"FOR HERE FORLORN AND LOST I TREAD"

The Gender Differences Between Captivity Narratives Of Men and Women from 1528 to 1886

By

Kathleen Shofner Cole

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Arts

In the

History Program

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2000

"For Here Forlorn and Lost I Tread"
The Gender Differences Between Captivity Narratives
Of Men and Women from 1528 to 1886

Kathleen Shofner Cole

I hereby release this thesis to the public. I understand this thesis will be housed at the Circulation Desk of the University Library and will be available for public access. I also authorize the University of other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Kathleen Shofner Cole 8-9-2000
KATHLEEN SHOFNER COLE, Student Date

Approvals:

8-9-2000
DR. MARTHA PALLANTE, Thesis Advisor Date

8/9/00
DR. DONNA DEBLASIO, Committee Member Date

8/9/00
DR. FREDERICK BLUE, Committee Member Date

8/10/00
PETER J. KASVINSKY, Dean of Graduate Studies Date

ABSTRACT:
"FOR HERE FORLORN AND LOST I TREAD"
The Gender Differences Between Captivity Narratives of
Men and Women from 1528 to 1886

Taking captives was an old and established custom in the Americas long before Columbus arrived in 1492. Nevertheless, the coming of Europeans ushered in a new era in the taking of captives, since the Native Americans could use the colonists as slaves, for ransom, and for adoption, to replace their dead. The prospect of captivity placed an additional burden of fear on an already difficult life for the European colonists.

Indians captured both men and women. However, because of the different roles men and women played in their society, the circumstances of their capture and captivity differed, based on their gender. Women, normally confined to the home and care of the children, were usually captured with their children, and fear for them placed an additional burden on the mothers. Men, nearly always kidnaped while hunting, farming, or soldiering, typically only had themselves to worry about.

Men and women also dealt with the actual captivity and its aftermath differently. Men, without their families involved, found it easier to escape from the Indians. Women, however, rarely escaped unless or until their children were all dead. After their release, men publicly profited from their experiences, while women did not.

The captivity narrative itself changed over time, depending on the audience and the mood of the times. Women moved from being stoic, Puritan women, through the Amazon stage of the American Revolution, to the Victorian Age and its vision of women as delicate and frail. The narratives can tell scholars much about a past way of life, and how men and women were viewed through the centuries.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

As usual, many people helped me in the research and writing of this thesis. Though family is usually listed last, I would like to list them first. Thank you to my husband, Ronald Cole, and my parents, Harley and Claudine Shofner, for telling me I could do it and providing tons of encouragement and support. Thank to my friend Emily Byrd who helped in so many, many ways - I could not have done this without you. And special thanks to my late grandparents, Vernon and Maudine Shofner. Her pride in, and his disdain for, their mutual Cherokee and Comanche heritage first sparked my interest in my Native American history.

Special thanks to Dr. Martha Pallante, my advisor. She listened to my complaints and encouraged me over the rough spots, making helpful suggestions and generally letting me cry and whine on her shoulder. Thank you to Dr. Blue and Dr. DeBlasio, my thesis committee members, for reading and making suggestions. And thank you to the History Department at YSU: Dr. Domonkos for welcoming me into the department when I wandered in and said I thought I wanted to major in History; Dr. York for first telling me I thought like a historian (and thereby making me feel as if I had finally found my place); and Dr. Friedman for always demanding more (and getting it) than I at first thought I could give. Thanks to all for the personal time and attention I received from each professor, which made my time at YSU unforgettable. Thank you all.

KATHLEEN SHOFNER COLE

"FOR HERE FORLORN AND LOST I TREAD"[1]

The Gender Differences Between Captivity Narratives of

Men and Women from 1528 to 1886

[2]

---

[1] Charles Johnson account, "A Narrative of the Incidents Attending the Capture, Detention, and Ransom of Charles Johnson, of Botetort County, Virginia, Who Was Made Prisoner by the Indians...." Originally printed New York: 1827. (Reprinted Richard VanDerBeets, editor. *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives 1642-1836.* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973.) P. 276.-"For here forlorn and lost I tread, With fainting steps, and slow, Where wilds, immeasurably spread, Seem length'ning as I go."

[2] June Namias, *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier.* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993.) P. 45.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE: I researched and thought extensively on what to call the mostly white, Europeans colonists who came to the New World and interacted with the Native Americans already here. At first "whites" appeared to be the best description; however, I quickly found that there were many non-white, i.e. those of African background, who had also been captured by Native Americans, though only one was used in my study. Since non-whites were included, I also could not call these people "Europeans". And because many countries were involved with the settlement of the Americas, these people could not be designated, as a group, by the nomenclatures of "English", "French", Dutch", "Spanish", etc. They also could not be called "Americans" because few thought of themselves this way until the 1760s. Though the majority did come here to settle, some were just visiting the Americas when captured. After much debate, I finally settled on the word "colonists" as the name to call this mixed-bag of peoples. Please bear in mind, however, then reading this thesis that the description "colonists" includes all those non-Native Americans who were captured by Native Americans. These men, women, and children were of European or African background; some were born in Europe and were first-generation colonists, whereas others were born in the Americas. Some meant to settle and "colonize" this country permanently, while others intended to just visit and then return to their native lands. Many, especially the Africans, did not come voluntarily; many European women and children also had no choice and had to follow their husbands or fathers. After the American Revolution it becomes proper to refer to these people as "Americans", but it should be kept in mind that visitors to this country could also be captured and retained by Native Americans. I have not designated them "United States citizens" because some of these people were Canadians captured in Canada and brought south, or were Spanish/Mexican captured in the Southwest and brought north. Others were captured in the United States and taken north or south into other countries. Native Americans did not acknowledge national borders. (Though it is now correct to label these people as "Native Americans", in the past they were referred to as "Indians", and I have used both designations throughout this paper.)

Chapter One: Introduction

Before the "white man" arrived, the land belonged to the "red man". The North American continent was a land that stretched for over three thousand miles from sea to sea. It had gentle hills and misty valleys, hot burning deserts, cold high mountains, endless flat prairies, and miles and miles of rivers, streams, and lakes. This land was already inhabited by groups, clans, tribes, and nations of people, speaking over two thousand different languages and dialects, reflecting the wonder diversity of cultures that lived on the continent.[1] Some of these people, mostly those on the east and west coasts, were agriculturists and lived more or less in one area. Farming, along with hunting, supplemented their diet. Those in the middle of the continent, due to the type of land conditions there, were usually hunters and gatherers. To provide for their people, they had to wander over a large territory, and depended almost exclusively on big, wild game.

These Native Americans were very different from the European colonists who first settled in the Americas. For many reasons, Native Americans took these colonists captive. This study examines the differences in the capture and captivity between women and men colonists. Their accounts, called captivity narratives, were written down and published over and over to provide their audience entertainment and to satisfy propagandist purposes. These captivity narratives varied from one or two pages to almost a hundred pages. Often they were brief descriptions of the trials the colonists faced, but

---

[1] David Hurse Thomas, et. all. *The Native Americans: An Illustrated History.* (Atlanta: Turner Publishing, Inc., 1993.) P. 26.

many others included interesting observations of Indian life and the flora and fauna the colonist encountered. These accounts were all used for propaganda, with the enemy always the Indian. However, depending on the political climate, the accounts might also denigrate the French, the British, or the Spaniards.

These captivity accounts vary over time and geography. The earliest accounts take place in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in New England and New France. As time passed, and the frontier moved, captives were taken from homes into the southern United States, the Midwest and Great Lakes area, the southwestern United States and Mexico, and the northern borders between the United States and Canada. The last taking of captives was in the nineteenth century, on the upper reaches of Michigan and lower Canada.

Though there were literally thousands of captives, and hundreds of captivity narratives, this study examines the accounts of thirty-one men and thirty-five women. Twelve of these were children when they were captured. All are of European origin, except one, Briton Hammon, who was of African descent. He is also the only one in which the Spanish were involved in his capture; in all the other narratives listed here, either the Native Americans, the French, or British were involved. This is not to way that there were not very many Africans captured, but many of them voluntarily lived with the Indians in the South. Many were, or their ancestors had been, runaway slaves. Particularly in Florida, those of African descent became tribal leaders.[2] The Spanish

---

[2] Norman J. Heard. *White Into Red: A Study of the Assimilation of White Persons Captured By Indians.* (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1973.) P. 46.

were also involved with many captives, buying or selling them to and from the Indians. However, many of these Africans and Spanish-Mexicans were illiterate and left no written record. Because this is an English-speaking country, most of the accounts that are accessible to the general public are English accounts, with a few French or Spanish ones translated into English.

In the captivity narratives available, several broad generalities can be seen. In some cases, women did not have to fear torture while men did. In some areas, women would likely be raped, while in other areas and cultures, they would not. In some instances, men would more likely be killed, while women might have a better chance to live. Children were a favorite target and "rarely did a child successfully resist assimilation in any native culture area".[3] In all cases, the circumstances of women's captures varied from that of men. These same circumstances also appear to dictate whether women would attempt to escape their captivity. Though it seems self-evident that mens' and womens' captivity experiences would differ-- based on their different roles and psychology-- few previous writers have looked at the different physical, emotional, and mental circumstances under which men and women were taken prisoner.

The Native Americans, similar to Europeans, were not all peaceful, nor did even the more peaceful ones always get along. Often misunderstandings arose over territory, hunting rights, and other issues. However, in few of these groups of indigenous peoples was found the type of large, generalized warfare that was found in Europe. Most warfare was of the raiding type, and overall loses were few. Because Indians did not "own" the

---

[3] Ibid, pgs. 102-103.

land in the same way that Europeans did, North American Indian warriors did not try to take over or colonize other territories, except in rare instances. Indians, unlike Europeans, did not have to fight in war they did not support; a despot could not declare war and force others to go to war with him.

Public speaking was an important part of Indian life; through their language, they influenced events in their tribes, even war. "Indian leaders did not give orders to their people -- many North American Indian languages contain no imperative voice -- they enlisted their support through persuasion and influence".[4] (Many later writers have mentioned how Indian speakers used rich images and metaphors, along with humor, irony, sarcasm, and other devices, in their speeches.) Through their use of speeches, Indians could shame or praise others. The declaring of war was debated in council, with eloquent speeches by the various war and peace parties. The actual warfare was carried out by young warriors, whose actions depended on their own personal valor and initiative, unlike most European wars. In most Indian societies, the "war chief" did not have the power or authority of an European "commander-in-chief"; however, Indians did honor and respect the oldest and bravest among them. Colonel James Smith, in his treatise on Indian warfare, wrote, "No one can arrive at any place of honor among them but by merit. Either some exploit in war must be performed before any one can be advanced in the military line, or become eminent for wisdom before they can obtain a

---

[4] Collin G. Calloway, editor. *The World Turned Upside Down: Indian Voices From Early America.* (Boston: St. Martin's Press, 1994.) P. 12.

seat in council...There is no such thing as corporeal punishment used in order to bring them under such good discipline..".[5] Unlike their European counterparts, Indian warriors did not command based solely on seniority, but had to have proved himself in war, or have the reputation for great wisdom. If a warrior, for any reason, decided not to fight, the most he might face was derision from his friends. In European armies, a refusal to fight would result in a court-martial and death.

Since most of the Indian tribes, even at the best of times, lived a subsistence life, the loss of even a few people in a tribe or clan was devastating. If a tribe lost too many members through illness, accident, or warfare without replacing them, that tribe would rapidly cease to exist. So a distinct and unusual custom came about -- the taking of captives. Native Americans took other Indians captive for several reasons.

Indians had complex cultural ideas and customs when it came to taking captives. Many tribes fought in what is now called "mourning" warfare. Though many individuals often fought to secure revenge or to enhance their personal prestige, among eastern North American tribes the war party's main purpose was to assuage the grief and misery of the deceased person's family. Any death, not just one from warfare, might cause one tribe to attack another neighboring tribe in an attempt to take captives. Among the Iroquois, for example, the deceased's relatives were expected to plunge into such an abyss of mourning and despair that the entire tribe might be threatened. Violent outbursts against

---

[5] Colonel James Smith's Narrative, "An Account of the Remarkable Occurences in the Life and Travels of Colonel James Smith...During His Captivity With the Indians..." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint, Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1995.) Pgs. 253-259.

other tribal members, or among the grieving persons, themselves, was common and even expected.[6] A controlled outlet was found in social customs. While in Europe it was uncommon for noncombatants to be captured (of if they were, they were only held until they could be exchanged or ransomed), in the Americas it was customary for captives of all ages and sexes to be taken. Though Indians did kill other Indians, it was preferable for prisoners to be brought back to the tribe.

North American Indians had two systems of warfare. One was the practice of exchange, where a price was put on everything including a life. The other system was revenge, which arose out of the group's values. In this case, *only* a life was worth a life. To decide which type applied in any given situation, the tribe used a system of calculation and justification, taking into account family and tribal kinship. If the killer and victim were members of the same group, there usually was no punishment. If they were from different clans within the same village, some form of compensation might cover the crime. However, if the victim and the killer were totally separate, the victim's tribe would usually send a war party out for vengeance. So the Indians had consistent

---

[6] Alden T. Vaughan and Daniel K. Richter. *Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763.* (Worcester, Mass: American Antiquarian Society, 1980.) Pgs. 74-75.

principles for dealing with murder, without courts of law or prisons[7], depending on the identity of the killer and the relationship between the killer and the victim. Without any form of prison system, captives had to be either adopted, or tortured and killed[8]. This was a highly ritualized code of behavior.

As Mary Jemison, a famous "White Indian"[9] described the scene:

> It is a custom of the Indians, when one of their numbers is slain or taken prisoner in battle, to give the nearest relative to the dead or absent, a prisoner...On the return of the Indians from conquest, which is always announced by peculiar shouting, demonstrations of joy, and the exhibition of some trophy of victory, the mourners come forward and make their claims. If they receive a prisoner, it is at their option either to satiate their vengeance by taking his life in the most cruel manner they can conceive of; or, to receive and adopt him into the family, in the place of him whom they have lost...[10]

In most cases, unless the person was sickly, very old, or sometimes very homely, they were adopted. If the mourning family had only recently been notified of their loved one's

---

[7] "They have scarcely any penal laws; the principle punishment is degrading; even murder is not punished by any formal law...Their not annexing penalties to their Laws, is perhaps not as great a crime, or as unjust or cruel, as the bloody penal laws of England...Let us also take a view of the advantages attending Indian police. They are not oppressed or perplexed with expensive litigation; they are not injured by legal robbery; They have no splendid villains that make themselves grand and great upon other peoples Labor; they have neither church nor state erected as money-making machines." Colonel James Smith narrative. Drake, p.258.

