

*Naturalist, or Wild Scenes and Wild Hunters* (1852). His accounts fell heavily to the side of sensationalism, yet also evince accurate natural description and even remorse. But it was during the 1880's and 1890's, while the code of gamesmanship was formally emerging, that the term reached its present meaning. Hunters such as Charles Sheldon, George Bird Grinnell, G.O. Shields, Henry Fairfield Osborn and Theodore Roosevelt began calling for wiser usage of wildlife and wider acquaintance with undiluted nature. Roosevelt's works, such as *The Wilderness Hunter* (1893), delineated the code for the eager public. Famed naturalist John Burroughs lent his influence to these hunters' pleas and later supported their rebukes of "nature fakers" like Ernest Thompson Seton. William Temple Hornaday, curator of the New York Zoological Society, carried the cause into the 1930's.

Over recent decades, with sport hunting encountering increasing criticism, the idealization of the "hunter-naturalist" has received ardent support from several quarters: seasoned hunters like Archibald Rutledge, Jim Woodworth, or Sam Wright, conservationist Aldo Leopold, writer Vance Bourjaily, game warden Frank Calkins, and, of course, hunting magazines. Yet even this idealization has not gone unchallenged. Critics such as Cleveland Amory and Bil Gilbert, and even Leopold, charge that the image is untenable and purely nostalgic in that few hunters approach it or even aspire to it.

---

## Reaction

ALAN M. FUSONIE

National Agricultural Library

### COMMENT:

Both papers, if taken together, present a balanced picture of the historical development, current status, and future challenges for the hunting community. Dr. Stange has artfully portrayed man's shift from the position of hunter for survival to that of hunter for sport with man as the dominant species. On the other hand, Dr. Altherr has utilized an interesting selection of primary and secondary sources in presenting an historical contrast between the hunter-naturalist and the "game butcher."

With the advent of the printing press in the fifteenth century, oral tradition as well as handwritten manuscripts relating to man's thoughts about agriculture and hunting became more easily recorded in the printed form for educated men to read. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the primary sources published in the English language relating to agriculture and hunting increased. In 1567, Charles Estienne, a French agriculture writer, published his...*Maison Rustique*....The latter edition of this work, which came out in 1600, included a detailed description of the hunting of hart, wild "bore," hare, and fox, as well as the art of falconry. While also touching upon these areas, *Recreation* first published in 1731 provides useful information concerning the use of the long-bow or cross-bow as well as the ancient sport of cockfighting which eventually found its way to America where it was reportedly enjoyed by such notables as Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton. John Worlidge in his treatise *Systema Agricultura* which was first published in 1669 and dedicated to the gentry and yeomen of England, attempts to identify and justify areas where

man should interfere with nature. For example, Worlidge describes the otter as “a pernicious destroyer of fish either in pond or brook. . .” to be killed by insnaring underwater or by use of dogs. What about today? According to Leslie G. Pine in his book entitled *The History of Hunting*, the otters killed by hounds of today are vicariously fulfilling man’s need for bloodshed. The fox, in the first half of the seventeenth century, is depicted by Worlidge as the destroyer of lambs, geese, and especially poultry who must necessarily be subdued by the use of greyhounds, hounds, terriers, and nets. Worlidge stresses the fact that to destroy the whole breed is a commendable and noble exercise. Today, however, the real control of the fox is reportedly being administered by gamekeepers rather than hunters.

Although on a somewhat smaller scale, if there is one area in which the proud ancestral heritage of the chase aspect of sport hunting has remained, it lies in the time-honored sport of falconry or hawking which probably originated among the tribes of the Asian steppes around 2000 B.C. From the tenth to the seventeenth centuries, the European nobility pursued hawking with enthusiasm—from kings, princes, noblemen, to clergy. Monarchs took the hawk under their protection and governments enacted laws for its protection.

