An Exchange on Philip Sampson, 'Evangelical Spirituality and Hunting', *Ethics in Brief* 21.3 (Summer 2016).

Editor's Introduction

KLICE is pleased to be able to present three responses to Philip Sampson's article, from Sarah Withrow King (Evangelicals for Social Action/CreatureKind), Dennis Danielson (University of British Columbia) and Matthew Rowley (University of Leicester). Issues of *Ethics in Brief* do not generally elicit substantial written responses, so to receive three at once indicates that we may have struck gold in terms of contemporary relevance and controversy. We decided that these thoughtful, and at several points forceful, rejoinders merited wider dissemination. Philip Sampson has gamely (forgive the pun) agreed to reply to each. We are grateful to our three respondents for their contributions to this exchange and to Philip for replying both extensively and robustly – and for writing such a thought-provoking article in the first place. We hope you find the exchange illuminating.

Response from Sarah Withrow King

Interim Director, Evangelicals for Social Action
co-Director, CreatureKind

Thank you for the profoundly disturbing and deeply important article 'Evangelical Spirituality and Hunting' by Philip Sampson. I was raised in a Christian house, accepted Jesus as my Savior when I was a child, and have continued to grow (and stumble, and repent, and rejoice) in faith throughout my life. As an evangelical, I read the Bible for many years before I began to see the importance of attending to the welfare of God's created world. In today's culture, too often marked by individualism, materialism, and a consume-all-we-can-as-fast-as-we-can mindset, I've come to believe that the discipline of creation care is a matter of vital urgency to Christians and to the health of the church.

Jesus prayed that his followers would seek God's will 'on earth, as it is in heaven'. We know from reading the Scriptures that God's original intent for creation was one in which humans and other creatures did not eat one each other: 'Then God said, "I give you every seed-bearing plant on the face of the whole earth and every tree that has fruit with seed in it. They will be yours for food. And to all the beasts of the earth and all the birds in the sky and all the creatures that move along the ground—everything that has the breath of life in it—I give every green plant for food." And it was so' (Gen. 1:29-30). After human sin disrupted the *shalom* of God's creation, humans and other creatures began to fear, and to kill, one another.

But we have truly Good News to share! Jesus's death and resurrection point us to the current and coming reality that the Creator is reconciling all of creation back to God: 'The Son is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. For in him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things have been created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. And he is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning and the firstborn from among the dead, so that in everything he might have the supremacy. For God was pleased to have all his fullness dwell in him, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether things on earth or things in heaven, by making peace through his blood, shed on the cross' (Col. 1:15-20).

Is it possible to live in a broken world without death or killing? The sin of humankind has made that idea almost laughable. But just because we will be unable to realize the

fullness of God's reconciled Kingdom does not mean that we don't try, by the grace of God, to live into the promise now.

Through my study of Scripture, I've come to believe that many of the ways in which we treat animals today fall outside what can, with integrity, be called responsible stewardship. Sport hunting in particular is a tragic shortfall of our Kingdom mission, both inconsistent with our special role as God's image bearers in the world and directly counter to Jesus's commands to seek first the Kingdom of God and refrain from violence.

As I conducted research for my book *Vegangelical: How Caring for Animals Can Shape Your Faith* (Zondervan, 2016), I learned that 75% of hunters in the United States identify 'recreation' or 'to be close to nature' as their motivation for killing animals. But hunting isn't re-creation—it's death, often violent death. In some cases, hunting is part of deeply flawed wildlife management systems in which humans develop economic structures around the maintenance of eco-systems that have been damaged by human activity.

There is an important distinction to be made here between hunting for sport and hunting for subsistence. I have never had to rely on killing animals to feed my child, and that is a privilege I acknowledge and I do not begrudge those who simply have no other option. And sometimes when I give a presentation on animals in factory farms who are used for food, there is an individual in the room who will raise his hand and say something to the effect of, 'I only eat meat from animals that I hunt'. While I don't believe this is an ideal choice, particularly for a Christian, it is a far cry from the sick system of prolonged horrors endured by billions of animals on factory farms each year.

'Every animal of the forest is mine, and the cattle on a thousand hills. I know every bird in the mountains, and the insects of the fields are mine', says the Creator and sustainer of the whole world in Psalm 50. And in Psalm 147, we learn that God provides for animals, not for what they do or how they function, but simply to delight in the pleasure of provision. The world belongs to God, who is working in and through and in spite of us to bring about the reconciliation of that whole groaning creation. When we kill an animal, whether directly (as through a rifle scope) or indirectly (through the purchase of their flesh in a grocery store), we participate in the severance of a relationship between God and that creature; we silence that creature's worship.

Made in the image of a life-generating, life-sustaining, grace-filled God, many modern humans have managed to grossly misinterpret our call to steward the earth. It's no wonder that spiritual sickness abounds as too many of us move deeper and deeper into self-serving thoughts and behaviors, rather than seeking mutually interdependent, generative, self-sacrificial ways of being and relating to God and to the world. It's my constant prayer that Christians committed to sharing the Good News of Christ and leaning into the Kingdom of God on earth will keep in mind that the wolf will one day live with the lamb and 'they will not hurt or destroy on all my holy mountain; for the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea' (Is. 11:9).

Response from Dennis Danielson

Professor of English, University of British Columbia
Dennis.Danielson@ubc.ca

H. L. Mencken once defined Puritanism as 'The haunting fear that someone, somewhere, may be happy'. I've always thought this definition massively unfair to the Puritans, yet I confess it's the first quotation that popped into my head upon reading Philip Sampson's 'Evangelical Spirituality and Hunting'. Perhaps it is likewise unfair to employ it as an allegation against Sampson and his cohort of anti-hunting sources, given their clearly

honest spiritual intent. However, I'd like to suggest that his essay, while well written and interestingly documented, offers but a weak argument.

First, though, full disclosure: Philip Sampson has been a valued friend for more than four decades; I truly wish to honour him and his work. But also, I am a hunter. At the age of 62 I decided I'd fulfill a lifelong dream, take the requisite firearms and outdoors safety courses, and go deer hunting. I've now hunted an average of four days annually for the past six years and killed a deer in four of those six outings. These adventures have been immensely pleasurable for the challenges they offer: long preparation, careful strategy, study of ballistics and of deer behaviour, and self-discipline, not to mention my sheer joy at tramping in the forests and fields of western Canada—despite the fact that my quarry has faculties of smell and hearing maybe twenty times more acute than my own.