[8] Gordon J. Sayre. *Les Sauvages Americians: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature.* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.) Pgs. 277-281.

[9] "White Indian" was a term used to describe those European colonists who decided to live completely as Indians, even when they could have returned to their white families.

[10] Mary Jemison, "A Narrative of Her Life." (1824 Edition.) Collin G. Calloway, editor. *The World Turned Upside Down.* P. 74.

death, and therefore were angry and freshly grieving, they might choose to vent their grief through horrible torture.

Since no native North American Indian society believed in the idea of "biological determination of identity or behavior" and was "disinterested in skin color, the standard Euro-American sign of racial identity"[11], the race or tribal origin of the prisoner was not a consideration in their adoption. If adoption was decided on, and it usually was, a "requickening" or adoption ceremony was carried out. The adoptee assumed the deceased's name and often literally replaced the deceased in the family and tribe. Assuming the deceased's name assured, at least to the Indians, the survival of the deceased's social role and personality. One another tribe took someone captive, his actual family usually regarded him as dead. Even if he escaped, his own family usually refused to see him. It was expected that the prisoner would assimilate completely into his or her new role. This facilitated the assumption of a new identity.[12] To Europeans, whose nuclear family was the basis for their name, class, and inheritance, it was amazing and unnatural that Indians could be adopted into a new tribe and accept it so completely, even going so far as to go to war and kill their own natural parents. This was one of the major differences between the Native Americans and Europeans. Though Indians were individuals, their role and actions in the social fabric were more important, so if a father died, his family, like an European one, would miss and grieve for him. However, while

---

[11] James A. Clifton, editor. *Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Studies of North American Frontiers.* (Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1989.) P. 11.

[12] Sayre, p. 295.

he would be missed, it was his hunting skills that would be missed the most. Adoption, therefore, kept the entire social structure of the Native Americans from collapsing[13]. Subsistence life was harsh and demanding; every single person was important to the life and success of the tribe. A tribe could not absorb too many loses among its people before the tribe would collapse into anarchy and starvation.

The second reason for the custom of taking captives was for revenge. In some tribes, custom stated that the captives had to be sacrificed, or "...clemency shown toward a single head will bring ruin to us all".[14] Many Indians believed that the spirits of those already dead cried out for vengeance. If the tribe failed to satisfy that vengeance by torturing their captives, the spirits of the dead would exact their own revenge against the whole tribe. Captives therefore expected torture. Unlike Europeans, who tortured people for confessions or information, Indians tortured for honor or vengeance. There was a difference in the torture pattern between the eastern Indians and the Plains Indians. In the west, torture might last for days, and the prisoner could be mutilated, stabbed, hit, set on fire, shot with arrows, or dismembered while alive.[15] Though these customs also took place in the east, it was not as common as it was among the Plains Indians. The Plains tribes, because of their harsher environment and society, practiced harsher retribution than the eastern Native Americans.

---

[13] Ibid, pgs. 283-287.

[14] John Demos. *The Unredeemed Captive.* (New York: Random House Inc., 1995.) P. 31.

[15] Harold E. Driver. *Indians of North America.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.) P. 375.

Prominent warriors suffered the most elaborate tortures. Not only did torture bring honor to the torturers, it also brought honor to the one being tortured. He (rarely if ever were women tortured, especially Indian women) would insult and defy his captors as they expected. If he did not, not only was he held in contempt and his family dishonored, but he disappointed and shamed the other Indians. On the other hand, if the victim was unusually brave, sometimes his captors fed his flesh to their children, which they believed imparted strength and bravery[16]. No matter how brave, once torture started, captors rarely deliberately released their captives. However, in a few cases, Indian captors occasionally released brave Europeans . One Frenchman escaped by pretending to *want* to be burned at the stake, demanding to be tortured. His Indian captors were so impressed that they released him.[17] (Not only did the Indians admire this type of extreme bravery among Europeans, it was not as "fun" to the Indians to torture an European who wanted to be tortured.)

Later Europeans feared torture more than scalping. Not all tribes tortured their captives, but those that did became legendary. Torture was often a cult, and everyone took part. In many tribes, females played a prominent part. According to Charles Johnson, the Indians often hit their prisoners and recited all the wrongs that the whites had done to them; to the Indians, one colonist was much like another.[18] Cannibalism was also practiced in many tribes as a part of the torture. While the Indians ate the flesh of a

---

[16] Sayre, pgs. 297-299.

[17] Ibid, pgs. 279-299.

[18] Charles Johnson narrative. VanDerBeets, editor. *Held Captive By Indians.* P. 280.

man they admired, so as to gain his (the enemy's) strength, a coward's flesh was spurned. The heart was the most desirable part, and often the blood was also drunk. However, cannibalism was part of a strictly religious ritual. Occasionally, starving Indians ate members of their own tribe. This was considered a horrible act, and was usually punishable by death.[19] Before adopting them, the tribe often treated the women and children as slaves; a tribe also usually adopted young men, but the tribe might torture them before adoption, as could be the case with older men.[20] Of course, few Europeans understood these customs. Most believed the only alternatives to be tween captivity and torture, or ransom and vengeance. This was not necessarily true. When Europeans arrived on American soil, most Indians attempted, at least at first, to be friendly and helpful. This did not last long, and the Indians quickly adapted their customs of captivity and adoption to these strange new settlers. In addition to adoptions, Indians learned that non-Indians could be used as slaves or sold . Thus the Indians exploited any and all fears that the new colonists had. The Indians also discovered a new twist to the old custom of kidnaping. English, French, Spanish, or American colonies and governments paid good ransoms for the return of their respective colonists, and so kidnaping for ransom was added to the repertoire of the Indian's skills.

---

[19] Drimmer, *Captured By the Indians.* Pgs. 18-19.

[20] Driver, p. 375.

Chapter Two: The Puritans, 17th Century

When Christopher Columbus "discovered" the New World in 1492, no one could have predicted the clash of cultures that would soon ensue. Most of the "Indians" as Columbus called them, attempted at first to be friendly and helpful towards the strange, new pale-fleshed people they encountered. But the Europeans were eager for land, free Indian labor, and trade goods[1]. These rich new lands that the Europeans discovered could be stripped of all their resources and sent home to the mother country, or they could use these resources to provide a home for the unruly and dissentious. To establish footholds in this new country, the Europeans needed to build forts and trading centers. In addition, the rich resources also were to be mined, and all this required labor, cheap labor, if possible.

The Lucayans, natives of the Caribbean who settled the Bahamas off the coast of present-day Florida, were among the first to greet Columbus. They paid dearly for this honor; by 1513, more than 40,000 had been kidnaped by the Spaniards and carried to Cuba to labor on plantations.[2] The Indians became unwitting pawns in an European power-struggle played out in the New World between France, Great Britain, and Spain. Later this same power-struggle would be fought between Britain and a fledgling United States. Throughout these centuries of struggle, the Native Americans attempted, to the

---

[1] Heard, p. 1.

[2] Hank Messick and Burt Goldblatt. *Kidnaping: An Illustrated History.* (New York: The Dial Press, 1974.) P. 8.

best of their ability, to cling to their old customs while adjusting to new circumstances and new cultures.

With the arrival of Columbus in the New World, Europeans and Indians began taking each other captive. The Spanish, in their quest for gold, often took Indians as slaves, especially to work on Catholic Missions. By the 1620's, however, the Spanish "Council of the Indies" passed the *Los Leyes de Los Indios*, which forbid the Spanish from making the Indians, slaves. Instead, the Indians were treated as indentured servants.

The French also took captives, but the French had always viewed the Americas in a different way than other Europeans did. The encouraged many Frenchmen to marry Indian wives and become accepted into Indian tribes. The French established their colony in New France about the same time as the English, with many of the same goals: expansion, to gain religious conversion, and economic exploitation. However, when the farming did not work out, the French soon realized they could make a lot more money in the fur trade. To facilitate this trade, the French left young French boys with the Indians to learn their languages and customs.[3] The French followed the Indian practice (which was once common among European nobility) of exchanging, fostering, or adopting children to improve relations between two peoples. So the French viewed "captivity" differently than the English did. Many French explorers and priests were attracted to the Indian lifestyle. One simple way of looking at the motivations of each national group

---

[3] Sayre, p. 7.

was that the French wanted "fish, furs, and faith", the Spanish wanted "gold, God and glory", while the English wanted "land, land and land."[4]

A Frenchman wrote:

> Coi-moy, fais toy Huron. Car je voi la diferance de ma condition a la tienne. Je suis maitre de mon corps, je dispose de moy. Meme, je fais ce que je veux, je suis le uniquement que due grand esprit.
>
> (Take my advice, and turn Huron; for I see plainly a vast difference between thy condition and mine. I am master of my own body, I have the absolute disposal of my self, I do what I please, I am the first and the last of my Nation, I fear no Man, and I depend only upon the Great Spirit.)[5]

The French often considered themselves "guests", not "captives" of the Indians. Even when the Indians captured, tortured, and killed the French, the French priests expected to die for their Catholic faith, not be "delivered", as the English Puritans expected to be. The martyrdom of the priests emphasized their individuality, and they considered their sacrifice to be on behalf of the Indians, not fellow French colonists.[6] However, the English did not consider Indian life to be desirable.

The English did not require large groups of Indians as servants or slaves for building projects, as the Spanish did. The English did not trade furs, as did the French;

---

[4] Lect15.htm at intranet.rutgers.edu, (January 1998), p. 1.

[5] Ibid, p. 37.

[6] Ibid, pgs. 21-24.

the majority of the English had come to the New World to start a new life, and Indians were not very welcome in that new life. Because the Puritans experienced persecution in their homeland in England, they envisioned their colonies as insular "forts" against the threatening Indians and wilderness.[7] There were fundamental differences between the Indians and the non-Indians. Europeans shared a Judeo-Christian heritage combined with the history of Greece and Rome, while the Indians shared a completely different heritage, much of it from Asia, and rooted in the flora and fauna of the New World.[8] When the Puritans began seeing the Indians as racially different, instead of just socially different, there were serious consequences. Back in England, regardless of the social differences, at least nearly everyone was white, English, and Christian.[9]

The English noted that the Native women were "heavily burdened" while the Native men seemed to loaf around, playing, hunting, and fishing. (As captives, most colonists were at first used as slaves. English men would especially have found this repugnant, though English women might have found themselves doing work they were already used to doing.) The English were contemptuous of the Indian way of hunting and gathering; food sources varied and Indians were sometimes "fat" and sometimes "thin". To the English, this meant that the Indian men were not good providers. The English also

---

[7] Ibid, p. 6.

[8] Alvin M. Josephy, Jr. *The Indian Heritage of America.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.) P. 4.

[9] Richard Slotkin. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860.* (Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973.) P. 69.

saw beards as evidence of male political and sexual maturity and found the clean-shaven faces of the Indian men disturbing. In addition, the English favored permanent cities and villages with well-cultivated countrysides and large populations. In contrast, Indians favored herding, hunting, and small-use farming, non-permanent villages, and in consequence, low populations. The English believed they worshiped the one true God while the Indians worshiped the Devil; in other areas, such as clothing, division of labor, and sexual mores, the English and Indians also differed.[10] The English wore woven cloth, while the Indians wore tanned leather; English women rarely owned land, while among eastern Indians the women usually owned the lodge, farmland/gardens, and the crops. To the English, the Indians were sexually free; they did not understand the Indians different cultural sexual roles.

The Puritans came to the New World to create a"city on the hill", based on the principle of

> resistance to the forces of superstition, paganism, passion, nature, and unreason symbolized by Catholicism and tribalism. To create this city they had been compelled to breach and violate the ties of blood, custom, and affection that bound them to England. The traumatic experience of breaking those bonds made rigid adherence to remembered English ways a psychological necessity....[11]

---

[10] Kathleen M. Brown. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches & Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Racism and Power in Colonel Virginia.* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.) Pgs. 55-61.

[11] Slotkin, p. 121.

Furthermore, the frontier worried the Puritans. They believed the Indians to be lewd and sexually unclean, not noticing that the Indians had many sexual taboos. The Puritans associated the Indians' sexual freedom with their lack of organized government and sense of nationality. The Puritans believed in a rigid hierarchy with God, the Church, and the State at the top, funneling down to the husband, wife, children, and servants. To the Puritans, the Indians lacked a cohesive government, because it appeared that the Indians could do whatever they wished to do. They did not pay taxes or acknowledge a king. There were no courts of law or judges, either. With no government, there would be no nation, and therefore no sense of nationality, at least to the Puritans. Sexual freedom, a lack of government, no real religion, all this was part and parcel to the Puritans, and led to their belief that the Indians were subhuman. Because the Puritans often had times of disorder, they began to worry that "the wilderness", with all the disorder that it implied, was affecting them also, causing a breakdown in their mores.[12]

The wilderness, or frontier, became an enemy. According to James Clifton, a frontier is a "social setting, a culturally defined place where peoples with different culturally expressed identities meet and deal with each other".[13] The Puritans had two conflicting views of the wilderness. On the one hand, they saw the wilderness as being a place of glorious nature where a purified Christian could start anew; but they also saw it as a horrible place occupied by devil-worshiping, degenerate Indians. When the Puritans

---

[12] Slotkin, p. 76.

[13] Ibid, p. 24.

felt strong, they wanted to convert the Indians. But when the wilderness "worked on their minds", they were afraid they might degenerate similar to the Indians and become "monstrous". They also saw the Indians as "non-humans". This is why, in the 1680s, some sailors visiting Salmon Falls, near Berwick, Maine, stole the infant son of Sokoki Chief Squando and threw the baby into the river. They expected the Indian infant to instinctively know how to swim. The sailors and the Puritans' attitudes were that Indians enjoyed a more-than-human relationship with nature.[14] The English believed themselves to be a superior race, and they were horrified at the thought of captivity among a people they saw as barbaric savages. The Puritans intended to "help" the Indians; the thought of being captured and having to call an Indian "master" was a shocking inversion of the natural order of things.