The literature on falconry is rich indeed. In the English language, for example, George Tuberville, a poet and diplomat, published his work entitled *The Book of Falconry or Hawking* in 1576. Edmund Burke, in 1619, published his effort, *Treatise of Hawks and Hawking* and, in 1684, Sir Thomas Browne published his work entitled *Of Hawks and Falconry, Ancient and Modern*. James Campbell, in his *Treatise of Modern Falconry*, published in the late eighteenth century stresses the profound impact of the invention of the firearm upon the alteration of sporting attitudes and procedures. He points out that prior to the invention of the gun, the chase or fight was the major source of pleasure and satisfaction. This is visibly pictured in part II of the 1710 edition of the *Gentleman’s Recreation*, the authorship of which has been questionably attributed to Richard Blome. The section entitled “Hawking and Faulconry” contains several illustrative drawings. In one particular drawing depicting the technique for reclaiming and manning hawks, one sees a hawk crouched on top of a captured pheasant and surrounded by seven seemingly motionless hunting dogs. Both the hawk and the dogs appear to be awaiting the master’s orders and/or reward for their deeds.

Unfortunately, with the universal use of the gun and the enclosure of open lands, interest in hawking declined. Due to the invention and mobility of the gun, the primary act of sporting pleasure came to include the act of putting the game to death. As a result, emphasis was placed on good marksmanship and the use of the hawk began to decline. Today, interest in falconry continues in Europe, Britain, and the United States although on a smaller scale.

As Dr. Stange indicated, eventually the Forest Laws in England confined the rights of hunting and fishing to the King and his favorites and subsequent game laws only permitted a noble the opportunity of the chase on his own land. Eventually, however, for some there was the lure of the New World as reflected in some of the descriptive reports and literature of the time. For example, Thomas Hariot’s book, *A Brief and True Report on the New Found Land of Virginia*, first published in 1588 and then reprinted in later editions, contained descriptions of deer, conies, bears, and various types of fowl and fish. In particular, America was viewed as an unbridled game reserve where in some instances an individual proficient with the gun could kill more game than two families could eat in a week. Unfortunately time passed and with the advent of commercial slaughter and the westward expansion after the Civil War, the story of the sporting man interacting with nature enters a sad epoch in American history in terms of the near extinction of the buffalo.

I would agree wholeheartedly with Dr. Stange’s and Dr. Altherr’s identification of William Hornaday’s contributions to promoting responsibility in the hunting world. His concern was quite apparent in his writings: *The Man Who Became Savage* (1896), *The Extermination of the American Bison* (1889), *The Last Buffalo Hunt* (1887), *The End of Game and Sport in America* (1920). In referring to the status of wildlife in his book *Minds*

*and Manners of Wild Animals*, Hornaday said that, “our highest duty is to be sane and sensible in order to be just, and to promote the greatest good for the greatest number.” Yet, in terms of continuing efforts at wildlife conservation, the question each generation must continue to ask is whether the tenets of the “Hunter-naturalist” or those of the “hunter-slob” prevail or whether both exist simultaneously and, ultimately, who is the real beneficiary.

---

# Puritan Attitudes Towards Physical Recreation in 17th Century New England

by  
PETER WAGNER  
William and Mary College

A survey of the existing literature about physical recreation in 17th century New England, which focuses particularly on the last three decades, reveals a surprising phenomenon. While there is a large camp of authors denying the existence of physical recreation—the severe frontier conditions or the averse attitude of Puritanism supposedly nipped recreation in the bud—there are a few authors who maintain that physical recreation did take place and was even encouraged, if moderately practiced.

The explanation for these totally contradictory opinions lies in the methodological approach of both partisan groups. They presuppose a monolithic Puritan theology with certain tenets that were universally accepted. Certain conclusions are then drawn as to the “Puritan’s attitude” towards recreation. These are finally strengthened with the quotation of a prohibitive law or another fitting Puritan source. This approach leaves historical accuracy to the individual author.

New England Puritanism, however, was not at all monolithic, as the wave of studies after Perry Miller’s death in 1963 indicates. Hence the pluralistic movement needs a specific approach which also considers differing and contradictory attitudes.

An objective analysis of the writings of three important 17th century New England Puritans (Michael Wigglesworth, Cotton Mather, Samuel Sewall) demonstrates possible Puritan attitudes towards physical recreation. Chronologically these authors cover the period from 1653 to the first decade of the 18th century. A comparison discloses that within the limits prescribed by the Bible and the secular laws (the Puritans distinguished between ‘lawful’ and ‘unlawful’ recreations) there was enough freedom left to take distinct, if not controversial positions on such a question as physical recreation. One could accept it as a means to stay healthy, for instance, or approve of it with certain conditions, or fully welcome it as a pleasure-yielding human activity.

An assessment of Puritan ideology and physical recreation, i.e., the attitudes of the