At each of my kills, I've paused to ponder the solemnity of the thing. Yes, it's sport, but not only sport. It is also an elemental, satisfying, beautiful, humbling encounter with something one must admire and treasure, and for which one must give thanks, as I do. I also give thanks for the fresh, lean, organically grown meat (I do my own dressing and butchering) which over the course of a year further reduces the already small amount of beef my family consumes.

I therefore have trouble recognizing myself or my experience in the anti-hunter vitriol that Sampson quotes from various sources: Cowper's allegation that my sport 'owes its pleasure to another's pain' or Sampson's own echo of the slander that wicked hunters take 'pleasure in [animals'] suffering and death'. Here I'd note that if wickedness and cruelty are indeed part of one's definition of hunting from the start, then of course one's conclusion will reecho the charges of wickedness and cruelty. But that is mere circular reasoning, not sound argument. One can also heap up quotations by people who agree with that definition, yet still no genuine argument emerges.

Instead, let's make some distinctions and concessions. There's hunting and there's hunting. Moreover, I have no doubt that there are (and long have been) genuinely cruel blood sports. I do not condone fox hunting, to take only one prominent example. I also concede that the 'doctrine of dominion' is susceptible to abuse, and that it *is* no excuse for mistreatment of animals. However, judging from the online deer hunting forums to which I belong, I can say that real hunters deplore cruelty ('taking pleasure in another's pain or distress'; *OED*) and promote the ethics of 'fair chase' and of the 'clean kill'. Of the four animals I've shot, three died within 10-15 seconds of being hit; the other required a follow-up shot, making for a death that lasted perhaps a minute.

If you object that death is still death, I'll remind you (roughly echoing Shakespeare) that *every* creature owes God a death. The main alternatives to the death that I dealt those deer were slow starvation ('winter kill'), predation, or disease—each of them, I suspect, involving more than one minute of suffering. Out in the wild there are no palliative care wards, and certainly no immortality.

In short, I find in Sampson's article no rational, empirically-based account of the actual practices of hunters, nor of wild animals' other possible forms of mortality. What I do find is a convenient but specious contrast between hunters and shepherds. Yes, shepherds do care for their sheep—but they keep them for purposes of wool and meat production. I suppose there might be cruel shepherds and kind shepherds, but one can say the same thing of hunters. Besides, if there were no shepherding industry, there would be vastly fewer sheep in the world; and it's equally true that if there were no deer hunters, there would be vastly fewer deer in the world (or at least in North America). Hunters as a community are avid supporters of environmental and habitat protection, disease-control, stringent anti-poaching regulations, and other measures that enhance the lives and sustain the populations of deer and other wild animals.

Furthermore, I'm concerned at what I see as an insupportable and tendentious biblical hermeneutic at work in Sampson's essay. It may be the case that some have naively adopted Nimrod, for example, as a 'positive' role-model for hunters (rather than seeing him as a violent usurper of divine sovereignty). But such facile interpretation does not itself excuse other fast-and-loose exegesis. Most crucially, one can simply no longer accept that humankind's fall alone 'brought death into the world' (Milton)—or that there would have been no violence among animals themselves if humans 'had remained in their first and original condition' (Calvin, as cited by Sampson). Sheer eons of animal suffering, predation, and death preceded the appearance of any human beings on this earth. Still today, the cycles of predation we catch glimpses of in the oceans and elsewhere involve death and pain far transcending any human sin or agency. To seek the elimination of all earthly suffering and death is to wish for a creation wholly other than the one in which we blessedly find ourselves. (None of which, of course, justifies either cruelty, or indifference toward suffering and death.)

Finally, one may not merely cherry-pick biblical imagery to make a purportedly theological or ethical point. For example, Sampson's equivocal assertion that 'the most prominent biblical hunter is the Devil' has no more pertinence to the ethical question at hand than does the sin of Nimrod. Likewise, yes, the poetry of Isaiah 11 paints an apocalyptic picture of the leopard lying down with the young goat. But Isaiah 55 similarly envisages 'the trees of the field [clapping] their hands'. Neither powerfully poetic image supports literalistic arguments about the anatomy of trees or the ideal behaviour of leopards. Again, to abstract all those predators across the whole sweep of earthly history and geography from their predatory capacities is to create a (gnostic?) fantasy whose adherents imagine a creation quite other than the challenging and glorious world in which the Creator has actually placed us: one in which hunters too—carefully, solemnly, ethically—have a minor but happy role to play.

Response from Matthew Rowley:

Godly Hunters: A Critique of 'Evangelical Spirituality and Hunting'

PhD candidate in history, University of Leicester/Reader, Tyndale House, Cambridge
mpr22@le.ac.uk

As a Christian (and secondarily an American) who studies religion and violence, I have many serious critiques of American evangelical gun culture. On the issue of hunting, I am largely ambivalent. Though I have been invited to go dozens of times, I have so far declined. However, I am wary of any linking of piety with killing. Philip Sampson's 'Evangelical Spirituality and Hunting' makes three main arguments and I will briefly comment on each: American evangelicals and hunting; the Bible and hunting; and early Protestant views towards hunting. My main critique relates to the Reformed view of hunting. Many of Sampson's examples come from the Puritans (who preferred to be called 'the godly'). As a scholar of the Puritan theology of killing *humans*, the group as described in this article is largely unrecognisable.

1. American evangelicals and hunting

That American evangelicals love mixing theology and hunting is indisputable. However, this article would have benefited from a discussion of the different types of hunting. The brief description below will be important throughout:

Type I: Literal Life-Taking

A: Hunting for the sake of killing (sheer delight in taking life)

B: Hunting for trophies (and maybe nutrition)

C: Hunting as aristocratic entertainment (mainly for pleasure, but often for

eating)

D: Hunting for the solitary/group experience and for nutrition (what most American hunters do)

E: Hunting for necessary nutrition (providing for individual or group)

F: Hunting for profit (selling food or furs)

G: Defensive hunting (for protection of persons or property, but often for food)

Type II: Metaphorical Life-Taking

As I will argue below, the article takes Reformed statements about Type II metaphorical life-taking (e.g. spiritual wolves hunting God's sheep) and infers a principled objection to Type I hunting.

2. The Bible and hunting

Though I have studied the theology of killing in the Bible, I would need to do much more serious work on the biblical view of hunting. I am critical of the use of the Hebrew Bible to justify life-taking—especially when grounded in some kind of dominion mandate. I also agree that the spirituality of Christ should be foremost in the ethics of a Christian. However, it is clear that Jesus approved of fishing and ate fish. I assume that the same kind of male bonding and child-rearing that occurs in the tree stand also takes place in the boat. Though Sampson is certainly right that hunters are generally portrayed negatively in the Bible, the evidence that hunting is unbiblical is not as black and white as he suggests. For example, Proverbs 12:27 seems to approve of hunting (type I.E). However, as he rightly notes, one would be hard-pressed to find in the Bible the glorification of killing animals that is present in some segments of American evangelical culture.