Many of the Puritans and Quakers who came to the New World, did so for religious reasons. To Puritans, in its most simplistic form, history was a cosmic struggle between God and Satan, and it was the Puritan's job to help assure God's victory over evil by establishing a government based on God's laws. They modeled this government after ancient Israel's theocracy, and became, at least to themselves, a "New Chosen People". Since Massachusetts was the "New Israel," the Indians were the Canaanites who, with God's help, the Puritans would conquer. Soon, in a sort of natural

---

[14] Ibid, pgs. 117-119.

progression, the Indians became not just Canaanites, but "devils incarnate".[15] The Indians did not come *en mass* to be converted to Christianity, and the more the Puritans learned of the Indian's own religion, the more it seemed to the Puritans to be a devilish religion. The Indians were not overly impressed with the Puritan's religion, type of government, or even the clothes they wore. The Puritans realized they had failed in their mission to Christianize the Indians. The Puritans refused to believe that it was their own fault, that perhaps their lifestyle was not something to be envied. Instead, it became the Indian's fault, and this meant that Satan was at work with the Indians, against the Puritans.

The Puritans believed in the "Doctrine of Predestination." To them, there were only two type of people: those who had been "elected," or pre-selected, to enjoy everlasting life, and those who had been consigned, in advance, to spend eternity in hell. Unlike the Indian method of justice and punishment, the English settlers in Massachusetts Bay paid little attention to the grief of the victim, the motives of the offender, or the anger of the community. Once before the Justices, an offender would not care how severely the judges would treat him, because the offender was doomed to eternity in hell. The Puritans required the assurance that God supervised and predestined every movement in and out of the universe.[16] Their captivity accounts reflect this need.

---

[15] James Levernier and Hennig Cohen. *The Indians and Their Captives.* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977.) P. Xvii.

[16] Kai T. Erickson. *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance.* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.) Pgs. 188-191.

To the Puritans, one of the worst things that could happen was to be taken captive by Indians, though some people did voluntarily opt for Indian life. In 1642 the Connecticut General Court complained that "divers [*sic*] person departe [*sic*] from amongst us, and take up their abode with the Indians in a prophane [*sic*] course of life..."[17]. This was very upsetting to the Puritans, who did not understand how this could happen. Later, a "White Indian", John D. Hunter, remarked, "...white people, generally, when brought up among the Indians, become unalterably attached to their customs, and seldom afterwards abandon them..."[18] Richard Drinnon, who wrote of Hunter's case, described it as, "...something in the Indian social bond was singularly captivating, and far superior to anything to be boasted of among us [Europeans]."[19] The Puritans did not want to examine too closely the reasons why many colonists went over to the Indians. This might bring up answers that were best left alone, such as the narrowness of gender roles, and the strictness of the Church and government in Puritan life. However, according to Vaughan and Richter, most of these voluntary defectors were probably marginal figures in colonial society (except for those taken as children and raised Indians.) Those adults who defected had never really found a place in the close-knit New England community.[20] In every society there are people who do not fit in to the social

---

[17] Vaughan and Richter. *Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763.*Pgs. 46-47.

[18] Richard Drinnon. *White Savage: The Case of John Dunn Hunter.* (New York: Schocken Books, 1972.) P. 12.

[19] Ibid, p. 12.

[20] Vaughan and Richter, pgs. 48-49.

mores of the community, who feel like outsiders for whatever reason. If the difference between community standards and how the individual feels about the community is wide enough, these individuals will seek to leave the community, either physically, or through alcohol and other means. In New England, there was an outlet for dissatisfied individuals -- they could defect and live with the Indians.

Most captives, however, were taken in war. It is at this point that they got their first true look at as drastically different way of life. After 1689, English were also exposed to French-Canadian life. It was a less drastic cultural and religious shift for the English to convert from Protestant English to French Catholic Canada than it was to convert from Protestantism to Indian religious customs. At some point in their captivity, most captives experienced both Indian and French Catholic culture. Indeed, many of France's Indian allies themselves practiced some kind of hybrid Catholicism and observed some French customs.[21]

The process the colonists went though when exposed to another culture is called "acculturation". According to most anthropologists, "Culture [is] not biologically inherited, but [is] the product of learning...the symbols and meanings shared by a group and acquired by individuals from that group."[22] Individuals must first self-identify themselves as belonging to a group, and take an active social role in that group. Next, other members of the group must accept the individual's identity as one of the group, and

---

[21] Ibid, pgs. 50-51.

[22] Clifton, editor. *Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Studies of North American Frontiers.* P. 279.

the individual must incorporate the group's world view and behavioral norms. This identity with a particular group is not always a slow process; it can arise rapidly in response to particular situations.[23] "Transculturation" is a process whereby individuals temporarily or permanently (and voluntarily or involuntarily) detach themselves from one group and enter another societal group, coming "under the influence of its customs, ideas, and values to a greater or lesser degree."[24] This is what many of the colonists did when they were prisoners. They adapted to their environment, eating the same food the Indians ate, dressing in the same clothing, even taking part in some rituals such as "running the gauntlet". (The "gauntlet" is a term used for the ritual in which Indians lined up on either side of a path. The victim had to run down the length of the gauntlet while the Indians hit or pelted the victim with whatever was at hand. This was a common bonding ritual that usually had to occur for a person to be accepted in the tribe.) "White Indians", those who identified completely with the Indians, would have made a complete Transculturation shift from their old culture to the new Indian one.

The experience between individuals varied considerably, and there are several factors which govern how completely the Transculturation process will be. Some of these factors are: the person's age when the change begins; prior attitudes towards the host group; length of residence or association with the new ethnic group; the motivation of the new "migrants"; the specific slot in the society in which they will fit; and attitude and

---

[23] Ibid, p. 280.

[24] Ibid, p. 280.

reception of the host group.[25] "Transculturation" is a virtually complete shift from one culture to another, including a nearly complete acceptance of the new culture and a complete rejection of the old one, while "acculturation" is a "partial shift or blending of cultures".[26] Vaughan and Richter comment:

> Ironically, we customarily call Indians "tribal", suggesting an inbred, parochial society with jealously guarded rituals and totems, and refer to the English as a "nation", implying considerable ethnic and cultural heterogeneity and the assimilation of newcomers. In many respects the terms are More appropriately reverse: Indian America welcomed outsiders and freely incorporated them. New English America did not.[27]

Race and ethnicity come by accident of birth and early learning. When parents bear children of the same "race" it usually means that children would receive not only biological but also cultural characteristics from their parents. For this reason, "culturally determined patterns" are often confused with the physical characteristics of "race" that are inherited biologically. Sensitivity to things such as skin color or hair is typically an European cultural pattern; it was absent, at least initially, among Native Americans.[28] This also facilitated the captivity and adoption of colonists by the Indians. This captivity was not only a historical reality, but was usually considered catastrophic to the New Englander. Families were torn apart, and captives might vanish forever, or become or

---

[25] Ibid, p. 280.

[26] Vaughan & Richter, *Crossing the Cultural Divide.* P. 24Note.

[27] Ibid, p. 89.

[28] Clifton, p. 27.

marry a Roman Catholic, or even worse, become or marry an Indian.

Obviously, the colonists did not volunteer to be ripped from their homes and be carried off by Indians. Faced with the threat of attack, whole communities huddled together in a garrison house, which became a symbol of security. At the first sign of danger, neighbors gathered their families and their few valuable possessions and took refuge together. In those towns lacking a garrison, a strongly-built house served as the agreed-upon refuge. The Indians could attack at any time, though they preferred warm weather. ("Indian Summer" gets its name from the week or so when, after the first cold snap of early winter, the days become warm again. This brief warmth gave the Indians one last good chance to attack before winter set in.)[29] The attacks usually took the colonists by surprise. The Indians favorite method of attack was to surround a cabin or fort before dawn and wait for the men to come out. The Indians then rushed in and massacred the old men and women, and very small children. Depending on the circumstances, the men might or might not be slaughtered as well. After taking the women and older children and those men allowed to live, the Indians quickly left before the neighbors could be organized to pursue.[30] If the captives could not keep up, the Indians often killed them. To the colonists, this was the height of callousness and cruelty, but to the Indians it was a kindness. Better to tomahawk an injured, sick or old captive

---

[29] Daniel J. Boorstin. *The Americans: The Colonial Experience.* (New York: Random House, 1958.) Pgs. 348-349.

[30] Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola and James Arthur Levenier. *The Indian Captivity Narrative, 1550-1900.* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993.) P. 120.

quickly, then to leave then to die a long, lonely, terrified death in the wilderness.[31]

This custom of Indians waiting for the men to leave before attacking points out the fundamental difference between the captivity of men and women; how, and where, they were attacked. To determine this difference, it is necessary to first discuss the difference between womens' and mens' lives in the seventeenth century. Unlike today, in many ways men and women occupied entirely different worlds, which complemented each other.

While the rest of Europe entered into the "modern age", life on the frontier in the Americas more closely resembled life in the Middle Ages. Many historians present the conflict between the English and Indians as inevitable, between an advanced culture and a much more primitive one. The more advanced culture, the English, has automatically been assumed the hands-down favorite to win. However, some historians disagree. Karen Kupperman, a historian, believes that at the time, the English did not see their ultimate victory over the Indians as inevitable, and Indian technology was often superior to the English one. The English depended on Indian aid to a large extent, especially in the beginning years. "European diseases, not European technology, conquered the Indians."[32] When the Indians began dying in large numbers, both colonists and the Indians believed it was God who favored the English.[33] This was a natural assumption on

---

[31] Demos, p. 29.

[32] Karen Ordahl Kupperman. *Settling with the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580-1640.* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.) P. viii.

[33] Ibid, p. 6.

both sides; the English had prayed to their god that the Indians would disappear, and the Indians had prayed to their gods that the English would disappear. When the Indians got sick and began dying, it appeared that the English god was the one answering prayers.

During the Middle Ages, Englishmen did outside, active work while women performed so-called "passive" work inside the home. This division of labor was based on St. Thomas Aquinas' view that women "existed for one of two reasons: to assist procreation and to provide food and drink for men".[34] Though few English men and women probably followed Aquinas' advice to the letter, in general men worked out in the fields and women worked closer to home. Husbands provided for the family by farming and hunting or trading; women raised the children and tended the house and garden. They did the cooking, cleaning, washing, food preservation, and cloth production. This necessitated raising chickens, goats, and cows; making cheese and butter; the gathering and drying of fruits and vegetables; making beer and cider; and the salting and smoking of the meat her husband brought home.[35] Women's traditional work of providing for the family was desperately needed in the Colonies. Though the earliest settlements were business ventures, when it became necessary to build a society, women provided indispensable labor and a "civilizing" influence. In the towns, small shops dominated the economy, and in some of these shops the women worked side-by-side with the men.

---

[34] Marty Williams and Anne Echols. *Women in the Middle Ages: Between Pit and Pedestal.* (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers, 1994.) P.15.

[35] Carol Ruth Berkin and Mary Beth Norton. *Women of America: A History.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979.) P. 37., and Carol Hymowitz and Michaele Weissman. *A History of Women in America.* (New York: Bantam Books, 1980.) P. 4.

Colonial women in larger and more prosperous towns were blacksmiths, barbers, printers, tanners and tavern keepers.[36]

Out in the wilderness, however, women worked in the house and out in the garden. Modeling their roles and society on England, English women colonists above the level of cottager's status did not do heavy field work. In fact, to promote land for colonization, some tracts in the Chesapeake region promised that female servants would not have to work in the fields.[37] When necessary, there is no doubt that women did and could work for short periods of time in the fields, planting or bringing in the harvest. Food production, however, was so time-consuming and such hard work that women usually had to spend much of their time preparing and cooking food. Women found it easier to perform chores around the house while they were also preparing food. A mother supervised the family during the day. Both young boys and girls helped the family by performing tasks around the house, like soap- and candle-making, spinning, weaving, preparing the food, and watching younger brothers and sisters. As the children became older, a division of labor developed. Girls continued on with their labor in and around the house, taking on more and more responsibilities. Boys, on the other hand, went out in the fields and woods and helped their fathers.[38] Their play prepared them for a life spent in self-defense. Boys practiced shooting with a gun or bow and arrow, and throwing a

---

[36] Jean E. Friedman and William G. Shade. *Our American Sisters: Women In American Life and Thought (3rd Edition.)* (Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath & Company, 1982.) P. 10.

[37] Ibid, pgs. 59-70.

[38] Ibid, p. 285.

tomahawk. "By the time a boy reached the age for service in the militia he was already at home in the forest and knew the ways of the Indian..."[39]

This division of labor had far-reaching implications when the Indians invaded a settlement to kill and take prisoners. It was this difference in the type of work that men and women performed, that led to the differences in their capture. To put it simply: men were captured while away from home, while women were captured in the home. This difference also meant that men usually tried to escape, and women did not, due to other circumstances in their division of labor.

Most of the seventeenth century narratives do not relate, as later ones do, what happened to the captives once they returned home. At most, the reader is given a sermon on appreciating the Puritan way of life and God's grace in rescuing the captive. The narrative itself, at this time, was in the form of a sermon, which usually began with a biblical text. Next came the doctrine, where the writer laid out the major premises of the sermon. Then came the actual narrative, placed in the area in the text where reasons were usually placed. This indicated that the narrative was the justification of the sermon. Last came the application, which outlined the lessons the reader was supposed to have learned from the sermon. [40] Cotton Mather was famous for using this method in his sermons. In his doctrine, he saw the Indians as the enemy of the "New Israel" (i.e. the Puritans) and thundered that the Indians were a judgment upon the second generation of Puritans for

---

[39] Boorstin, p. 350.

[40] Slotkin, pgs. 66-67.

their impurities and sins.[41]

All early narratives were written as lessons for those left behind. God and the Devil, in the form of the Indians or the French, were a primary and real force in the narratives, and the readers or listeners, for these early narratives were meant to be read aloud in church, were exhorted to reform their ways lest they themselves be taken captive for their sins. In most cases, the captives were made out to be, very subtly, heroes for resisting the Devil's blandishments. Hannah Duston, who supposedly killed and scalped ten Indians, was the subject of a rousing sermon from Cotton Mather, who approved most heartily of her actions. These were not meek and mild captives, even though they attempted to give God most of the glory for their surviving their ordeal.

Though there were relatively few popularly published accounts of colonists captured in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a few have survived to the present day. John Ortiz's account is one of them. The Florida Indians captured him while he was on a mission to find another missing Spanish explorer; the Indians held him for over nine years.[42] Isaac Jogues, a French Catholic Jesuit priest, became a captive several times while in Canada attempting to convert the Indians; ultimately they tortured him to

---

[41] Ibid, pgs. 83-84.

[42] John Ortiz, "Narrative of the Captivity of John Ortiz, A Spaniard, Who Was Eleven Years A Prisoner Among the Indians of Florida." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 11-20.

death.[43] Both of these incidents were typical of France and Spain, because for many years, initially only French and Spanish men were sent to the New World. Once cities were established, the women from each country might join the men, but they rarely ventured out into the wilderness to the extent that the French and Spanish male explorers did.

