bodies, Cultural Control, and Colonialism in the Pequot War." *Early American Studies* 6, no. 2 (2008): 295-345.

De Forest, John William. *History of the Indians of Connecticut.* Hartford: WM. JAS. Hamersley, 1853.

Donegan, Kathleen. *Season of Misery: Catastrophe and Colonial Settlement in Early America.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Drake, Samuel Gardner. *The Book of the Indians, Or, Biography and History of the Indians of North American from Its First Discovery to the Year 1841.* Book II. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey, 1841.

Edney, Matthew H and Susan Cimburek. "Telling the Traumatic Truth: William Hubbard's 'Narrative' of King Philip's War and his 'Map of New-England.'" *The William and Mary Quarterly* 61, no. 2 (2004): 317-348.

Eliot, John. "The Clear Sun-Shine of the Gospel Breaking Forth Upon the Indians in New-England." (1648). In *The Eliot Tracts,* Edited by Michael P Clark, 101-139. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.

-----. "The Christian Commonwealth: or, The Civil Policy Of The Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ" (1659), Edited by Paul Royster. Lincoln, NE: Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries, Paper 19. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libraryscience/19

-----. "A Further Accompt of the Progress of the Gospel in New England" (1660). In *The Eliot Tracts with Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter,* Edited by Michael P. Clark, 329-396. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.

-----. "The Glorious Progress of the Gospel" (1648). In *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*, Edited by Michael P. Clark, 141-167. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003.

-----. "A Late and Further Manifestation of the Progress of the Gospel" (1655). In *The Eliot Tracts,* Edited by Michael P Clark. 300-320. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.

-----. "Strength Out of Weakness" (1651). In *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*, Edited by Michael P. Clark, 211-247. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003.

Emerson, Everett, Editor. *Letters from New England: The Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629-1638.* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976.

Fickes, Michael L. "They Could Not Endure That Yoke"; The Captivity of Pequot Women and Children after the War of 1637." *The New England Quarterly* 73, no.1 (2000): 58-81.

Field, Jonathan Beecher. *Errands into the Metropolis: New England Dissidents in Revolutionary London.* Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2009.

Fisher, Julie and David Silverman. *Ninigret, Sachem of the Niantics and Narragansetts: Diplomacy, War, and the Balance of Power in Seventeenth-Century New England and Indian Country*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014.

Fitzgerald, Stephanie. "'I Wannatuckquannum, This Is My Hand:' Native Performance in Massachusett Language Indian Deeds." In *Native Acts: Indian Performance, 1603-1832*, Edited by Joshua David Bellin and Mielke, Laura L., 145-168. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2012.

Fox, George. *A Journal or historical account of the life, travels, sufferings, Christian experiences and labour of love in the work of the ministry of George Fox: Volume 1.* Edited by Wilson Armistead. London: W. AND F.G. Cash, 1853.

-----. *The Secret Workes of a Cruel People Made Manifest*. London, 1659.

Gardiner, Lion. *Relation of the Pequot Warres.* Edited by Andrew Neuman. *Early American Studies* 9, no. 2 (2011): 468-489.

Gardner, Russell Herbert. "Last Royal Dynasty of the Massachusetts." *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society* 57, no. 1 (1996): 18-34.

Garrett, Harman. "Will of Harman Garrett, February 1, 1678." In *Yale Indian Papers Project,* Edited by Paul Grant-Costa et. al. New Haven: Yale Divinity School, 2011. http://jake.library.yale.edu:8080/neips/data/html/1678.02.01.00/1678.02.01.00.html

Gethyn-Jones, Eric. *George Thorpe and the Berkeley Company: A Gloucestershire Enterprise in Virginia.* Gloucester, UK: Alan Sutton Publishing, 1982.

Glover, Jeffrey. *Paper Sovereigns: Anglo-Native Treaties and the Law of Nations, 1604-1664.*Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

Gookin, Daniel. "An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677." In *Archaeologia Americana: Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society Volume II,* 423-534. Cambridge: Printed for the Society at the University Press, 1836.