3. The Reformation and hunting

The aim of 'Evangelical Spirituality and Hunting' is to recover the 'Reformation tradition in which hunting was seen as not only unethical but also spiritually dangerous'. A central claim is that 'from Martin Luther to William Wilberforce, the forebears of today's evangelicals regarded hunting as, at best a waste of time, and at worst a spiritual peril'. Though I cannot speak on the beliefs of Luther, Calvin or Wilberforce, I can address the Puritan tradition invoked throughout the article. My critiques fall into two categories: First, there was no monolithic 'Reformation tradition' to recover; and second, if a variegated tradition is uncovered, it is not the one claimed by Sampson.

Sampson correctly notes the connection made by preachers between hunting and evil (type II). Reformed catechisms frequently use hunting language—and it is the godly who are hunted.[1] Roger Williams—the stalwart defender of Native Americans and of religious liberty—used lupine terminology in twenty-two ways throughout his writings.[2] The minister Thomas Shepard also had a half dozen metaphorical uses.[3] As shown throughout the article, the Puritan frequently made the connection between the devil and hunting. He is also right that many condemned the delight in taking animal life (type I.A). However, people in early modern Old and New England had much more to say about the topic. The article's historical argument assumes that there was some kind of largely unified post-Reformation mind on the issue of hunting, and this is far from the

1 See the many uses of wolf and sheep in James T. Dennison Jr. (ed.), *Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation (1523-1693)*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014).

2 Roger Williams, *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams*, 7 vols. (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963).

3 Thomas Shepard, *The Works of Thomas Shepard*, 3 vols. (Boston: Doctrinal Tract and Book Society, 1853).

case.

Hunting and the Law

Regulations on hunting in royal forests have a long history—going back to King Cnut.[4] Since the first parliament of Henry VII in 1485, nighttime disguised unlawful hunting was punishable by death and daytime undisguised unlawful hunting merited imprisonment or a fine (1 Hen. 7 c.7). Throughout the next century, the Tudor affinity for the hunt was well known and is often visualised in paintings and tapestries. The first Stuart king, James VI and I, was passionate about the sport, temperamental when obstructed in the chase and open in his disdain towards popular hunting.[5] He seemed to claim a royal right to all of England's game.[6] 'It has been calculated that throughout his entire reign in England, James spent about half his time either at his hunting lodges or on progress'.[7] The rights of his people and the responsible government of his kingdom fell prey to his hunting obsession.[8] In this light, it seems fitting that there is a *KJV Sportsman's Bible* full of 'Field Insights and Devotional' notes.[9] James might have found it informative and edifying! Though his personal motto was *Beati pacifici*, he was a gruesome hunter. As D. Harris Willson describes: 'upon reaching the game... the king dismounted, cut the stag's throat, and opened its belly. He thrusts his hands (and sometimes his feet) into the stag's entrails, sating the dogs with its blood and daubing the faces of courtiers' (type I.A, B or C).[10] If there is a difference between the Reformed James VI and I and modern evangelical hunters, contemporary hunters seem to show more respect for the animals they kill.

This provides an important backdrop to beliefs about hunting in early modern England. It was largely considered an aristocratic event (type I.C) that was in most cases illegal for the populace. In the eyes of godly Puritans, they thought that wealthy men, addicted to leisure and pleasure, hunted in order to distract themselves from piety and responsibility. Therefore it is not surprising that the godly condemned hunting. Their rejection did not stem from a principled biblical stance concerning animals. Rather, it was the soul-destroying nature of ease and luxury that they condemned. Even during the Commonwealth, there were strict laws on hunting.[11] This, however, had more to do with property rights and position in society than with concern for animals.

Hunting and Property Rights

Hunting could be a way of establishing property rights—except when the land was legally owned by the crown. In 1605 the English jurist John Cowell, in *Institutiones juris Anglicani* wrote that possessions are 'are held and had, either by the Law of Nature, the Law of Nations, or the Law Civil'.

> Now dominion or propriety in things by the Lawes of Nature and Nations was first created by the occupation and possession of those things which did not properly belong to any particuler Person. Occupation includes, Fishing, Hunting, Fowling, Inclosing, Seising, the Law of Nations puts the property of things thus gotten into the person who hath possession, but ours doth not. For there are many things

4 James VI and I, 'By the King. A Proclamation Against Unlawfull Hunting' (16 May 1603), in *Stuart Royal Proclamations* vol. 1: *Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603-1625*. Edited by James F. Larkin and Paul L. Hughes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), n.1.

5 E.g. Johann P. Sommerville, *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 202.

6 James VI and I, 'Unlawfull Hunting', n.3.

7 Alan Stewart, *The Cradle King: A Life of James VI and I* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2003), 176.

8 Stewart, *Cradle King*, 176–81; cf. Bryan Bevan, *King James VI of Scotland & I of England* (London: Rubicon, 1996), 91–104.

9 *The KJV Sportsman's Bible* (Holman: Nashville 2007).

10 D. Harris Willson, *King James VI and I* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1956), 180.

11 Nicholas Collyn, *A briefe summary of the lawes and statutes of England* (London, 1655), 73–76.

> which are the Kings by his Prerogative, and there are many Statutes which put limitations both to Fishing, Fowling, and Hunting by which that ancient liberty which the Law of Nations intitles us unto, becomes bounded, custome also of places doth often in these alter common right.[12]

New England colonists were well aware that their new land had many inhabitants. However, they thought these did not possess solid claim to all of it because they did not demarcate and cultivate the land.[13] As John Cotton argued, Puritans were going to be obedient to 'the grand Charter given to *Adam* and his possession in Paradise, *Gen. 1. 28. Multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it*'.[14] In such instances, John Winthrop believed it was morally permissible to take the land, provided the Colonists left 'sufficient' land for Algonquian use.[15]

Puritans and Animal Fighting

The Puritans were well known for banning animal fights. There were many different reasons behind shutting down this form of entertainment. Only occasionally did this stem from human attitudes towards the animals themselves. As Bernard Capp notes: 'The authorities also disapproved of animal sports, concerned over public order rather than cruelty to animals'.[16]

Hunting in Puritan New England

According to Sampson, New England Puritans carried the 'biblical' rejection of hunting with them to New England. Modern evangelical love of hunting, he argues, owes its origin not to the Puritans but to American revolutionaries and Darwin. However, if New England Puritans held to Sampson's 'biblical view', they would have starved to death. Though hunting might have been legally risky in England, in New England it was deemed necessary. Cargo lists on the ships going to New England record large amounts of guns, some deemed for defense and others for hunting.[17] In May 1645, Massachusetts ordered that youths age ten to sixteen shall be trained in firearms and bows and arrows.[18] This likely had a dual function—teaching them how to defend themselves and also hunt for food (type I.E).