The English, however, were different. Like the French and Spanish, the men initially explored the New World as a business venture. The New England and Virginia areas quickly became areas where both English men and women settled. New England, in particular, came under attack by Indian who carried off almost whole populations. Indians captured the majority of the colonists during King William's War (1689-1697) but even during so-called "times of peace," attacks by Indians continued. It is worth noting that of the eleven English accounts of the seventeenth century examined in this study, the captures of all eleven people (five men and six women) took place at their homes or garrisons. However, even though everyone was at their home or garrison when attacked, the men did not necessarily have their families with them. Of the four English men in this study that were captured, only one of them, John Gyles, had his children or family involved; his brother was later tortured and killed by Indians.[44] Though in this

---

[43] Father Isaac Jogues, "Captivity of Father Isaac Jogues, of the Society of Jesus, Among the Mohawks," Richard VanDerBeets, editor. *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives 1642-1836.* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973.) Pgs. 3-40.

[44] John Gyles, "Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, etc. in the Captivity of John Gyles, Esq., Commander of the Garrison on St. George River, in the District of Main. Written by Himself. Originally Published at Boston, 1736." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivity or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 73-100.

study all the colonists were attacked by Indians, not all were captured by them. Thomas Toogood had no family involved in the attack, and he fought the Indians until they gave up and left.

The capture of the women, just like the other English male colonists, occurred in the supposed safety of their homes and garrisons. However, the difference was that the attack and subsequent abduction of the women also involved their children. Consequently, the women felt unable to make any attempt at an escape as long as their children were in danger. Mary Rowlandson,[45] had children killed in the initial attack, as did Hannah Swarton[46] and Hannah Duston[47]. The Indians killed all except three of Rowlandson's children, and after her abduction, her youngest baby died. Mary Rowlandson made no attempt to escape, and the Indians finally released her in 1676. Ransoms later bought her surviving son's and daughter's releases.

Hannah Duston had eight children, the youngest only one week old. This was typical; in many of the narratives the women are either pregnant or newly delivered. The seven oldest children escaped during the attack, but the Indians captured Hannah, the

---

[45] Mary Rowlandson, "Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson, Wife of the Rev. Joseph Rowlandson, Who Was Taken Prisoner When Lancaster Was Destroyed, In the Year 1676, Written By Herself." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 20-60.

[46] Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, editors. *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724.* (Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981.) Pgs. 145-157.

[47] Hannah Duston, "A Notable Exploit; wherein, *Dux Faemina Facti* from *Magnalia Christi American.*" Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1998.) Pgs. 58-60.

midwife, and the newborn baby. Hannah made no attempt to escape until the newborn baby died. Then Hannah, the midwife, and another young captive boy did something unusual: they supposedly killed and scalped the ten Indians holding them hostage, and returned home. It is almost certain that if the baby had lived, Hannah Duston would have made no attempt to escape. Her exploits, however, became famous throughout New England, and Cotton Mather, the famous preacher and writer, spoke at length about her, praising her lavishly for her actions.[48] It is extremely doubtful that two women, one only recently out of childbed, and one ten-year-old boy, could have killed and scalped ten sleeping Indians, unless the Indians were totally incapacitated with drink, which was unlikely in the middle of the wilderness. However, what is important is not whether the act occurred, but that the colonists believed it did. Whether Cotton Mather privately believed the story or not, he was quick to use Hannah's captivity narrative, and its unlikely ending, to his own advantage. By praising her for her actions, he acknowledged to the community at large that it was desirable to kill Indians; in fact, because Hannah received a reward for the scalps she brought back, the colonists were encouraged to kill Indians. This was not the first time, nor would it be the last, that colonist's captivity

---

[48] Hannah was not the only unusual female in her family with a capacity for violent behavior. Four years before, in 1693, her sister Elizabeth Emerson was accused of killing her twin babies shortly after their birth. Though she denied it, she was executed for the crime on June 8th, 1693. Ironically, one of the women who examined her after the birth was a Mary Neff, who a few years later would be the midwife that accompanied Hannah into captivity. Cotton Mather, who so lavishly praised Hannah years later, presided at Elizabeth's last sermon and begged her to confess her sins. (Laurel Thatcher Ulrich. *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England 1650-1750.* (New York: Random House, 1991.) Pgs. 195-201.)

experiences would be used for propaganda against the Indians.

Hannah Swarton's husband died in the initial Indian attack. Hannah, along with her four children, was captured and they were spread out among the various Indian families who needed children. Hannah Swarton made no attempt to escape, and later the French ransomed her. Unfortunately, she has to leave her children behind, and there is no record of what happened to them. There was a good chance, though, that they stayed with their Indian families. Many children found it very difficult to leave their adopted families. Thomas Hutchinson, an expert, explained:

> This tenderness [the Indians' carrying of the children on their backs] has occasioned the begging of an affection, which in a few years has been so rivetted [*sic*], that the parents of the children, who have gone to Canada to seek them, could by no means prevail upon them to leave the Indians and return home.[49]

Indians were unusually affectionate towards their children and rarely punished them. Although Indian women had many tasks and chores to perform, just as European women did, the communal nature of their work did not isolate them as European life did its women.[50] In the east, especially, Indian women enjoyed a degree of independence and autonomy that few white women enjoyed. Women owned the land and the product of the land, and though not allowed to sit on the council, they elected the men who governed the tribe.

Aside from the fact that having children as "hostages" among the Indians usually

---

[49] James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America", *William and Mary Quarterly,* 3rd Ser., 32 (1975),. p. 68.

[50] Drimmer, p. 13.

prevented the captive from an escape attempt, there was another reason that the Puritans in New England in the seventeenth century did not usually try to escape their captivity. Puritans believed that capture by Indians was not an accident and a trick of fate, but was God's punishment for heavy sins committed not only by the individual, but also collectively by the entire community. The Puritans saw God in their community, and God and Satan fought for the souls of the Puritans. Both God and Satan did not hesitate to use the Indians towards their own ends. Cotton Mather, the famous Puritan minister, believed that the Indians were God's punishment for a new generation of backsliders who saw the new land of America as a place of material wealth, not spiritual wealth.[51] "Redemption," a frequently used term in captivity narratives, had a double meaning.[52] Physically it meant to be ransomed from the French or Indians by the English or colonial government for a sum of money, enabling the captive to return to their home and somehow pick up the pieces of an often shattered life. Spiritually, redemption meant to have lost the closeness of God, and then to have found it again. To last out the captivity while keeping one's faith that one would return to civilization, meanwhile seriously reflecting on one's sins, was the surest pathway to redemption for the Puritans With rare exceptions, the Puritan captives endured their captivity.

Once returned to "English" civilization, the Puritans developed a uniquely "New World" method of coping with their traumatic experiences in the form of the "Captivity Narrative". With this narrative, they dealt with the horrors they experiences while at the

---

[51] Slotkin, p. 101.

[52] Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians*, p. 5.

same time educated their fellow Puritans and questioned the state of everyone's souls and actions in relation to God. The captivity narratives mirrored the Puritan's conversion process, as they understood it. The struggling Puritans were tried through a process of terror and blood, often losing family and friends along the way. They endured hardships of cold, hunger, and often abuse, sorely trying their faith. Then, on top of it all, the Indian way of life, being freer in some aspects from their lives, wooed and tempted them. If they did not give in to temptation, they were often tempted again by the French-Catholic way of life. It was thought this temptation came to women in particular. Not only did Indian women have more freedom and power than Puritan women did, but Puritans assumed that women's natures were weaker. This was not helped by cultural assumptions; in the society of the time the Puritans expected women to leave their homes and adjust to their husband's home and social status. "Men resisted; women adapted."[53] Men set the standards and parameters of daily life. Women had little say in political or matters decided outside the home; even in matters which directly concerned them, men did not usually allow women to make the final decision. Women were taught from their birth to adapt to the needs of their family, and when they married, their husband expected obedience from them also. Because women were more flexible and adaptable, this meant that as captives, women often adjusted better to Indian or French-Canadian life. This was especially true if they had children by Indian or French men; the women would be less likely to abandon their children to return to their previous way of life. (Cotton

---

[53] Carol Berkin. *First Generation: Women in Colonial America.* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996.) P. 43.

Mather described this as "Indianization", i.e. "to adopt the way of Indians.")[54]

Indian life was not entirely unattractive to the hardworking women of the Colonial age. The tasks that Indian women performed were not any harder than the work that Puritan women did, and Indians rarely if ever did any spinning, weaving, sewing, or knitting. Plus, the Indians worked communally, not individually, so chores were lightened by the presence of other women.[55] Many of the Indians the Puritans encountered belonged to the Iroquois Nation, in which Indian women controlled most of their work, as well as owned their lodges and agricultural output. They did not sit on the public councils, but they did have a large degree of authority within their clans.

> It is they [women] who really maintain the tribe, the nobility of blood, the genealogical tree, the order of generations, and conservation of the families. In them reside all the real authority: the lands, fields, and all their harvest belong to them; they are the soul of the councils, the arbiters of peace and war; they hold the taxes and the public treasure; it is to them that the slaves are entrusted; they arrange the marriages; the children are under their authority; and the order of succession is founded on their blood. The men, on the contrary, are entirely isolated and limited to themselves. Their children are strangers to them. Everything perishes with them.[56]

With this time of life-style, it is no wonder that some colonial women decided to stay with the Indians rather than return to their white relations.

While adult Puritan women did not usually stay with the Iroquois (in spite of the

---

[54] A. Irving Hallowell, "American Indians, White and Black: The Phenomenon of Transculturation." *Current Anthropology,* No. 4 (1963), p. 519-531.

[55] Nancy Woloch. *Women and the American Experience.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.) Pgs. 37-38.

[56] Demos, p. 165.

Indian's attractive living arrangements), young Puritan girls often did. "Les filles...ils le droit de liberte."[57] The eastern woodland Indians treated children well and quickly adopted them. According to Norman Heard, who has done an exhaustive study of white assimilation into Indian culture, the age of the person, not the length of their captivity or their sex, determined the degree of assimilation. The crucial time was around twelve years of age for girls and fourteen for boys (or around the age of puberty). Over that age, some colonists might accept some Indian ways, but usually retained the desire to return home. Though there are exceptions to this rule, it seems to have held true in most cases.[58] (One exception was in 1764 during a large prisoner exchange on the Muskingum River. While the Indian prisoners returned with joy to their Indian families, the redeemed white captures had to be tied, hand and foot so they would not break away from their white redeemers and return to their Indian families.)[59] Once the captives reached French territory, the Indians often sold them to the French. There the captives were usually pressured to convert to Catholicism. Sometimes they were in greater fear of this than they were of the Indians:

> A few days later, we arrived at Penobscot fort...In that time, the Jesuit of that place had a mind to buy me...He gave me a biscuit, which I put into my pocket, fearing he had put something into it to make me love him. Being very young, and having heard much of the Papists torturing the Protestants, caused me to act thus; and I hated the sight of a Jesuit. When my

---

[57] "A young women, say they, is Master of her own body, and by her Natural Right of Liberty is free to do what she pleases." Sayre, p. 39.

[58] Heard, pgs. 119-135.

[59] Lec17.htm at intranet.rutgers.edu (January 1998.) P. 1.

> mother heard the talk of my being sold to a Jesuit, she said to me, "Oh, my dear child, if it were God's will, I had rather follow you to your grave...than you should be sold to a Jesuit; for a Jesuit will ruin you, body and soul!..."[60]

The Puritans were concerned mostly for the soul, not the body. The same philosophy that saw their captivity as a trial from God, allowed them to consider that death would be preferable to a life as a Catholic convert.

Not knowing if they would ever be ransomed, many young girls and boys were tempted to convert to either the French or Indian way of life. Certainly the Indian life provided more freedom and expression than did Puritan life. If captives refused adoption, they might remain slaves all their lives, so adoption very much tempted them. The Indians offered parents to the children without parents, and they offered husbands to widows and girls. Boys and men could win wives and acclaim through their actions in way that were not possible in Puritan society. Adoption ruled out fear of the unknown.

Both Puritan men and women had their various fears regarding the Indians. For women, it was the issue of rape. However, the eastern woodland Indians did not rape. Indian warriors practiced continence during wartime, and they had stringent incest taboos.[61] Because having sex with a clan member was incest, and a warrior never knew if or into what clan a woman might be adopted, potentially making her his "sister", Indian warriors avoided the whole issue by not raping. This was often an issue alluded to in Puritan writing, and the captive women expressed amazement that the Indians did not

---

[60] Gyle account, Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 77-78.

[61] Wolock, pgs. 37-38.

exhibit vulgar behavior. The fact that it was remarked on so often, which meant that colonial women expected to be raped, allows great insight into colonial society. Probably many colonial men would not refrain from raping Indian women caught during a raid. Mary Rowlandson wrote regarding this issue:

> I have been in the midst of those roaring lions and savage bears, that feared neither God, nor man, nor the devil, by night and day, alone and in company, sleeping all sorts together, and yet not one of them ever offered the least abuse of unchastity to me in work or action...[62]

What men seemed to fear most, unlike women, was having to call another man "master". In New England, the family centered on the conjugal relationship of husband, wife, and children. Servants were treated almost as family members, but had to call the man "master". Vaughan and Clark believe that the relationship between master and servant in New England, which was a reciprocal one, with the master providing food, clothing, and shelter, led many colonists to believe that once captured, their Indian "master" also had reciprocal obligations. Many captives initially complained that their Indian "masters" did not give them enough to eat or proper clothing, but later realized that the Indians ate and dressed as poorly or as well as their captives.[63] Europeans consistently saw Indian women as slaves, doing chores that the Indian men should be

---

[62] Rowlandson's narrative, Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* P. 55.

[63] Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians.* Pgs. 19-20.

doing such as chopping wood, building houses, and carrying heavy loads. On the other hand, European men, used to being the master of the house, suffered greatly psychologically when made to perform what they saw as "women's work" as an Indian captive.

The aftermath of captivity among the French or Indians was often traumatic. Some captives, in their narratives, gave the impression that they had not changed in any way, though trauma of this nature and degree would obviously leave no one unaffected. Many Puritans had unconscious suspicions that the captives had perhaps found French Indian life irresistible and had brought back evil influences that might change Puritan society. Other captives gained insight into Indian culture, and used their narratives to impart natural observances of Indian life, which all in all was unfamiliar to the Puritans. Earlier accounts were less sensational than later accounts, and the women in particular strove to appear as resilient, resourceful women in the earlier accounts.[64]

Most of the captives were taken during times of war between the English colonists and the French and Indians. New England's worse days were in the 1670s when the area's worse Indian wars claimed one-tenth of the adult colonial men, the highest mortality rate ever in American military history.[65] The Puritans did not ever expect kindness from an Indian, and were always shocked when it happened. They passed this frequent kindness off as God's interference in their lives, thus permitting themselves to make and keep their racial stereotypes of the Indians. As the Indian wars

---

[64] Ibid, pgs. 14-25.