-----. "Report to the Massachusetts General Court on the Laying out of Land for the Pequot." June 16, 1664. Edited by Paul Grant-Costa, et. al. Yale Indian Papers Project, Yale University. http://hdl.handle.net/10079/digcoll/3656

Gookin, Frederick. *Daniel Gookin, 1612-1687, Assistant and Major General of the Massachusetts Bay Colony: His Life and Letters and Some Account of His Ancestry.* Chicago: Donnelley, 1912.

Gray, Kathryn N. "'How Might wee come to serve God?': Spaces of Religious Utterance in John Eliot's *Indian Tracts. The Seventeenth Century* 24, no. 1 (2009): 74-96.

Gray, Nichole. "Aurality in Print: Revisiting Roger Williams's *A Key Into the Language of America.*" *PMLA* 131, no. 1 (2016): 64-83.

Haefeli, Evan. "On First Contact and Apotheosis: Manitou and Men in North America." *Ethnohistory* 54, no. 3 (2007): 407-443.

Hall, David D., Editor. *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History*. Second Edition. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990.

-----. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.

Haynes, John et. al. "Treaty of Hartford (Copy), September 21, 1638," Edited by Paul Grant-Costa, et. al., Yale Indian Papers Project, Yale University. http://hdl.handle.net/10079/digcoll/2389

Hinds, Hilary. *George Fox and Early Quaker Culture*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 2011.

Hirsch, Adam. "Collision of Military Cultures in Seventeenth-Century New England." *The Journal of American History* 74, no. 4 (1988): 1187-1212.

Holder, Charles Francis. *The Quakers in Great Britain and America: The Religious and Political History of the Society of Friends from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century*. New York: The Neuner Company, 1913.

Holstun, James. *A Rational Millennialism: Puritan Utopias of Seventeenth-Century England and America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Howard, Joy. "Spirited into America: Narratives of possession, 1650—1850." Purdue University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing, 2011.

Hubbard, William. *The Present State of New England. Being a Narrative Of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England, from the first planting thereof, in the year 1607, to this present year 1677: But Chiefly of the late Troubles in the two last years 1675, and 1676. To which is added a Discourse about the War with the Pequods in the year 1637*. London: Printed for Tho. Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside, 1677.

Jehlen, Myra. "History before the Fact; Or, Captain John Smith's Unfinished Symphony." *Critical Inquiry* 19, no. 4 (1993): 677-692.

Jennings, Francis. *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest.* New York: Norton, 1976.

Jones, Augustine. *Nicholas Upsall.* Boston: Press of David Clapp & Son, 1880.

Kellaway, William. *The New England Company 1649-1776: Missionary Society to the American Indians.*London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd, 1961.

Kennedy, Lawrence W. *Planning the City Upon a Hill: Boston Since 1630.* Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

Kupperman, Karen. *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Knopf, 1998.

Longfellow, Henry Wordsworth. *The New-England Tragedies*. Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1869.

Lopenzina, Drew. *Red Ink: Native Americans Picking Up the Pen in the Colonial Period*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012.

Maclear, J.F. "New England and the Fifth Monarchy: The Quest for the Millennium in Early American Puritanism." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (1975): 223-260.

MacMillian, Ken. "Benign and Benevolent Conquest? The Ideology of Elizabethan Atlantic Expansion Revisited." *Early American Studies* 9, no. 1 (2011): 32-72.

Matar, Nabil. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Mather, Cotton. *The Life and Death of the Renown'd Mr. John Eliot who was the first Preacher of the Gospel to the Indians in America. Second Edition*. London: Printed for John Dunton, 1691.

Mather, Increase. "A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New-England (1676): An Online Electronic Text Edition," *Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries* Paper 31. Edited by Paul Royster. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Digital Commons: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libraryscience/31

-----. *A Relation of the Troubles which have Hapned in New-England, By Reason of the Indians there; From the Year 1614. To the Year 1675.* Boston: John Foster, 1677.

McBride, Kevin et al. "Battle of Mistick Fort: Site Identification and Documentation Plan Public Technical Report. National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program GA-2255-09-017. *Battlefields of the Pequot War: Mashantucket Pequot Museum & Research Center.* Last Modified April 2016. http://pequotwar.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/MPMRC_- NPS_ABPP_PublicReportMistickFort.pdf

Morgan, Edmund. *Roger Williams: The Church and the State*, 2nd Edition. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.