Puritan New England documents are full of references to hunting (type I.E). They do not argue that hunting is biblically permissible because the licit nature of the practice is assumed.[19] For example, in trying to draw godly ministers to New England, one member of the clergy secured the promise of a 'man-servant' who would be responsible for 'catch[ing] fish and fowl'.[20] During the winter, as another person claimed, the colonists would have starved were it not for the wild animals 'they have killed'.[21] In fact, God in his providence was viewed as the one who provided the animals for hunting.[22] Another individual claimed 'some have killed sixteen deer in a day'.[23] This makes modern gun-toting evangelical hunters look like card-carrying PETA members.

---

12 John Cowell, *The institutes of the lawes of England* (London, 1651), 57.

13 J. Winthrop, *Reasons to Be Considered for... the Intended Plantation in New England*, in *The Puritans in America: A Narrative Anthology*. Edited by A. Heimert and A. Delbanco (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 73.

14 J. Cotton, *Gods Promise to His Plantation* (London, 1630), 5.

15 Winthrop, *Reasons*, 73.

16 For a summary, see Bernard Capp, *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and Its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 205–10.

17 E.g. Young, *Chronicles*, 43–45.

18 *Recs. Mass.* II:99.

19 Young, *Chronicles*, 5, 161, 324, 404–06, 455.

20 Young, *Chronicles*, 212.

21 Young, *Chronicles*, 213.

22 Young, *Chronicles*, 265.

23 Young, *Chronicles*, 405.

England, the Fur Trade and Protective Hunting

It is well known that the English participated in the fur trade (type I.F). This fundamentally changed Algonquian and Iroquois culture and politics and led to decades of warfare. Similarly, local town records frequently document payments made to English and Algonquian killers of wolves and foxes (type I.G).[24]

Hunting and Native Americans

The view (described above) that hunting was done by lazy men had disastrous consequences when Puritans arrived in New England. Because Algonquian men hunted instead of raising livestock (type I.E), the English assumed the men were lazy shirkers of responsibility (type I.C).[25] Therefore, the form of hunting practiced by the Algonquians was a sign of barbarity, not civility. They eventually came to have a more nuanced view and Algonquian hunting rights were often written into treaties and sales.

Hunting Native Americans

Even in our modern world, people speak of hunting humans—be they terrorists, witches or political detractors. Puritans likewise spoke of *hunting humans*. Especially in times of conflict, natives were frequently described with lupine terminology.[26] At the end of his account of the Pequot War, Cotton Mather claimed God providentially cared for the needs of the soldiers throughout the campaign.[27] In another battle 'the bodies of so many of their countrymen [were] terribly barbikew'd, where the English had been doing a good morning's work'.[28] Their successes continued as 'Heaven so smil'd upon the English hunting after them'.[29] Females and children were enslaved.[30] During King Philip's War, one intentionally anonymous petitioner, sensing the increasing Deuteronomic curses, called for a ministerial inquiry into the sin that caused 'our mighty men to fall in battle... our younge men to fall by the sworde our wives and our children taken captives'. This self-styled 'serv[ant] of God' also suggested the use of canines defensively and offensively: 'doogs would be a great means to discover them if not tere [Indians] to peces'.[31] Lest one think this idea of using animals to hunt and kill humans was only furthered by an anonymous radical, Jonathan Edwards' uncle, Solomon Stoddard, argued for something similar in 1703. After a series of Indian raids on the English, he said dogs could be 'trained up to hunt Indians as they do bears'.[32] As my current research argues, Puritans did not delight in hunting humans as an end in itself, but they were willing to do so when they felt driven to such extremes by the perceived incivility and inhumanity of their enemies.

4. Conclusion

The point of the above arguments has not been to put forward a normative evangelical stance on hunting or to say that Puritan or modern evangelical beliefs were correct or incorrect. Rather, in claiming to recover the Reformation's teaching on hunting, Sampson's article has largely misunderstood the lived experience of early modern

24 E.g. George A. Schofield ed., *The Ancient Records of the Town of Ipswich* (Ipswich: Chronicle Motor Press, 1859), *passim.*

25 E.g. Alexander Young, ed., *Chronicles of the First Planters of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, From 1623–1636* (Boston: Freeman and Bolles, 1846), 257. See James Axtell, *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 49–50.

26 Jon T. Coleman, *Vicious: Wolves and Men in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 31–32, 41–44, 49–50; Patrick M. Malone, *The Skulking Way of War: Technology and Tactics among the New England Indians* (Oxford: Madison, 2000), 24, 75.

27 Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1979), 556.

28 Mather, *Magnalia*, 556.

29 Mather, *Magnalia*, 556.

30 Mather, *Magnalia*, 556.

31 Massachusetts Archive Collection, Military II:214 (The Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point).

32 'Solomon Stoddard to Joseph Dudley' (1703).

persons. The Reformed view, to the extent we can recover such a thing, was complex and deeply influenced by the laws concerning aristocratic privilege. Once distanced from these laws, New England hunting became more widespread. If Americans evangelicals are to look to early modern Old and New England for guidance, they might be led further away from Sampson's principled stance against hunting.

Replies from Philip Sampson

I am grateful to Sarah Withrow King, Dennis Danielson and Matthew Rowley for taking the time to respond to my article. I will treat each in turn. The length of my response is unrelated to their significance.

Reply to Sarah Withrow King

I am grateful for Sarah Withrow King's biblical critique of sport hunting which helpfully develops the discussion. In many respects she echoes the spirituality of the pre-twentieth century evangelicals I discussed, especially her emphasis that suffering and death are consequences of the fall, and not part of the creation order. In particular, I valued her distinctive 'kingdom' emphasis which is less apparent in the earlier evangelical literature. Her comments about recreation/re-creation reminded me of Thomas Wilson's early seventeenth century observation that 'death and destruction… being a part of the curse for our sins, wee may not make our recreation'. And who could fail to be moved by her emphasis on the work of Christ in the contemporary world; I recalled C. H. Spurgeon's remark that in 'gentleness and kindness our great Redeemer is our model'. By setting her discussion within a broader consumerist culture, she nicely supplements my pre-twentieth century sources.