[65] Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians.* P. 9.

continued and more and more English colonial lives were lost, the narratives changed from a Puritan documentation of sin and redemption, to one of virulent anti-French and Indian feeling.

Chapter Three: The Midwest/Great Lakes Area, 18th Century

The next century brought a lot of changes for the colonists. Most of the century for the English colonists in the Americas was spent at war: war with France, war with Britain, and continuous war with the Native Americans. As with the previous century, episodes of war resulted in more captivities than periods of peace, and the captivity narratives began to change. The "sermon" captivity was no longer popular because the Puritans as a cohesive unit began to disappear. As more and more colonists immigrated or were born in the Americas, the demographics of the colonists began to change. Other religious groups populated the colonies, and more and more colonists were not extremely religious people. Where the former captivity narratives emphasized God's role, and women were expected to be stoic and physically and emotionally tough, the new captivity narratives emphasized new values. Secular expectations of independence and strength replaced religious expectations of dependence on God.

Because of hostilities, especially with the French, the length of time spent in captivity grew longer, mainly because the French did not want to release British colonists back to their government until the French-Indian war was over. Of the thirty-six captivities studied here during the eighteenth century, twenty-three of them occurred during war: King George's War (1744-1748), the French-Indian War (or the First War for Empire) (1754-1763), and the American Revolution (1776-1783). War is normally a time of great upheaval, and this was no exception. To captives, war became even more traumatic. Many of these colonials spent the war years in captivity, not allowed home

until the war was over. During wartime, the Native Americans had greater incentive for taking captives, since the colonists' governments paid good money for the captives. Every colonist not on the frontier meant one less soldier or citizen for the other side. With enough captives, the Indians (or French or British) could pressure the colonists' government for concessions. Unfortunately, these wars, as all wars do, left a continuing miasma of hatred and intolerance between the different peoples now inhabiting the New World. Depredations committed in the name of war built up a legacy of hatred, especially between the colonist and the Indian. Neither side was willing to forgive and forget, and bloodshed became common whenever and wherever colonist and Indian met.

During the eighteenth century, the frontier shifted from the New England coastal states to the inland states. During the first part of the century, colonists were still being taken from places like New Hampshire, Maine, and Massachusetts. By the mid-part of the century, areas in eastern Pennsylvania saw Indians kidnap colonists, and by the late eighteenth century, Kentucky, Virginia, and western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio lost colonists. With this method, it is possible to trace the westward movement of the American frontier as it spread across the continent. Where the frontier went, so did the clash between Indian and colonist. The Iroquois, the largest Indian nation in the eastern part of the continent, was content to play the French and the British off against each other. The French and British were rivals for many things on the continent, and the Iroquois depended on this rivalry. The Iroquois needed the French to be in competition with the British, to keep the price of furs up. Since the British wanted land, only the

French forts, the Iroquois felt, kept the British in check in the east.[1] The Indians had a lot to fear. The colonial population grew leaps and bounds. With low rates of infant mortality (compared to Europe) and a long life expectancy, especially in the north, many women had between five and eight children, and families of ten or more children were not uncommon. Even worse, from a population standpoint, most of these children could expect to survive to adulthood and in turn have children of their own. To compound the problem, immigration was also high. Coastal communities were crowded and were not able to support even the children of already-established colonists, much less new immigrants. More and more people poured into the "backcountry", where the Indians were.[2]

During the French-Indian war, the British hoped that the strongest Indian tribes would ally with them. However, most of these tribes -- the Iroquois, Creek, and Cherokee -- either remained neutral or allied with the French. Once the French were defeated, the Indians felt themselves at a disadvantage, and they often chose war as a means of revenge for their insecurities.[3] So though war among the European powers stopped being an issue after 1763, the Indians continued warring with the colonists who had taken their land. Despite passage of the British Proclamation Act of 1763, which forbade the British colonists to settle west of the Appalachian mountains, few colonists accepted this act.

---

[1] James West Davidson, et. all. *Nation of Nations: A Narrative History of the American Republic, 2nd Edition.* (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1990.) Pgs. 122-123.

[2] Ibid, pgs. 125-129.

[3] Ibid, pgs. 167-168.

The British hoped to mollify the Indians until things simmered down on the frontier, and hoped that colonists would chose to settle in Florida or Canada and dilute the Spanish and French influences in these places.[4] This did not work, and shortly the "Americans" as the colonists began referring to themselves, engaged in another war; this time they fought the British.

In the early part of the eighteenth century, women still suffered when taken captive by Indians. Out of the sixteen women in this study who were captured in the eighteenth century, all but one of them were attacked in their homes. (Jane Frazier, attacked and taken captive in 1754, was riding with a manservant to town for supplies.)[5] In addition, they all had children involved in the attack, or were children under the age of sixteen themselves. Of these sixteen captures, four happened because someone, a scout or a husband, left the door open. One attack succeeded because the women mistook the arrival of the Indians for their own men returning and opened the door themselves. Considering the known danger of Indian attack, it seems incredible that one-fourth of the captures might have been avoided if common-sense measures had been taken and the doors kept closed and locked. This shows that psychologically, in spite of the danger, many, if not most, of the colonists felt safe in the security of their homes.

Of the sixteen females in the study taken captive in the eighteenth century, five

---

[4] Ibid, p. 168.

[5] Jane Frazier, "Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Jane Frazier". "Taken from Thomas' History of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania." (1930) Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109.* (New York: Garland Pub. Inc., 1977.) Pgs. 1-13.

were children aged sixteen or under. Of these children, Mary Jemison stayed with the Indians, refusing to return to white society.[6] Two of the children, Maria and Christina Manheim, age sixteen (twins) were killed by the Indians in a dispute over whose property they became upon being captured.[7] This was very unusual; normally young women would not be tortured and killed. However, the Indian warriors argued over who would get which twin, and almost came to blows. Because peace within the tribe was more important than any captive, the twins were automatically killed by burning them to death.

Only one of the women, Molly Finney,[8] did not have children of her own; the impression given in her account is that she was still fairly young. However, her brothers and sisters, along with others in her family, were all involved in the attack. Of the ten remaining adult women, all of whom had children, six had children killed in the attack or shortly after capture. Though many women did not become pregnant until their late twenties or early thirties, and learned to space their children, many still had large families. In spite of their best intentions, women often spent most of their reproductive lives in a nearly constant round of pregnancy, childbirth, nursing, and pregnancy again.[9]

---

[6] Mary Jemison. "A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison." Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 122-210.

[7] Frederick Manheim. "Narrative of the Captivity of Frederick Manheim." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 333-334.

[8] Molly Finney account. "The Means Massacre: Molly Finney, The Canadian Captive". Originally published 1932 by Freeport Press, Freeport, ME. (Reprinted Wilcomb Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109.*

[9] Brown, p. 302. and Ulrich, p. 135.

Of the eleven adult women, seven eventually or quickly escaped their captors. Among the four women who did not escape, Elizabeth Hanson, Isabella M'Coy, Jemina Howe, and Jean Lowry, only Isabella M'Coy[10] had no children to stay her escape attempt. However, she voluntarily stayed for sixteen years in Canada with the French to escape her abusive husband, and only reluctantly returned home to see her children. Elizabeth Hanson,[11] Jemina Howe[12], and Jean Lowry[13] all had children either with them or in French or Indian hands, and did not wish to jeopardize their children's safety by attempting to escape. This is consistent with the captivities of women in the seventeenth century.

---

[10] Isabella M'Coy. "Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Isabella M'Coy, Who Was Taken Captive at Epson, N.H., In the Year 1747...". Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 143-147.

[11] Elizabeth Hanson. "God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty, Exemplified in the Captivity and Surprising Deliverance of Elizabeth Hanson, Wife of John Hanson, of Knoxmarsh, at Kecheachy, in Dover Township, Who Was Taken Captive With Her Children and Maid-Servant By the Indians in New England, in the Year 1742...." Ibid, pgs. 113-126.

[12] Jemina Howe. "A Particular Account of the Captivity and Redemption of Mrs. Jemina Howe, Who Was Taken Prisoner By the Indians At Hinsdale, New Hampshire, on the Twenty-Seventh of July 1755....". Ibid, pgs. 156-165.

[13] Jean Lowry. "A Journal Of the Captivity of Jean Lowry and Her Children, Giving an Account of her being taken by the Indians, the 1st of April 1756....With an Account of the Hardships she Suffered...". Printed by William Bradford, at the Corner of Front and Market-Streets, Philadelphia, 1760s. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8.)* Pgs. 1-31.

Of the seven women who did escape, only one did so and left her child behind, and she is the exception that proves the rule. Mrs. Clendenin (no first name)[14] had invited the Indians into her home to eat the three elks her husband had just killed. The Indians surprised everyone by attacking and killing many people, and taking others hostage. Mrs. Clendenin, taken prisoner with her infant, had to leave with the Indians and began the long trek back to their territory. She waited until another female hostage was helping her take care of the baby, and then Mrs. Clendenin vanished into a thicket, leaving her baby behind. Not until later, hearing the infant's cries for its mother, did the Indians realize that Mrs. Clendenin had escaped. In revenge, hoping she would show herself to protect the baby, the Indians killed the infant. Mrs. Clendenin was nowhere near them by then; that night she returned the ten miles to her home. There she found her dead husband and other dead child. There is no explanation for her strange behavior, except to note that according to the narrative it is "surprising", and "[she is] more to be admired for her courage than some other qualities not less desirable in the female character".[15] The narrator did not know what to make of Mrs. Clendenin's behavior; it obviously took courage to strike out on her own and return home ten miles through the wilderness. On the other hand, leaving her infant child behind to be killed was not exactly the type of feminine maternal or even parental behavior that colonial society encouraged in

---

[14] Mrs. Clendenin. "Narrative of the Destruction of the Settlement of Greenbriar, Virginia, Together With the Capture and Surprising Conduct of Mrs. Clendenin, Who Was Among Those Who Escaped the Tomahawk of the Indians at That Massacre." Drake, pgs. 284-286.

[15] Ibid, p. 286.

eighteenth century women. One can only speculate that the attack and murder of her husband and children in front of her traumatized her into disregarding the life of her remaining child.

Experience Bozarth[16], in a surprise attack by Indians in her home, managed to escape capture by her quick thinking, though she, too, lost children in the attack. The children playing outside were the first to spot the Indians, and the first man who went to the door was shot in the chest. The only other man quickly became engaged in hand-to-hand combat against another Indian when Experience took up an axe and began killing Indians. They was killed the white man, but Experience managed herself to kill three Indians in as many minutes, and then shut the door, apparently leaving some of the children outside to the mercy of the remaining Indians. She and the other survivors of the attack spent the next several days in the house, awaiting rescue, while the Indians surrounded the house. Eventually the Indians left and the other colonists rescued the survivors, with several people left alive only through the quick wits and strength of Experience Bozarth. She, too, was an exception to the standard view of women, but was considered to be a better role model than Mrs. Clendenin. Settlers on the frontier needed amazon women needed during the eighteenth century.

All the other women who escaped from the Indians did so only after their children were dead and no longer held in a hostage situation among the Indians. Mrs. Francis

---

[16] Experience Bozarth. "Signal Prowess of a Woman, In a Combat With Some Indians. In a Letter To a Lady in Philadelphia." Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 334-335.

Scott,[17] (another woman like Mrs. Clendenin, known only to history by her husband's name), was taken captive because her husband had left the door open, saw the Indians cut the throats of her youngest three children. Her oldest daughter, eight years of age, ran to her mother and begged Francis to save her. However, the Indians tomahawked the daughter as she hid in Francis' arms, and led Francis away. Francis, like several other of the women, never recovered from her experience and at the end of her narrative it is written that she "continues in a low state of health, and remains inconsolable for the loss of her family".[18]

Indians killed Mary Kinnan's[19] and Massy Herbeson's[20] children during the attack or shortly thereafter. Both women, unencumbered with small children, managed to escape. This is in keeping with the pattern that women without children usually escaped their captivity, instead of waiting to be ransomed.

Many women survived their captivity, but paid a great price for it. Much of the trauma, no doubt, was due to the initial attack, especially when they saw their children and husband killed in front of them. Of course, men also probably experienced great

---

[17] Francis Scott. "A True and Wonderful Narrative of the Surprising Captivity and Remarkable Deliverance of Mrs. Francis Scott, an Inhabitant of Washington County, Virginia, Who Was Taken By the Indians on the Evening of the 29th of June, 1785." Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life In the Wigwam.* Pgs. 338-342.

[18] Ibid, p. 342.

[19] Mary Kinnan. "A True Narrative of the Sufferings of Mary Kinnan." Derounian-Stodola, *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 109-116.

[20] Massy Herbeson. "An Account of the Sufferings of Massy Herbeson, and Her Family, Who Were Taken Prisoners By a Party of Indians....". Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 349-352.

trauma, but there is a difference. According to the prevailing fashion of the time, men rarely noted in their narrative how mentally fragile they became due to their trauma. Women were more open in revealing their emotions, while the majority of men would never admit to feelings of insecurity or poor health as a result of their captivity. At most, men in their accounts wrote of some fear during the initial attack. Additionally, men were probably more physically fit than the women were, for the long treks on foot required as a result of being kidnaped. Many women were either pregnant or just recovering from childbirth, and as a result trauma, poor food, and abuse would more than likely leave physical marks for long afterwards.

Many of the men were also able to use their captivity adventures to their advantage later in life, as the women were probably unable to do. For example, James Smith,[21] later a Colonel, became a noted Indian fighter and wrote several books on Indian customs and fighting methods. This allowed him to "debrief" from his experiences and work out his trauma in an acceptable manner which brought him acclaim. Instead of being seen as weak, his survival of his physical and mental circumstances resulted in his being seen as stronger, as heroic. Women, on the other hand, had to be careful when writing of abuse. There was always the suspicion that women had been raped or otherwise taken advantage of. Even though this was not her fault, it tainted her for the rest of her life. If a woman survived, some readers might question exactly how she did

---

[21] James Smith account. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 178-264.

this, and if she had to compromise herself to do so. Survival for women was a double-edged sword.