Morton, Thomas. *New English Canann, or New Canaan.* London: Printed for Charles Greene, 1632.

Nelsen, Anne Kusener. "King Philip's War and the Hubbard-Mather Rivalry." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1970): 615-629.

Newell, Mary Ellen. *Brethren by Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American Slavery.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015.

Norton, Humphrey. *New England's Ensigne.* London: Printed for T.L. for G. Calvert, 1659.

Oberg, Michael Leroy. *Uncas: First of the Mohegans.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.

-----. "'We Are All the Sachems from East to West': A New Look at Miantonomi's Campaign of Resistance." *The New England Quarterly*, 77, no.3 (2004): 479-499.

O'Brien, Jean. *Dispossession by Degrees: Indian Land and Identity in Natick, Massachusetts, 1650-1790*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

-----. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

-----. "Historical Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies: Touching on the Past, Looking to the Future." In *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies*: *Routledge Guide to Using Historical Sources*, Edited by Chris Andersen and Jean O'Brien, 15-22. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Pecoraro, Luke Joseph, "'Mr Gookin, Wholly Upon His Owne Adventure:" An Archeological Study of Intercolonial and Transatlantic Connections in the Seventeenth Century." Boston University, ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing, 2015.

Pestana, Carla Gardina. "The City upon a Hill Under Siege: The Puritan Perception of the Quaker Threat to Massachusetts Bay, 1656-1661. *The New England Quarterly* 56:3 (1993): 323-353.

-----. *Quakers and Baptists in Colonial Massachusetts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Peter, Hugh and Thomas Weld. *New Englands First Fruits.* In *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*, Edited by Michael P. Clark, 56-70. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003.

Peters, Eleanor Bradley. *Hugh Peter: preacher, patriot, philanthropoist, fourth pastor of the First church in Salem, Massachusetts*. New York: Privately Printed, 1902.

Peters, Kate. *Print Culture and the Early Quakers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Plane, Ann Marie. *Colonial Intimacies: Indian Marriage in Early New England*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2000.

Pulsipher, Jenny Hale. *Subjects Unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Rhode Island General Assembly. *Narragansett Tribe of Indians: Report of the Committee of Investigation; A Historical Sketch and Evidence Taken, Made to the House of Representatives, At its January Session, A.D. 1880.* Providence: E.L. Freeman & Co, 1880. Google Books.

Rhode Island Historical Society. *Collections of the Rhode-Island Historical Society, Vol. III*. Providence: Marshall, Brown and Company, 1835.

Rivett, Sarah. *The Science of the Soul in Colonial New England.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2012.

Ronda, James. "'We Are Well As We Are': An Indian Critique of Seventeenth-Century Christian Missions." *William and Mary Quarterly* 24, no. 1 (1977): 66-82.

Royster, Paul. "Preface" *The Christian Commonwealth: or, The Civil Policy of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ. An Online Electronic Text Edition* (1659). Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries. Paper 10. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libraryscience/19.

Salisbury, Neal. *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England 1500-1643.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

-----. "Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (1974): 27-54.

Sedgwick, Catharine Maria. *Hope Leslie; Or, Early Times in Massachusetts,* ed. Mary Kelley. New Brunswich, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987.

Seeman, Erik R. *Death in the New World: Cross-Cultural Encounters, 1492-1800*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Sewel, William. *The History and Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People Called Quakers Intermixed with Several Remarkable Occurrences.* London: Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle, 1722.

Shepard, Thomas. "The Clear Sun-Shine of the Gospel Breaking Forth Upon the Indians in New-England" (1648). *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*. Edited by Michael P. Clark. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003: 101-139.

-----. "The Day-Breaking, if not the Sun-Rising of the Gospell with the Indians in New England. *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*. Edited by Michael P. Clark. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003: 79-100.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel B, Editor. *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England: Volume II 1642-1649.* Boston: From the Press of William White, 1853.

Smith, Charlotte Fell. "Humphrey Norton." *Dictionary of National Biography, 1885-1900.* Volume 41. Edited by Lee, Sidney, 212-213. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1900.

Smith, John. *The Generall Histories of Virginia, New England & the Summer Isles,* Volume 1. Glasgow: J. MacLehose and Sons, 1907.