I entirely agree with Withrow King that the distinction between 'sport' hunting and hunting for subsistence is important; as noted below, it was clearly made in the pre-twentieth century evangelical literature. Moreover, she is surely correct about 'the sick system of prolonged horrors endured by billions of animals on factory farms'. However, I doubt that an argument can be made for hunting for food in Western developed economies, especially if trapping is included in hunting for subsistence, with its grotesque cruelties of leg-hold traps and twist-offs. Apart from hunting conducted as part of stock management by a properly qualified professional, eating the hunted animal cannot be separated from the 'system' of institutional and cultural reproduction of 'sport' hunting, with its attendant cruelties. Moreover, talk of eating the hunted animal can become a shibboleth among sport hunters, providing a rationalisation for what otherwise can appear to be pleasure in killing. Sometimes this makes for bleak comic effect. In 2012, Daniel Richards, then president of the California Fish and Game Commission (which oversees the 'management and wise use' of the state's wildlife), attracted criticism when he shot a mountain lion while on a hunting trip in Idaho. Mountain lions are protected in California but not in Idaho. He was unrepentant, 'saying he did not shoot the animal for pleasure and that he had eaten the lion.'[33]

Reply to Dennis Danielson

Pleasure and suffering

Dennis Danielson appears to accept that 'wild' animal *suffering* and human *pleasure* are relevant issues in a spirituality of *sport* hunting. But, as he claims that hunting inflicts

[33] Jenny Stevens, 'Wildlife official shoots lion', *Independent* 2.3.2012, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/wildlife-official-shoots-lion-7488639.html

minimal suffering, he is forced to the conclusion that objections to it can only come from a dislike of pleasure. The desire to prevent others from enjoying themselves leads to the 'slander' of 'anti-hunting vitriol'.

Thus he opens with a quip of Mencken's to this effect in the case of Puritans. He concedes that this is generally unfair, but is prepared to make an exception over hunting. I suspect that Mencken was using the word Puritan to mean small-minded censoriousness, rather than in Danielson's scholarly sense. But be that as it may, Danielson's quotation unfortunately opens the way to misunderstanding for those less familiar with the literature than he, so it is best to clarify from the outset Puritan attitudes to pleasure and suffering.

During the mid-nineteenth century, Lord Macaulay wished to distance animal welfare reform from Puritan theology, an association he found uncongenial. Like Danielson, he emphasised their dislike of pleasure rather than of animal cruelty. 'The Puritans', he wrote, hated bear-baiting, 'not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. Indeed, he generally contrived to enjoy the double pleasure of tormenting both spectators and bear'. This jibe is described as 'wholly unfair' by specialist historians. In fact, the Puritans were, in their day, known for their compassion towards both humans and animals.[34]

Puritan outspokenness against cruelty came not from a rejection of pleasure, but from revulsion at the agonies of hunting, and their view that God hated animal cruelty. Most people, not just Puritans, knew about the cruelties of hunting. As early as 1516, Thomas More called hunting 'the lowest and vilest part of butchery' on account of its cruelty, and forbade hunters from his Utopia since 'the hunter seeks nothing but pleasure from a poor little beast's slaughter and dismemberment'.[35] Hunting was so well known for its cruelty that Shakespeare uses the 'sobbing' deer and 'tyrant' hunters to illustrate suffering (*As You Like It*, 2.1). In *Macbeth* (4.3), a slaughtered mother and children are called 'murdered deer', and when Shakespeare sought a comparison for the extreme suffering endured by a woman who has had her hands cut off and her tongue torn out, he chose a hunting analogy: 'I found her', says Marcus Andronicus of the mutilated Lavinia, 'straying in the park, Seeking to hide herself, as doth the deer That hath received some unrecuring (mortal) wound' (*Titus Andronicus* 3.1). Shakespeare could rely upon his audience recognising these comparisons as apt. I see no point in denying that hunting was cruel, nor in labelling the exposure of such cruelties as 'anti-hunting vitriol'.

Particularly regrettable is that Danielson extends his comments to William Cowper, not of course a Puritan. Cowper diagnosed the cruelties of slavery, of the factory system, and of animal sports from his biblical faith. In the eighteenth century this required courage, as the rich and powerful had a vested interest in all three. His verse remains eloquent, and was quoted several times by Martin Luther King. To describe him in Danielson's terms for speaking up for the voiceless seems harsh.

Danielson says that I present a weak argument, explaining that I offer 'no rational, empirically-based account of the actual practices of hunters nor of wild animals' other possible forms of mortality'. It is worth recalling that my article concerned *sport* hunting. It contrasted a self-proclaimed spirituality found among contemporary evangelical hunters in the USA, with one I traced in the discourse of their supposed predecessors in the UK. I suggested learning from this heritage. As I have not yet written about 'the actual practices of [contemporary] hunters' nor of the ways wild animals might die, it seems premature to assess the strength of such an argument. I shall return to this below. But first, I consider the comments he makes about what I did write.

[34] P. Sampson, *Six Modern Myths* (IVP, 2001), 84.
[35] Thomas More, 'Utopia' in *Works* (Yale University Press, 1965), vol. 4, 170-1.

Hermeneutics
Danielson finds an 'insupportable and tendentious biblical hermeneutic', a 'fast-and-loose exegesis', a 'cherry-picking biblical imagery' in my article. Presumably this does not refer to my sources. Whilst obviously pre-critical, they are widely regarded as careful pioneers of a canonical hermeneutic, using the best scholarship of their day. I suppose, then, that he must be referring to me. But I offer little exegesis of my own, other than mild paraphrases. He gives two main examples.

Shepherds and hunters
Danielson finds a 'specious contrast between hunters and shepherds', yet it was John Owen, not I, who contrasted Nimrod 'the great hunter' with Christ 'the great shepherd'. I merely noted the supporting evidence.