Though wounded, Robert Benham[22] escaped his captivity. He later became a conductor and led many expeditions back into the same territory, allowing him to deal with his fears in a appropriate psychological manner. Jasper Parrish[23], taken captive as an eleven year old, later became an interpreter between the Indians and the colonists. Moses Van Campen[24], later a Major, was familiar enough with the Indians that the colonists used him as a spy among the Indians, and he became friends with some of them. While on his farm with his adult brother and father, the Indians captured him. He escaped but they captured him again. The experience did not leave many, if at all, psychological scars because after his release, he kept in touch with his many Indian friends. Many years later, he ran into and became friends with the Indians who had kidnaped him. Obviously the Indian lifestyle was familiar to him, and he did not suffer during his brief captivity. If he had, it is doubtful that he would have later made friends with the same Indians who kidnaped him.

---

[22] Robert Benham. "Robert Benham's Narrative of an Encounter With the Indians." Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of North American Indian Captivities., Vol. 38.* Pgs. 72-75.

[23] Jasper Parrish. "The Story of Captain Jasper Parrish, Captive, Interpreter and United States Sub-Agent to the Six Indian Nations." Originally published in 1903 in Buffalo Historical Society Publications, v. 6, p. 527-546. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 105.* Pgs. 1-12.

[24] Major Moses Van Campen. "An Inch of Ground to Fight On". Drimmer, *Captured By the Indians.* Pgs. 105-118.

John Slover,[25] after having been a prisoner of the Indians for over twelve years in Ohio, later became an interpreter and made his living dealing with the Indians. This, no doubt, helped him adjust to his earlier captivity. People in Kentucky knew John Tanner[26] as a "White Indian", since the Chippewas captured him as a child and raised him. However, Tanner did not have an as easy a time as other captives when he became an adult. Raised in both the white and Indian worlds, he was a product of both, and neither. Unfortunately, Tanner suffered as a result of this ambiguity; never at home in either world, he moved back and forth between the white and Indian worlds, and eventually vanished into the Indian world under suspicion of murder. His trouble-filled life emphasizes how many of the other male colonists did manage to cope successfully with their lives.

Of the twenty men in this study taken captive in the eighteenth century, only two were captured as children (Jasper Parrish and John Tanner.) The other eighteen men were adults when the Indians attacked and took them captive. Of these captures, only two occurred at the men's homes. The vast majority of the attacks took place while the men were away from home. Some, like Briton Hammon[27] (the only African-American in this

---

[25] John Slover account. "The Narrative of John Slover." Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 38.* Pgs. 53-71.

[26] John Tanner. "White Indian." Drimmer, *Captured By the Indians.* Pgs. 142-182.

[27] Briton Hammon. "A Narrative of the Sufferings and Deliverance of Briton Hammon." Originally printed 1760, Green & Russell, Boston. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of North American Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 1-14.

study), were taken while aboard ship in Florida. Others, like Nehemiah How[28] (who died in captivity in French Canada from a fever), James Smith,[29] who was doing road-work in Pennsylvania, and Robert Eastburn[30] (traveling to Oswego), were kidnaped while they were out in the "wilderness". Others, also, were kidnaped while traveling, trading, trapping, or soldiering. Only Peter Williamson[31] was waiting at home for his wife when he was captured. Moses Van Campen, already mentioned, was on his farm with his father and adult brother when attacked. Even here, he was out in the fields, not sitting in his house.

Of these eighteen adult males, two had children and families involved in the attack. This is, again, consistent with the roles men occupied in the eighteenth century. John Fitch[32] was a trader and had much experience in dealing with Indians. With his wife, five children, and three soldiers, John set up a garrison on the frontier. The Indians

---

[28] Nehemiah How. A Narrative of the Captivity of Nehemiah How, Who Was Taken By the Indians At the Great Meadow Fort Above Fort Dummer, Where He Was an Inhabitant, October 11th, 1745...". Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 127-138.

[29] James Smith account. Drake, *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 178-264.

[30] Robert Eastburn. "A Faithful Narrative of the Many Dangers and Sufferings, As Well As Wonderful and Surprising Deliverances, of Robert Eastburn, During His Late Captivity Among the Indians....". Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 265-283.

[31] Peter Williamson. "A Faithful Narrative of the Sufferings of Peter Williamson...Having Been Taken By the Indians In His Own House, October 2nd, 1754." Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 147-156.

[32] John Fitch. "Particulars Relating To the Captivity of John Fitch, of Ashby, Mass...". Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 139-140.

attacked and finally forced to them to surrender to the Indians. They took the entire family to Canada where they stayed until after the war. The family was finally liberated and allowed to return home. Unlike most of the women, who were torn from their families, husbands, and children, John Fitch's entire family was taken. The Indians, nor the French, split his family up, and though they no doubt experienced moments of doubt and suffering, they did not have to worry about what was happening to each other: they were all together. This was really the exception, not the rule. It was very unusual for the Indians to capture an entire family. Most families had at least one family member die during the attack, and usually the Indians split the family up among them.

The only other man attacked with his family was the Reverend John Corbly.[33] The simple title of his account is in great contrast to the poignant narrative within, and it is evident that when John wrote his account, he was still in tremendous psychological pain. John, his wife, and their five children had set off from their house to attend a prayer-meeting when they were attacked by Indians. His wife, with the baby in her arms, was shot and scalped, as was the baby. His only son, six years old, was tomahawked to death, and another daughter was killed and scalped. Only the two oldest daughters escaped alive, but both were scalped. John writes:

> I have had, and still have, a great deal of trouble and expense with them, besides anxiety about them...[I] found my dear and affectionate wife with five children all scalped in less than ten minutes from the first onset. No one...can conceive how I felt; this you may supposed was killing to me. I instantly

---

[33] John Corbly. "Rev. John Corbly's Narrative." Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 335-337.

> fainted away...When I recovered, oh the anguish of my soul! I cried, would to God I had died for them! would to God I had died with them!....[34]

Perhaps due to his education and profession, the Reverend Corbly felt freer to expound his feelings, than did the typical eighteenth century man.

Though the men, unlike the women, rarely gave any indication of the psychological trauma they endured, it is inescapable that they also suffered a great deal, though the mores of the day did not usually allow them any outlet for their pain. Also, having to worry only about themselves was probably not as terrifying as worrying about one's helpless children. At most, eighteenth century men allowed themselves only small outbursts of fear and terror. As Charles Johnson, a young attorney wrote upon being taken captive, "No one who has not had a similar misfortune can imagine the terror I felt. I had been bred up with a horror of Indians and Indian cruelties, and now, suddenly, *the thing I feared the most had happened* [my emphasis]. I felt I would never see my friends or the civilized world again....[35] Notice that he does not mention his family. Perhaps it was Charles' young age (21) and advanced education for the times that allowed him to write honestly at all of his feelings.

As the eighteenth century came to a close, many changes had taken place in the lives of the colonists. By 1763 most of the colonists were calling themselves "Americans", and this attitude eventually, within a few short years, led to the American

---

[34] Ibid, p. 337.

[35] Charles Johnson account. *Drimmer, Captured By the Indians.* P. 189.

Revolution and independence from British control. Many of the Indians who had once sided with the French, now sided with the British. Because the Americans felt the British encouraged the Indians to attack, it was written into the new Declaration of Independence that "He [the English King] has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the *inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages* [my emphasis], whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions...".[36] The colonists became exasperated with the Indian terror, and the British were an easy target to blame, instead of the colonists' own behavior towards the Indians.

During this time the narratives, and the view of women in particular, began to change. With the advent of independence, the roles of women, ironically, became more restricted. Many women, while their men were away at war, learned to run farms and businesses. However, the new Declaration of Independence, along with the new spirit in America, began to limit the roles of women. As more and more towns and cities appeared throughout the east and Midwest, the self-reliance of women began to decline. Though women were beginning to be seen as important contributors to the home and the raising of children, their influence outside the home, the "sphere of womanhood", began also to decline. The new model of womanhood was "weak, submissive, charitable, virtuous, and modest. Her mental and physical activity was limited to keeping the home

---

[36] Davidson, *Nation of Nations.* P. A-2.

in order...and rearing children...She was urged to avoid books and intellectual exercise..."[37]

While the earlier models of women captives were portrayed as physically and emotionally tough, this too began to change to suit the new American woman. The colonial era's tough survivor, redeemed by God, gave way to the Amazon of the Revolutionary era. These models began, in turn, to give way to yet another image of captive women, one far removed from the old models. Accounts began to emphasize the gory details of their captivity, and though the pain, blood, and death of these narratives were real enough, the image of women's vulnerability was exploited. While during the French and Indian War, the French were seen as about on an even par with the Indians, and the British, during the Revolution replaced the French as the hated enemy, now it was just the Indian. Editors began adding their own comments, additions, and melodramatic language to the accounts.

By the end of the eighteenth century, the roles of men and women, in towns in particular, differed greatly. Now, even if a woman was psychologically prepared to be attacked and captured by Indians, it was considered"unwomanly" to give the impression of strength. The "Frail Flower", who was fetchingly described by June Namias in her book *White Captives*, began to appear and be the norm.[38] Women, if they wanted their

---

[37] Friedman and Shade. *Our American Sisters: Women in American Life and Thought, 3rd Edition.* P. 18.

[38] June Namias. *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier.* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993.)

accounts to be read and believed, had to change their approach to the Indians, and captivity.

Chapter Four: The Western States, 19th Century

The Native Americans the colonists faced in the nineteenth century were far different than the ones their forbearers faced two centuries earlier. Hardened to warfare, with two centuries of conflict with whites behind them, the Plains Indians were an entirely different kind of enemy. The Spaniards introduced horses into the Plains society in the early 1700s, and it changed the way the Indians lived. Hunters could now go further afield, resulting in unprecedented wealth. Buffalo meat was now their main source of food and there were plentiful hides to use and trade. More individualized hunting styles were encouraged, which in turn encouraged the accumulation and display of wealth. With more wealth, and more food, in many cases the result was polygamy. Societies are usually dominated by those who provide the bulk of the food. Since only Indian male hunters could hunt the buffalo, men dominated the tribes. A good hunter could kill over forty buffalo a year.[1] With the food and wealth that this many buffalo provided, one hunter could support several wives. In fact, since women actually skinned and cured the buffalo hides, it was to a hunter's benefit to have several wives, and many tribes practiced polygamy. A chronic shortage of horses led to "institutionalized raiding and continuous tribal warfare", [2] which did not bode well for any white settlers entering Indian territory. Military societies developed, and war and hunting dominated the group.

---

[1] Elliott West. *The Way to the West: Essays on the Central Plains.* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.) P.66.

[2] Sara M Evans. *Born for Liberty: A History of Women in America.* (New York: the Free Press, 1989.) Pgs. 16-17.

With swift assurance on a horse that seemed merely an extension of himself, the Plains Indian warrior could swoop down and quickly burn houses and crops, taking people and horses captive. Because of these military societies, gender roles were incorporated in ways not really seen in the east. Females became more passive, dependent on males for food and shelter, and males became much more aggressive. There were ways and means, of course, for Indian women to break these boundaries, as there are in all societies, but few women made the attempt.

The Plains environment was quite fragile in many ways.[3] After centuries of occupation, the various Indian tribes had thorough knowledge of how to live and support life in places where there was little vegetation or water. Particularly in the deserts beyond the Rockies, life was a delicate balance, achieved after centuries of practice and hardship. The advent of hundreds, and then thousands, of whites into Indian territory could quickly result in starvation and death for the Indians. Desperate and upset Indians began to prey on travelers who were themselves in dire need of food and water.[4] With the arrival of intruders came the decimation of the buffalo herds, upon which the Plains Indians depended for almost everything in their life.

Native society was built around this animal; almost every part of the buffalo was used, and it was crucial for Indian life. Indian women used the buffalo for clothing, shelter, and food. Indian warriors spent most of their life hunting buffalo, raising and

---

[3] See Elliot West's *The Way To the West* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995) for an in-depth view of the Plain's environment and animals.

[4] Thomas B. Allen, editor. *We Americans.* (Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society, 1975.) P. 138.

stealing horses to hunt buffalo, and raiding other tribes to keep rival Indians away from their horses and buffalo.[5] The whites threatened this whole way of life by dragging themselves and their possessions across the dry Plains in an attempt to settle the continent, precipitating a disaster of genocidal scope.

Those captives, especially women, taken in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by eastern woodland Indians, had been astonished that they were rarely, if ever, raped or tortured. At most, they might be beaten, and almost everyone, men, women, and children, had to "run the gauntlet," a custom that was horrific to whites but was acceptable to the Indians (who also had to run the gauntlet upon joining a new tribe.) Though scalping was a common practice among both the Indians and whites in the East, the mistreatment of white prisoners reached new heights in the West. Many tribes became legendary for their tortures. "The inflammatory family legends of American Indian atrocities...pervaded the nineteenth century...".[6] Many women were terrified of Indians at first.

They had good reason to be. In addition to slavery, which eastern woodland tribes and some southern tribes practiced as well as the Plains tribes, torture was also acceptable to the Plains Indians, who treated women more roughly than women were treatedin the east. Comanches and Apaches were almost legendary for their methods of torture, and Comanche women were allegedly the worst. Life was harsh on the Plains,

---

[5] Thomas E. Mails. *The Mystic Warriors of the Plains.* (New York: Barnes and Nobles edition, 1995.) Pgs. 188-218.

[6] Glenda Riley. *Women and Indians On the Frontier, 1825-1915.* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.) P. 86.

and feats of endurance and pain were common among the Indians. Rape was also something that the Plains Indians did that eastern tribes did not typically do, and most women lived in fear of this. Rachel Plummer, a settler taken captive in 1836 in Texas for two years, was mistreated so badly that she died from her injuries within a year of her release. She died never knowing that her little son James, also kidnaped, was alive and would shortly be ransomed. Plummer was four months pregnant with her second child when she was captured; the baby was six weeks old when the Comanches tore it apart in front of Plummer.[7] This, as might be imagined, left severe psychological damage. Even children were not always exempt. Emeline Fuller, taken in 1860 on the way to Oregon, suffered physical abuse, starvation, and cannibalism. After she and the others in her camp had exhausted all means of food, including their horses and family dogs, they cooked and ate the bodies of their dead. Fuller changed from a "light-hearted child into a broken-hearted woman, and my wish was that I might lie down and die".[8]

Of the thirteen females from the nineteenth century in this study, four of them were children under the age of fourteen when the Indians captured them. The narratives of three of these children are different from the accounts in earlier centuries. Even when the Plains Indians attempted to be kind, life and the environment was so severe on the Great Plains that the children considered themselves mistreated to a greater or lesser

---

[7] Rachel Plummer Account, "Narrative of the Capture and Subsequent Sufferings of Mrs. Rachel Plummer, Written by Herself." VanDerBeets, editor. *Held Captive by Indians.* Pgs. 333-366.