Smith, Ralph Dunning. *The History of Guilford, Connecticut From Its First Settlement in 1639*. Guilford, CT by J. Munsell, 1877.

Stark, Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik. "Marked by Fire: Anishinaabe Articulations of Nationhood in Treaty Making with the United States and Canada." *American Indian Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (2012): 119-149.

Stevens, Laura. *The Poor Indian: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Sturtevant, William, Editor. *Handbook of North American Indians: Northeast.* V. 15, Washington, D.C., Smithsonian Institution, 1978.

Tooker, William Wallace. *John Eliot's First Indian Teacher and Interpreter, Cockenoe-de-Long Island, And the Story of His Career from the Early Records*. New York: Francis P. Harper, 1896.

Trumball, Hammond. J. *The Public Records of The Colony of Connecticut from 1666 to 1678: With the Journal of the Council of War, 1675 to 1678: Transcribed and Edited, In accordance with a Resolution of the General Assembly, with notes and an appendix*. Hartford: F.A. Brown, 1852.

Underhill, John. *Newes from America; Or, A New and Experimentall Discoverie of New England; Containing, A Trve Relation of Their War-like Proceedings These Two Yeares Last Past, with a Figure of the Indian Fort, or Palizado* (1638). Edited by Paul Royster. *Electronic Texts in American Studies*, Paper 37: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/etas/37.

Van Engen, Abram. *Sympathetic Puritans: Calvinist Fellow Feeling in Early New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Van Lonkhuyzen, Harold W. "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians: Acculturation, Conversion, and Identity at Natick, Massachusetts, 1646-1730" in *New England Encounters: Indians and Euroamericans, ca. 1600*-1850. Edited by Alden T. Vaughan, 205-232. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1999.

Wampatuck, Josiah. "Deed for Land near Blue Hills Given by Josiah Wampatuck to the Crown of England." 4 October, 1666. Edited by Paul Grant-Costa et. al. *Yale Indian Papers Project*, Yale University: http://hdl.handle.net/10079/digcoll/1018378

Weidensaul, Scott. *The First Frontier: The Forgotten History of Struggle, Savagery and Endurance in Early America*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, 2012.

Weimer, Adrian Chastain. *Martyr's Mirror: Persecution and Holiness in Early New England*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

White, Craig. "The Praying Indians' Speeches as Texts of Massachusett Oral Culture." *Early American Literature* 38, vol. 3 (2003): 437-467.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. 20th Anniversary Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Whitefield, Henry, Editor. "The Light Appearing more and more towards the Perfect Day" (1651). *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*. Edited by Michael P. Clark, 169-209. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003.

Whittier, John Greenleaf. *The King's Missive, Mabel Martin, and Later Poems.* London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington, 1881.

Williams, Roger. *Christenings Make Not Christians, Or A Briefe Discourse concerning that name Heathen,commonly given to the INDIANS. As also concerning that great point of their CONVERSION*. London, Printed by Lane Coe, for I.H. 1645.

-----. *George Fox Digg'd Out of His Burrowes*. Boston: Printed by John Foster, 1676.

-----. *A Key into the Language of America*. Edited by John J. Teunissen and Evelyn J. Hinz. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973.

-----. *Letters of Roger Williams 1632-1682*. Edited by John Russell Bartlett. Providence: Printed for the Narragansett Club, 1874, 2012 reprint.

Winship, Michael P. *The Times and Trials of Anne Hutchinson*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

Winthrop, John. "A Declaration of former Passages and proceedings betwixt the English and the Narrowgansets, with their confederates wherein the grounds and justice of the ensuing warre are opened and cleared." Cambridge, MA, 1645.

-----. *The Journal of John Winthrop, 1630-1649*. Edited by Richard S. Dunn, James Savage and Laetitia Yeandle. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Winslow, Edward. "The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians in New England" (1649). *The Eliot Tracts: With Letters from John Eliot to Thomas Thorowgood and Richard Baxter*. Edited by Michael P. Clark, 141-167. Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2003.

Winslow, Ola. *John Eliot: Apostle to the Indians*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Witgen, Michael. *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Wood, William. *New England's Prospect*. London: By Tho. Cotes, for John Bellamie, 1634.

Wyss, Hilary. *Writing Indians: Literacy, Christianity, and Native Community in Early America.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.