Danielson rejects Owen's contrast on the ground that shepherds care for sheep for purposes of 'meat production', which of course involves killing them, just as hunters kill. Now, modern shepherds do, indeed, commonly kill young lambs for their tender flesh. In fact, modern shepherds treat sheep as commodities, not as creatures created to praise the Lord from the earth (Ps. 148.7f). Thus they mutilate them by castration, tail docking, and mulesing, often without anaesthesia; criminal cruelties in the case of domestic cats or dogs. If this had also been the practice of ancient Israel, Psalm 23 would have been a horror story calculated to inspire fear of torture and death. Happily, modern shepherding is a poor guide to that of David. Sheep were then far too valuable for their wool, milk and dung to routinely kill as modern shepherds do; moreover, as Mary Douglas has observed, the Levitical law operated to prevent the cruelties which modern shepherds routinely exercise on sheep.[36] Only the wicked shepherds of Ezekiel 34 routinely kill and eat the sheep; indeed, according to Jesus, the good shepherd actually gives his own life for them, reflecting both their inter-dependence, and the mark of the righteous man (Prov. 12.10). Danielson has read modern cruel shepherding practices back into the past, thus blurring the distinction between hunter and shepherd. But the distinction is well attested in both Christian and Jewish traditions.[37] Even Rowley says that 'hunters are generally portrayed negatively in the Bible'.

Wolves and lambs
Danielson's second example concerns my concluding observation that 'In the Kingdom, not even wolves will hunt', a light paraphrase of Isaiah 11, compatible with a range of hermeneutics. He rather informally regards this as a 'literalistic' reading of a 'poetic image', comparable with 'the trees of the field [clapping] their hands' (Is. 55).

If my paraphrase counts as exegesis at all, then I am in good company. The twentieth century evangelical Martyn Lloyd-Jones observed of such passages that 'the lion who is carnivorous now, will not be so [on the new earth]'[38], going far closer to Danielson's 'literalistic' hermeneutic than I. Now Lloyd-Jones had many qualities, but 'fast and loose' exegesis was not in his repertoire. I note that Withrow King quotes precisely the same pericope.

Danielson's modern dualism of 'poetic' and 'literalistic' is simply inadequate for discussing such pericopes. Calvin, for example, notes that beasts 'crying to God' (Joel 1) is a 'personification', yet it is no mere poetic subjective experience: 'was it not a calling on God', says Calvin, 'as their nature admitted?'[39] The twentieth century scholar F. F. Bruce observes of Isaiah's prophetic 'poetry' that it 'enshrines no pathetic fallacy but

[36] O. Borowski, *Every Living Thing: daily use of animals in ancient Israel* (Altamira, 1998), 52f, 231. M. Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford University Press, 1999).
[37] For the Jewish tradition, R. H. Swartz, *Judaism and Vegetarianism* (Lantern, 2001), 25.
[38] T. Sargent, *Animal Rights and Wrongs* (Hodder, 1996), 154.
[39] J. Calvin, *Commentary on Joel,* 1.18ff.

something much more biblical and substantial'.[40] Moreover, few evangelicals before the twentieth century failed to distinguish between the metonymic personification of trees clapping their hands, and the prophetic genre of a wolf and lamb living together.

In fact, many Evangelicals past and present have taken these pericopes as pointing to the restoration of the peaceable kingdom, to violence and suffering being a feature of a *perverted* creation, not the creation which God pronounced 'good'. And here, I think, Danielson raises an important point. Apparently working within a neo-Darwinian discourse, he writes that 'one can simply no longer accept' that suffering and death are the result of 'humankind's fall alone'. Danielson is aware of the issues here, and carefully phrases his observation; readers less familiar with the literature are referred to Michael Lloyd's fine discussion.[41] Suffice it to say that even for those working within a neo-Darwinian discourse, it is entirely possible to accept that suffering and death are *the result of the fall*, even if not precisely of '*humankind's fall alone*'. Many writing after Darwin have denied that suffering and death are an inherent part of the creation order, and have affirmed that they will cease at the restoration of all things. Thus, for C. S. Lewis (not known as a critic of neo-Darwinism, and perhaps here indebted to Charles Williams' Platonic forms), lions were always 'awful' but their present realisation of this in 'fangs and claws' is 'a clumsy, and satanically perverted imitation' of their reality to be revealed.[42]

Just as Danielson's modern categories are a poor guide to seventeenth century usage, so it is obvious that we cannot simply transplant a seventeenth century theology into the twenty-first. Happily, several theologians have addressed this.[43]

I turn now to an area where Danielson carries the discussion forwards.

Modern hunting

I endorse Danielson's advocacy of a fact-based discussion of the contemporary experience of both hunters and of animals. My article was not about this, but I will comment briefly on each.

First, the experience of the *sport* hunter. It is commonplace for modern sport hunters to describe their primary experience of killing an animal as pleasure. Thus the hunting journalist Humberto Fontova says candidly that hunters 'are simply guys who get a thrill out of killing animals'. Sometimes, this is presented in a 'spiritualised' language of 'lyrical love'. For example, William Thompson, one of the founding fathers of the 'sport' of bowhunting, said of deer: 'I have so loved them that I longed to kill them' – a sentiment which Cartmill regards as pathological yet is, he says, 'commonplace among serious hunters'.[44]

Secondly, the experience of animals. Danielson asserts that 'real hunters' promote the ethic of the 'clean kill'. He offers as illustrations his experience of four deer which took between 10 seconds and a minute to die. A delay of up to one minute from penetration of flesh to insensibility would be considered entirely unacceptable in any secular abattoir claiming an *ethic* of 'humane' slaughter.

---

[40] Sargent, *Animal Rights and Wrongs*, 153

[41] M. Lloyd, 'Are Animals Fallen?' in *Animals on the Agenda*, in A. Linzey and D. Yamamoto (eds) (SCM, 1998), 147-160.

[42] C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain* (Collins, 1967), 131. For discussion, see A. Linzey, 'C. S. Lewis's Theology of Animals', *Anglican Theological Review* 80.1 (1998), 60–81.

[43] See A. Linzey, *Animal Theology* (SCM, 1994); D. L. Clough, *On Animals* (Bloomsbury, 2012); Lloyd, 'Are Animals Fallen?'

[44] M. Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning* (Harvard University Press, 1996), 238.

Moreover, abattoir death comes from exsanguination, and there is evidence that a clean cut causes restricted nerve stimulation, even in the absence of stunning.[45] Hunting death usually comes, at best, from organ damage and internal bleeding; there is no stunning. Moreover, modern technology may greatly extend death's pangs, as its higher kinetic energy causes widespread nerve stimulation through direct dissipation and cavitation. Even one minute of agony is a long time, as anyone who has experienced acute pain will attest. But it is not just one minute of agony.

Danielson asserts that 'real hunters' promote the ethic of the 'clean kill'. His use of the word 'real' suggests that he anticipates difficulties, which immediately appear when we consult the hunting literature. For example, hunting expert V. Paul Reynolds is candid that hunters 'often' take an 'unethical shot'. I do not think Danielson's case can be saved by simply asserting that these are not 'real hunters'. Danielson's version of killing is idealised.