[8] Emeline Fuller, "Left by the Indians. Story of My Life." Derounian-Stodola, *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* P. 332.

extent. The only exception to this is the story of Cynthia Ann Parker.[9] Related to Rachel Plummer, she too was kidnaped in 1836 Texas by the Comanches. Only age eight when taken, she lived her life among the Indians, taking a Comanche husband, bearing three children, and refusing to return voluntarily to her white family when given the chance. After twenty-five years among the Comanches, the U.S. Army finally captured her and she was forcibly returned to her family in east Texas. Desperate to return to the Comanches, she made several attempt escapes and died, according to family legend, of a broken heart at age thirty-five.[10] She obviously did not consider herself mistreated by the Indians, probably because she had been captured while still so young. At this age, according to Norman Heard, she had the best chance to be assimilated into the tribe.[11] Though usually cruel to adult whites, Comanches loved the white children they adopted, and Parker would have been treated with love and kindness. Comanche life would have been the only way of life she remembered.

Three of the females in this study were taken in 1836, two in Texas (Rachel Plummer and Cynthia Ann Parker) and one in Florida, Mary Godfrey.[12] 1836 was a time

---

[9] James T. DeShields. "Cynthia Ann Park: The Sotry of Her Capture." Originally Printed for the Author, St. Louis, 1886. Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 95.* Pgs. 1-80.

[10] The John Wayne movies *Ther Searchers* was loosely based on the Cynthia Ann Parker story. According to family records, I am a direct descendent of Cynthia Ann Parker through her half-Comanche son, Quannah Parker.

[11] Heard, *White Into Red.* P. 135.

[12] Mary Godfrey. "An Authentic Narrative of the Seminole War; and of the Miraculous Escape of Mrs. Mary Godfrey, and Her Four Female Children." Derounian-Stodola, *Women's Indian Captivity Narrative.* Pgs. 217-234.

of great unrest;), Texas was fighting for independence, with most of the men away from their homes at the Battle of San Jacinto, and in Florida the Seminole Indians were staging their second uprising (1835-1842. In the eighteenth century the Seminoles had split off from the Creeks and fled to Florida, where they joined refugees from other tribes and escaped black slaves. Congress wanted to annex Florida, bringing the Seminoles under control and destroying a community of free blacks that assisted runaway slaves. The two Seminole Indian Wars were the costliest Indian wars to the United States in both money and manpower. While troops were fighting in Florida and Texans were fighting against Mexico, the frontier was wide open for Indian attack, and the Indians took full advantage of it. In Florida, the Indians attacked Mary Godfrey and her four female children; one was still an infant. Mr. Thomas Godfrey had been drafted and sent to fight Indians, leaving his wife and children unprotected. When the Indians attacked Mary Godfrey, she and her children fled to the swamps and hid there four days without food. On the fifth day they were discovered by an escaped slave who was fighting with the Seminoles. The black man initially wanted to kill Godfrey and the children, but in the end took pity on them and brought them food and water. He kept them hidden until United States troops rescued them.

All these females were, however, attacked at home, just as in previous centuries. In fact, attacks on the remaining ten females in this study took places at their homes, though Emeline Fuller and Fanny Kelly[13] were both attacked in make-shift, movable

---

[13] Fanny Kelly. "Ho for Idaho!". Drimmer, *Captured by the Indians.* Pgs. 330-369.

homes: their wagon trains. It would seem reasonable to expect Indian attacks on the frontier, knowing the predilection of the Plains tribes (which gave them the all-important chance to count coup, a ritual which entailed everything from touching an enemy to scalping them; this was supremely important to a warrior and his status in the tribe depended on how many coup he had collected.) Still, many of these women were surprised and did not expect such an assault. Abigail Gardiner[14] was captured at age fourteen, in 1857 in Iowa, but the majority of the attacks on women occured between 1860 and 1864, the height of the "Indian Wars".

Many of the Indians were supposed to be safely settled on reservations by this time; however, they became restless when their allotments of food and money from the U.S. Government were late, due to the Civil War. What supplies did get to them were bad -- the meat was rotten, the flour had worms, and the bacon was rancid. When the Indians complained to the Indian agent, Andrew Myrick, the Indian agent, said, "If they are hungry, let them eat grass for all I care."[15] Much as a statement of this type led to the French Revolution, this statement by the Indian agent led to an uprising in the Minnesota

---

[14] Lorenzo P. Lee. "History of the Spirit Lake Massacre and the Captivity of Abigail Gardiner." Originally published by L.P. Lee, Publisher, New Britain, CT, 1857. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North Ameircan Indian Captivities, Vol. 72.)* Pgs. 1-312.

[15] Stephen Longstreet. *Indian Wars of the Great Plains.* (New York: Indian Head Books, 1993 edition.) P. 109.

area in 1862. Sarah Wakefield,[16] Lavina Eastlick,[17] Urania White,[18] Minnie Carrigan,[19] Helen Tarble,[20] and Fanny Kelly became captives at that time. Unlike the experiences of the women in the East, in the Minnesota uprising the women had additional fears. Not only was rape and torture a strong possibility, the Sioux also did not take any men or older boys hostage. All the men in the Sioux attack were killed; few escaped. The western Indians had suffered greatly at the hands of the colonists, and the Indians repaid in kind. This added to the psychological torment suffered by the women.

Unlike earlier narratives, many of these women did manage to escape *with* their children. Emeline Fuller escaped, though she was only a child. She was the only survivor of her family; they died of starvation and exposure after their escape. Sarah Wakefield and her two children escaped and survived, mainly because her husband was the

---

[16] Sarah Wakefield. "Six Weeks in the Sioux Tepees." Derounian-Stodola, *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 232-313.

[17] Lavina Eastlick. "Revolt of the Sioux". Drimmer, *Captured by the Indians.* Pgs. 314-329.

[18] Urania S. White. "Captivity Among the Sioux, August 18 to September 26, 1862." Originally published in *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society, Vol. IX*, St. Paul, Minn: April, 1901. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 104.)* Pgs. 395-426.

[19] Minnie Bruce Carrigan. "Captured by the Indians: Reminiscences of Pioneer Life in Minnesota". Originally published by Forest City Press, Forest City, S.D. in 1907. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 106.*)

[20] Helen M. Tarble. "The Story of My Capture and Escape During the Minnesota Indian Massacre of 1862." Originally printed by the Abbott Printing Company, St. Paul, MN in 1904. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 105.)*Pgs. 1-65.

physician to the Indians and he was well-liked; several Indians assisted her in her escape. Helen Tarble was a special case; she became friends with the local medicine man (rare for a white woman), and he and others in the tribe helped Helen and her children escape those Indians who wanted to kill them. Fanny Kelly first helped her daughter escape and then five months later she tricked the Indians and made her escape. Lavina Eastlick lost all her children in the initial attack. In keeping with women of previous centuries, she then made her way back to white civilization. Though their accounts read as Victorian melodramas, these women were strong, brave, and resourceful. This type of story, however, did not sell well in the Victorian marketplace. These narratives were used as propaganda against the Indians, to justify the colonial policy of Indian extermination. For this reason, women captives needed to be delicate and scared, at least in their narratives. Brave women just did not sell as well as scared ones did.

Many historians erroneously picture frontier women as marrying young and having many children. The few extant records do not support this. Although most women did eventually have children, contraception, including abortion, was fairly commonplace by the nineteenth century.[21] Theresa Delaney and Theresa Gowanlock,[22] both victims of

---

[21] Julie Roy Jeffrey. *Frontier Women: The Trans-Mississippi West 1840-1880.* (New York: Wange and Hill, 1979.) Pgs. 41-42.

[22] Thersa Gowanlock and Theresa Delaney, "Two Months in the Camp of Big Bear: The life and adventures of Theresa Gowanlock and Theresa Delaney." Originally published Parkdael: Times Office, 24 Queen Street, 1885. (Reprinted Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 95.)* Pgs. 1-144.

the Frog Lake uprising in Canada in 1885, had no children. The Indians treated Delaney well because her husband was the Indian Agent to the Chippewas. She visited the nearby Indian women frequently, and they helped her and others escape. Gowanlock, however, did not like or trust the Indians. She noted that in her opinion, the men were lazy and the squaws did all the work. She also called them "vicious, treacherous, and superstitious...childlike and simple.."[23] Her attitude towards the Indians might have influenced their treatment of her. She was not treated well and her husband was killed. Eventually Gowanlock returned to her parents.

Most of the women, in their accounts, were terrified at the start of their journey west. Unlike the previous centuries, however, these women lived intimately enough with Indians that they were able to see past the stereotype to the real people underneath. Sarah Wakefield's account is quite humorous as she describes hers and the others' fear of the Indians:

> The first night passed there was one of horror to all, as we were ignorant of Indian customs any further than what we had learned from those who were camped around our town, and this night they were having councils and were talking, shouting, and screaming all night and we, poor, ignorant mortals, thought they were singing our death-song, preparatory to destroying us. Towards morning the noise lulled away, and we dropped to sleep, but not to sleep for long, for soon came the tramp and noise of a hundred horsemen close to the house. The men all arose, prepared their arms, waited and watched, but no attack was made. What could be the trouble? why did they not make some manifestation? why were they silent - only that terrible tramping? At last, one man, braver than the rest, went down and behold - it was our own horses, which had been turned out. They had

---

[23] Ibid, p. 3.

> come up on the platform to get away from the mosquitoes. This gives, in the beginning, an idea of many Indian scares. Many times we were needlessly frightened....[24]

Sarah continued that at last, there was one attack that was real; one can read the sorrow and horror between the lines as she wrote.

Unlike the eastern woodland Indians, Plains Indians could and did rape, and there were many readers of these accounts who assumed the worst, often incorrectly . Sarah Wakefield was friendly with a Lakota Sioux named Chaska, in southwest Minnesota. Her captor and master, Hapa, was going to take her as his wife, in addition to his first Indian wife. Chaska stepped in and replied that since he was wifeless (his wife having previously died) he would take Mary as his wife. Chaska laid down beside her until Hapa drifted off to sleep, drunk. Chaska then went back to his own bed. Mary wrote, "My father could not have done differently, or acted more respectful or honorable...Very few Indians or *even white men* [emphasis hers], would have treated me in the manner he did...".[25] It was widely reported that Mary was Chaska's wife, and she did not dare contradict it as long as she was Hapa's prisoner. Unfortunately, Mary reported that even when she was rescued, everyone believed that she was a liar and that she had been married to Chaska. Her case was not helped by her behavior once back with the white settlers. Mary spoke out in public regarding Chaska and his kindness to her. After the

---

[24] Wakefield account. Derounian-Stodola, *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 243-244.

[25] Ibid, p. 271.

trauma so many had been through, and all the deaths, most of the settlers did not want to hear how some Indians were good, and Mary was roughly castigated for her supposed relationship with an Indian. Respectable women did not usually do that.

According to historian Glenda Riley, many of the women that had at first so despised or feared the Indians, later grew up to marry them. She cites the case of Mary Williams, who learned to love her Indian half-brothers and sisters, and grew up to marry a Choctaw. Anne Ellis, another young woman, used to answer the door with her shotgun in her hand because of her fear of Indians; she later married a full-blooded Comanche and upon his death, married a full-blooded Cherokee.[26] Barriers were indeed breaking down in the nineteenth century, though it was a slow and subtle process.

The unions between white men and Indian women have always received a lot of attention, mainly because men were the status-setters in European society. White men could "rescue" native women from their "barbaric states" and in the process gain land, stock, and the friendship of the woman's tribe. Men also apparently delighted in being rescued by Indian "princesses". Since the status of men usually determined the status of the family, men usually did not lose any prestige when they married native women but instead gained land and stock. However, this did not hold true when white women married native men. The woman took the lower status (in white society's eyes) of her Indian husband, and the media usually portrayed the white woman as one who had been dehumanized and debased. To the whites, a woman *lost* status, power, wealth, and

---

[26] Riley, *Women and Indians on the Frontier, 1825-1915.* Pgs. 92-97.

approval, so it is obvious that she would not want to marry an Indian. Man suspected that the marriage took place because of sexual competence or virility; this made most white men feel inferior, so they rarely addressed the issue. To acknowledge that the Indian had some socially-redeeming quality and were superior in some way, even if it was only sexually, would undermine the white view of the supposed inferiority of the Indian. This would in turn harm the white's policy of Indian genocide.[27]

Though many white men did marry Indian women, they rarely wrote captivity narratives because they were not held against their will (though occasionally there were forced marriages of the captive white man and an Indian woman.) Most of the information known today is from the captivity narratives, since Indians were not seen as a subject for study, but for extermination, and it necessarily gives a distorted view of white-Indian relationships. Nevertheless, it is true that when the Plains Indians warred, white men were the ones the Indians usually killed first. This was necessary, at least from the Indian viewpoint, since by the nineteenth century women rarely felt competent to hold off the Indians as they had done in earlier centuries. White men were thus the primary threat to the Indians, and when the Indians did resist the invasion of their lands, the white men were usually all killed first. Certainly the white men in the Minnesota

---

[27] For a complete discussion of this subject, see Riley, *Women and Indians on the Frontier*. Pgs. 182-184.

uprising in 1862 bore the brunt of the attack; very few escaped and the Indians made sure that all white men they encountered were killed.[28]

This study exmines only five men, since narrative accounts for men in the nineteenth century are rarely available. None were children and again, all were attacked while away from home, with the possible exception of John W.B. Thompson. Thompson was a lighthouse keeper in Florida when he was attacked, but not captured, at his business/home.[29] John Rodgers Jewitt lived a very adventurous life. While on a ship as a blacksmith near Vancouver Island, British Columbia, the captain accidently insulted the Indian chief. All aboard the ship were killed by the Indians, except for Jewitt and one other man whom Jewitt claimed (falsely) as his father. Appreciating his skills as a blacksmith, who could keep their swords and knives sharpened, the Indians kept Jewitt with them for two and one-half years, until he was able to outwit the Indian chief and escape.[30] Elias Darnell was in the army in Southeast Michigan when he was attacked. His grown brother was with him, who died along with many others. Elias, held for one

---

[28] Though there appears no official records of exactly how many were killed, from a casual reading of the narratives it is apparent that the Indians made a determined attempt to kill all the white males they could find. The Indians were more random in their killing of white women and children.