A British study of deer hunting found that 11 percent of deer killed by hunters died only after being shot two or more times, and that some wounded deer suffered for more than 15 minutes before dying.[46] Moreover, some deer escape, wounded; for obvious reasons, these are called 'crippling losses'. According to Reynolds, this happens sooner or later to most hunters, leaving the animal to 'suffer a slow death'. Estimates vary from 8% - 50% of the kill in the U.S.[47] What kind of ethic could make this acceptable?

Danielson argues for a calculus of suffering. Natural death, he says, is crueler: 'slow starvation…, predation, or disease'. These are, in fact, the very same agonising deaths suffered by 'crippling losses'. But Danielson's deer were 'clean kills', so he argues that, in this best case scenario, they did not suffer the extended deaths which may otherwise have awaited them.

But this argument works only if Danielson knows that precisely his deer are likely to suffer a cruel death that season, and that means deliberately selecting weak or sick deer. Otherwise, they may well have lived on happily for years. Perhaps Danielson selects the weak, but most hunters do not.

Either animals are chosen at random, the first unhappy creature to be spotted, or on the basis of status traits: size, or suitability of body parts as trophies. Random selection reduces the sum total of suffering only in so far as it reduces the number of deer. The logic of this is to eliminate the species – indeed, all species – thus reducing suffering to zero. But trophy selection is even worse. It may actually artificially select healthy, robust animals, making the population less resilient to food supply variations and affecting its genetics.[48] In Canada, hunting has reduced the horn size of some big-horn sheep, with 'probably deeper' effects on the populations' genetics.[49] As Withrow King notes above, hunting can be part of 'deeply flawed wildlife management systems'.

However, the most fundamental difficulty with Danielson's discussion is the calculus of suffering itself as an ethical procedure. Derrida points out that the Benthamite boundary

---

[45] T. Grandin, 'Euthanasia and slaughter of livestock', *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 204 (1994), 1354-1360.
[46] E.L Bradshaw and P. Bateson, 'Welfare Implications of Culling Red Deer,' *Animal Welfare* 9 (2000), 3–24.
[47] V. Paul Reynolds, 'Losing wounded deer', *The Ellsworth American* 12.11.2014 http://www.ellsworthamerican.com/sports-outdoors-in-maine/losing-wounded-deer/, accessed 21.10.2016. J. R. Skalski et al, *Wildlife Demography*' (Academic Press, 2010), 478ff. There are formidable methodological problems in deriving a reliable estimate; no hunter likes to be thought a poor shot.
[48] E. Pennisi, *Science,* Aug. 20, 2015 http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2015/08/superpredator-humans-are-hunting-other-animals-out-existence
[49] J. Whitfield, 'Sheep Horns Downsized by Hunters' Taste for Trophies', *Nature* 426 (2003), 595.

makes suffering dubitable; but the gaze of the deer is undeniable; it precedes ethics, requiring responsibility.[50] When it looks into our eye, we know it as a creature of God; to silence its praise calls us to account.

To be clear, I agree with Danielson's call for a fact based discussion, but his anecdotes raise more questions than they resolve. These include whether it is ever justifiable to derive pleasure from activities which inevitably (though not necessarily intentionally) entail animal suffering; if so, where does the limit lie? How much suffering, of what intensity and affecting how many of God's creatures, is permissible for a given quantum of human pleasure? How many 'crippling losses' are acceptable? How much weight should be given to unintended but foreseeable environmental and conservation consequences?

Finally, Danielson provides us with his own narrative of hunting, although it is uncertain whether it is intended as an alternative spirituality. It is couched in language reminiscent of transcendence, but the whole point of a spirituality of hunting is that it should be about hunting. Most of Danielson's celebration of creation is extrinsic to hunting. I, too, can wonder at nature, and celebrate God's self-revelation (Rom. 8). Indeed, Nussbaum has argued that precisely this wonder speaks *against* destroying creatures.[51] The evangelical sources I cited provide a spiritual framework for her view.

Reply to Matthew Rowley

Matthew Rowley begins by suggesting that I should have discussed a comparative lexicon of hunting. This was impractical in a short article, but it does raise important issues which will recur below. Those interested in the broader hunting literature should consult the suggested reading I provided.

As is clear in the synopsis and opening paragraphs of my article, I specifically discussed issues raised by contemporary *sport* hunting.[52] I analysed these within a well-defined archive of pre-twentieth century English texts by studying the intersection of discourses of human pleasure with those of animal suffering and death. I also noted the widespread recognition that, as Rowley puts it, 'hunters are generally portrayed negatively in the Bible'.

Common ground

Rowley and I do share some common ground. He considers it indisputable that contemporary hunters in the USA 'love mixing theology and hunting'. He affirms that we find a negative portrayal of hunting in the Bible, but not 'the glorification of killing animals' apparent among some modern evangelicals; that 'preachers' made connections 'between hunting and evil' (although he isolates tropes from their conditions of possibility, generating his dualism of type I and type II hunting); and that many Puritans 'condemned the delight in taking animal life (type I.A)'.

[50] In a famous footnote, Jeremy Bentham made suffering the criterion in animal ethics. J. Derrida, *The animal that therefore I am* (Fordham University Press, 2008).

[51] M. Nussbaum, 'Beyond Compassion and Humanity', in *Animal Rights,* edited by M. Nussbaum and C. Sunstein (Oxford University Press, 2004), 299–324, 306.

[52] I shall use the term 'sport' as a convenient shorthand to refer to both modern usage, and to the discursive practices before the twentieth century which I discussed in my article. Technically, I should each time specify the relevant intersection of discourses of human pleasure and animal suffering, but this would be tedious for both the reader and myself.

Parting company
However, Rowley and I part company on his preference for one-dimensional accounts, and when he generalises from my discussion of *sport* hunting to statements such as 'hunting is unbiblical', something I nowhere claim.

I argue that in the literature I discuss, we find a complex hunting discourse, ranging from 'at best a waste of time…[to] at worst a spiritual peril'. Rowley says that 'the godly [in early modern England] condemned hunting' (type I.C) because 'leisure and pleasure' distracts 'from piety and responsibility'; this seems to be a kind of 'spiritual peril', so thus far so good. But Rowley seems to deny that cruelty is such a spiritual peril. He is adamant that Puritan condemnation does not stem from 'a principled biblical stance concerning animals', yet I gave examples to the contrary. The cruelty of hunting animals 'infecteth' the heart with cruelty (Dod and Cleaver); killing an animal can gratify 'the sensual appetite' (Matthew Henry); even when hunting is for necessary food rather than sporting with 'God's curse' (i.e. the consequences of the fall), it must be done with 'the least cruelty' to the animal (Thomas Wilson). All these apply to Rowley's type I.C, all are presented as spiritual perils, all are principled, and all concern animals. In fact, Rowley elsewhere asserts that many Puritans 'condemned the delight in taking animal life (type I.A)', which surely overlaps type I.C ('mainly for pleasure') seeming to contradict his denial that 'a principled biblical stance concerning animals' is involved. In fact, it is now well established that, as Keith Thomas wrote some 30 years ago, there is a '(minority) Christian tradition' which took a principled stance towards animals, with a 'notable lack of historical development' in the arguments from the Puritans to the Methodists (among others).[53] In modern parlance, a discourse on animal suffering.

Diverging paths
Our paths diverge entirely when Rowley generalises without warrant. This is already apparent in the above paragraph. Rowley says that English Puritans 'condemned' hunting (I.C) and speaks of their 'rejection' of it. But I.C includes hunting 'often for eating', and I nowhere say that Puritans condemned or rejected such hunting; they didn't. A few other examples of Rowley's unwarranted generalisations must suffice.

He says that 'people in early modern Old and New England had much more to say about' hunting than I discussed. Of course they did, if we generalise from *sport* hunting to hunting *in general*, and extend the context from *Old England* to include *New England*. My article's focus was specific, and was set out at the beginning. Similarly, he asserts that in my article I assume 'that there was some kind of largely unified post-Reformation mind on the issue of hunting', again generalising from *sport* hunting to hunting generally, and from a specific intersection of discourses to 'a unified post Reformation mind' – a concept I nowhere employ. Or again: in my synopsis, I refer to '*an* older, Reformation tradition'. Quoting me, Rowley redacts this into '*the* "Reformation tradition",' or more grievously, to a '*monolithic* "Reformation tradition"' which he denies exists. I agree, but then I did not claim that there was a 'monolithic' tradition. 'Monolithic' traditions are Rowley's idea, not mine. I specifically noted (e.g. footnote 32) where my sources presented a multivalenced or interlaced discourse (akin to Rowley's 'variegated tradition').

In response to an article discussing the *discourse of sport* hunting in a pre-twentieth century *English* context, it is customary to address the literature concerned, the way that hunting is *written* about therein, and to look specifically at issues connected with *sport* hunting (the intersection of discourses of human pleasure with animal suffering). Unaccountably, then, Rowley overwhelmingly chooses sources from the entirely different context of *colonial America*, and seems more interested in the social and economic conditions of hunting (such as land ownership) than the way that it is *written* about. Few of Rowley's sources index human pleasure, and none animal suffering, key discursive features of my analysis.

[53] K. Thomas, *Man and the Natural World* (Penguin, 1984), 180, 154.

Rowley's one concession to the literature I actually wrote about is a modern third person account of James VI/I's hunting practices. His reference to 'the *Reformed* James VI and I' (my emphasis) suggests that he is using an archive which extends mine not only geographically, but also to include a very broad delimitation of 'Reformed'.[54]

Advancing the debate

Rowley draws our attention to the bloody ceremonial aspect of hunting discourses in deploying the binary pair *gruesomeness/respect*. Writing within a twenty-first century hunting sensibility, Rowley describes James VI/I as a '*gruesome* hunter' in comparison with 'modern evangelical hunters…[who] seem to show *more respect* for the animals they kill' (my emphases). However, both 'gruesomeness' and 'respect' are constructed, not found. As with Rowley's classifications, it is unwise to assume continuity with past discourses. What Rowley reads as 'gruesome' from his contemporary US context, need not have been so read by James's European contemporaries. Indeed, in James's day such ritualised 'unlacing' of deer and 'blooding' of courtiers was neither unusual, nor necessarily spoken of as gruesome. Erasmus had earlier penned a remarkably similar satirical account, in which he described the noble hunter's 'curious superstition' attending butchery, as of 'some new religious ceremony'.

In 1915 Henry Salt found *gruesomeness* in precisely a contemporary hunting tradition that Rowley considers to 'show *more respect* for the animals they kill' (my emphasis), albeit in an English setting. Salt described the initiation rite of 'blooding' children as a '*gruesome* parody of the rite of baptism'.[55] The blooding rite can surely be saved from being abusive (and gruesome) only by long ceremonial tradition, especially when, according to one US hunter, some children have 'to be chased down, tackled and held still to receive their initiations'.[56] Under what other circumstances would it be acceptable to hold down children and smear blood on them from the mutilated body of a recently killed animal? This ritual aspect of hunting practices, functioning to construct or obscure perceived 'respect' and 'gruesomeness', certainly warrants further study.

Rowley also advances the discussion in his comment that '…if New England Puritans held to Sampson's "biblical view" [of hunting], they would have starved to death.' This is, of course, not so, being another example of Rowley generalising what I wrote about *sport* hunting in *Old England* to hunting for *necessary nutrition* (type 1E) in *New England*. I even quoted Henry and Wilson (see above), whose 'biblical' views were entirely compatible with avoiding starvation. But more importantly, Rowley here draws our attention to his one-dimensional portrayal of his New England literature as focused entirely on the material conditions of hunting and its utility, with no regard to animal suffering or its place within a world-view spirituality of Creation-Fall-Redemption. This is, of course, possible, but I find it a little improbable. Their discursive heritage in English Puritanism might be expected to have enabled them to speak of 'wild' animals as God's creatures created to praise him from the earth (Ps. 148), and of cruelty as a sign of wickedness (Prov. 12.10). Indeed, by 1641 the Massachusetts Bay Colony had stipulated that 'No man shall exercise any tiranny or crueltie towards any bruite creature', establishing their principled recognition that animal suffering is worth talking about, even if here restricted to domestic animals.[57] Only further detailed study of a well-defined archive of colonial texts with a clear discursive focus could decide these interesting matters.

---

[54] For discussion of naming and delimiting institutional authorities, see M. Foucault, *Archeology of Knowledge* (Routledge, 2002), ch. 3.

[55] H. Salt, 'Blooding' in *Killing for Sport*, ed. H. Salt (George Bell, 1915) Appendix II, pp155-158, 155. Salt is not, of course, in my archive.

[56] Don Dubuc, *The Blooding Rite* http://www.dontheoutdoorsguy.com/features/featured-stories/51-the-blooding-rite-why-do-we-do-it.html, accessed 27.2.2016.

[57] R. Preece and L. Chamberlain, *Animal Welfare and Human Values* (Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993), 28.