[29] John B. Thompson, "The Following Narrative of One of the Most Extraodinary Escapes From a Dreadful Death, Anywhere Recorded, Is Contained In a Letter Written By the Sufferer To the Editor of the Charleston (S.C.) Courier, Immediately After It Happened. It Took Place at Cape Florida Lighthouse, in 1836." Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 357-360.

[30] John Rodgers Jewitt, "The Headhunters of Nootka". Drimmer, *Captured By the Indians.* Pgs. 216-255.

week by a mixed British-Indian army, managed to escape.[31] Ransom Clark was another soldier. Wounded, he was left for dead by the Indians, but managed to escape albeit with great difficulty. Shot five times, the Seminole Indians and their allies, some African-Americans, left himfor dead and stripped him of everything except his shirt. Able to crawl only on his knees and left hand, Clark crawled and limped for five days until he reached the safety of his fort in Florida.[32] He was one of the few survivors.

Nelson Lee was an adventurer *par excellence.* With a varied and checker-board career, he was at various times a boatman on the St. Lawrence River, a soldier in the Black Hawk War, a Master's Mate in the United States Navy, a sailor in the Texas Navy against Mexico in the Yucatan, a Texas Ranger, and finally a trader and dealer in horses and mules in Texas. It was in the last incarnation that the Comanches captured him, and only his huge silver watch, an alarm clock, saved his life. After he was stripped, the Indians picked up his watch. When it went off, Lee described the scene:

> He [the Indian] looked immensely pleased with the singular and pretty bauble. While he regarded it, ...the alarm went off. The utter astonishment of the Indian was beyond description. He held the watch out at extreme arm's length, his head thrown back and staring wildly, too surprised, as it roared and rattled for two minutes, to decide whether it was safest to let it fall or retain it in his grasp.[33]

---

[31] Elias Darnell, "Remember the River Raisin!" Drimmer, *Captured By the Indians.* Pgs. 256-267.

[32] Ransom Clark, "Narrative of the Escape of Ransom Clark...From the Massacre In Which Major Dade and His Command Were Cut Off By the Seminole Indians..." Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Pgs. 355-357.

[33] Nelson Lee, "Three Years Among the Comanches." Drimmer, *Captured By the Indians.* P. 282.

Colonists knew the Comanches for their torture, and this group did not disappoint Nelson. They tortured two of his comrades and Nelson expected this to be his fate at any moment. During his captivity he closely observed the Comanches and reported at length on their customs and rituals. This was fairly common in male captivity narratives. The Comanches forced Nelson into an Indian marriage, and during his three years of Comanche life, his alarm clock continued to be a source of wonder and awe.

As in keeping with most of the male captivity narratives, none of the men in this study in the nineteenth century had children involved in the Indian attack or captivity. This is not to say that attacks on men never took place with their families; many assaults on immigrants and settlers happened at their home or in wagon-trains. Most of these men, however, either fought off the Indians, or ended up dead. The Plains Indians took few adult white men captive since they saw fully adult white men as the enemy. The stakes were higher in the west than they had been in the east.

Certainly Indians took many more captives than are recorded. Norman Heard lists several Mexican children, among them Tomassa and Andres Martinez, who were captured by Comanches or Apaches in the Southwest, and these are by no means unique examples.[34] Most of these children either stayed with their adopted Indian families, or moved back and forth between the white and Indian world, neither of one world nor the other.

---

[34] Heard, *White Into Red.* Pgs. 25-49.

The image of women had changed by the nineteenth century. In towns the roles of men and women began to differ, and "Victorian morality" appeared.[35] The self-reliance of women, and their physical vigor, began to lessen in wealthier families. The model Anglo-American woman was:

> nurse or midwife. She was urged to avoid books and intellectual exercise, for such activity might overtax her weak mind, and to serve her husband willing, since she was by nature his inferior.[36]

The captivity narratives of the nineteenth century reflected this attitude, which was a drastic and radical change from previous centuries of writing. Though the women themselves were often resourceful, courageous and strong, their writing did not always reflect this. Pioneer life by its very nature was not for the weak, but the smart woman did not advertise these strengths in her writing. The Victorian audience's sympathy depended on the pity and compassion they felt for the helpless victim; strong women raised the specter that they they might have deserved their treatment by going outside their roles as meek wife, mother, and daughter. Weak women deserved the protection of not only men, but the United States Government. If women on the frontier were threatened, this provided the government, and society, the justification it needed to eradicate the Indian. Women had to appear helpless and appeal to the compassion of their audience or they would find that audience turning against them, as Sarah Wakefield learned to her sorrow. Times had certainly changed since the Puritan days.

---

[35] Friedman and Shade, *Our American Sisters.* P. 14.

[36] Ibid, p. 18.

Chapter Five: The Captivity Narrative

The captivity narratives changed dramatically through the years, reflecting the change in American society and the audiences who read the narratives. It evolved, as did the United States, with the expanding and evolving frontier, and its characters became almost mythical. These narratives, just like myths, are never neutral or objective; each one delivered a message to the audience on how to behave or what to expect under trying circumstances. They were used for more than just entertainment. Many were written as a means for the victim to earn money, which meant that to a very large degree they were be shaped for the marketplace. Some were written to satisfy public curiosity, or for educational purposes. Some were meant to be private, in an effort to deal with the traumatic aftereffects of the incident.

Even the nationality of the writer affected how they wrote. To the Spanish, the Indians were brutes and beasts to be exploited, and the few Spanish accounts reflected this. Since it was necessary for trappers and Indians to be on good terms with each other, French writers saw Indians as souls needing salvation and education, which the Catholic Church could provide. The British saw the Indians in two different ways. In Virginia, at least at first, the British needed peaceful marketing opportunities, so they viewed the Indians as exotic innocents. In New England, authors under a stricter British regime depicted Indians as competitors for the land that the Puritans coveted. Indians became Satanic beings whose mission was to destroy the saintly.[1] In each case, the captivity

---

[1] Derounian-Stodola and Levenier, *The Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 15-17.

narrative served the political aims of the ruling European country. Few displayed any sympathy or understanding of the Indian. A wider audience read and marveled over women's narratives in particular. The image of a weak and helpless female held in bondage by a beastly Indian brute was a powerful one, and various governments exploited this. Appearing more physically vulnerable than men, the discomfort and stress of the women in the wilderness was a more affecting image than the male in the wilderness, who of course was strong and courageous.[2] The image of the captive woman came to unconsciously symbolize the captivity of the New World by the Indian, forcing the colonists to "free the land" under the guise of "Manifest Destiny".

The narratives also forced the audience to think deeply about issues that were once remove from the narrative itself. Were Indians human? What did it mean to be human? Did this mean that others, like the African slaves, were human? Why, and what, did it mean when white colonists voluntarily stayed with the Indians? How did the colonists cope with the danger and total disruption of their life?[3] With each question, the reader wondered how they themselves might react in the same situation. At the most basic level, all the narratives told the same story: on the frontier Indians captured and carried off someone into the their world, a world that was different and "other". While there, the captive withstood several ordeals, and faced death. He or she then escaped, or

---

[2] Sarah Carter. *Capturing Women.* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997.) Pgs. 24-25.

[3] Gary L. Ebersole. *Captured By Texts: Puritan to Postmodern Images of Indian Captivity.* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1995.) P. 9.

was ransomed, or chose to stay with the Indians. Only the details of each captivity differed.[4]

Each narrative was usually very popular, and most went through several reprints. The majority of the men's narratives were first-person, because men were usually more literate than women. Many women could read, but not write, and therefore someone else took down their accounts were taken down orally and often felt free to add "editorial comments" to the text. Most of the women's accounts that are first person are spare, strong, and, in a way, unemotional. Those accounts, however, that were third-person were usually much more melodramatic.

In their narratives, captive women tended to "polarize Indian women either as extremely cruel and primitive or as exceedingly kind and sympathetic".[5] Very few kept in touch with their Indian captors, as men often did, especially during the colonial period. Because captivity could provoke such trauma, former captives often not only eased other new captives back into white society, they even raised money to ransom and clothe them.

In the captivity narrative, it was usually the women who refused to leave Indian society, probably because it was not noteworthy for white men to acquire and keep some Indian habits, or even an Indian wife or mistress, and still return to white society. Several men used their captivity experiences to write books about Indian warfare tactics, or testified before Congress on their experiences. Women rarely had this outlet, nor would readers sympathize with any woman who kept Indian customs. Thus there is little

---

[4] Ibid, pgs. 10-11.

[5] Derounian-Stodola and Levenier, *The Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 115-153.

literature that deals with the transculturation of women, though it is possible to read between the lines and know that all captives did not easily re-adjust to white society, especially if they became captives as children and raised as an Indian. Comanches kidnaped John Parker, younger brother to Cynthia Ann Parker, as a young child. Although there are several conflicting stories as to his fate, one has it that after ten or more years with the Indians, he came back to white civilization and fit in without any problems. This seems very unlikely. In the Southwest in particular, many of the children raised by the Comanche, Kiowa, or Apache, moved back and forth between the two worlds of Indian and white, never feeling comfortable nor quite fitting in either world.

Although many of those known as "White Indians" did consider themselves to be Indian, their white relatives did not, and kept attempting rescue for years and years. Mary Jemison and Frances Slocum stayed in some kind of touch with their white families even as they lived as Indians. But Cynthia Ann Parker and Olive Oatman were captives returned to their white families against their wills. Most people found this hard to believe, and attributed it to the "maternal instinct" of not wanting to leave their half-Indian, half-white children behind (since they would not be accepted in white society.) This was easier to believe than the fact that Indian society might be freer and more comfortable than white society.[6]

The earliest narratives were the Puritan ones, the ones of New England and New

---

[6] Ibid, pgs. 158-166. Note: Frances Slocum and Olive Oatman were not discussed in this study. However, Indians captured both as children; Slocum continued to live with the Indians while Oatman was re-captured by whites and returned to white society.

France. In them, the women were physically strong and tough, fit symbols of God's representatives on earth. They required courage and fortitude to survive in a hostile wilderness, and their narratives reflected this attitude. Straightforward and unsentimental, writers cited scriptures in the same unemotional sentences as the descriptions of fire and death. Even though the birth- and death-rate was higher then, this does not fully explain the manner in which these women wrote of their losses. It is easy to see Puritans considered their captivity, even their life as a whole, to be a test or trial by God. ("....yet the Lord by his Almighty power, preserved a number of us from death....".)[7] Puritans found spiritual lessons to learn and pass on to others, and the captivity narrative performed this function well. It most often took on the shape of the sermon, a medium with which Puritans were very familiar. They used symbolism familiar to them, as well as scriptural quotations and illusions. Acceptance of their fate, and their willingness to see God's hand in every feature, dominated these narratives. Mary Rowlandson's account, the first and perhaps the best known of all the narratives, cited scripture and talked about God constantly: "...still the Lord upheld me with his gracious and merciful Spirit...".[8] Mary felt very dispirited until an Indian offered her a bible, and her words reflect the Puritan ethic of sin and redemption:

> ...so I took the Bible, and in that melancholy time, it came into my mind to read first the 28 *Chapter of Deuteronomie* [her emphasis], which I did, and when I had read it, my dark heart wrought on this manner, that there was no mercy for me, that the blessings were gone,

---

[7] Rowlandson's account. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* P. 23.

[8] Ibid, p. 25.

> and the curses came in their room, and that I had lost my opportunity. But the Lord helped me still to go on reading, till I came to *Chap.*30. the seven first verses: where I found there was mercy promised again, if we would return to him, by repentance: and though we were scattered from one end of the earth to the other, yet the Lord would gather us together, and turn all those curses upon our Enemies. I do not desire to live to forget this Scripture....".[9]

Though Rowlandson's captors frequently treated her kindly, she makes very little mention of it, and rarely if ever acknowledges that they showed any human kindness at all. This was typical of Puritan writing. Puritans saw the Indians as agents of Satan (and in a roundabout manner, of God, since He used them to punish and enlighten the Puritans), who existed only for the purposes of punishment and redemption. Therefore, it did not matter if the Indians showed any kindness or not, and the captives did not recognized when it did happen. This type of Puritan narrative dominated the field for roughly two generations, and then a more sentimental version replaced it, as the times and political climate changed.

During the eighteenth century American colonists used the narrative mainly as a political propaganda tool. As the Indian wars continued, and the French (and later the British) became heavily involved against the newly developing "American" character, the narratives became a vehicle of hatred towards the Indians and their European allies. At the same time, they began gradually to unveil a new emerging symbol, the "American". These new "Americans" were not wholly European, nor wholly new world,

---

[9]Ibid, p. 28.

but a blend and mixture of both into

> ...a distinctly American type...Acculturation was inevitable, given the frequency of racial contact along the advancing colonial frontier and the vitality of both European and American Indian cultures...the vast majority of Indians and European-Americans fell somewhere between the extremes. They borrowed what they wanted... while in all other respects retaining their own cultural heritages. Acculturation ...was an integral and irresistible part of the American experience...[10]

Nevertheless, many captives had problems readjusting to white society. Many captives tried to give the impression that they had not changed, though it was obvious to even the most casual observer that the experience had not left them untouched. For women, especially, it became important to state that they had not found Indian life attractive, nor had they been "compromised" by rape. While many men wrote about their experiences and the things they learned from the Indians, few women did.

As the narratives became more sentimentalized, their authors and editors added other features. Many writers, particularly males, took the time to describe natural history, the flora and fauna they discovered. Soon, audiences expected a description of Indian customs, animals, and the landscape. Biblical quotations decreased, and embellishment and diffusion became the norm. Publishers and editors began taking a hand in the writing and shaping of the narratives, and the women became more frail and passive.[11]

The British and colonial authorities needed suffering, vulnerable women as

---

[10] Vaughan and Richter, *Crossing the Cultural Divide.* Pgs. 86-87.

[11] Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians.* Pgs. 22-25.

victims. Heroic women, such as the Puritans were, or even women who coped and adjusted, were not as useful for anti-Indian purposes. Richard Drinnon wrote that Dorothy Behen found, in her study of eighty-four narratives, that their most characteristic feature "was their emphasis on the gory details of violent physical abuse wilfully inflicted by their captors".[12] In most female accounts, a husband and/or children died in the initial attack, the woman was pregnant or had just given birth, Indians separated surviving children from their mother, and the risk of abuse, slavery, and rape always existed.

Though several authors have suggested that this was a typical formulaic *theme*,[13] it is clear from reading the accounts, and colonial history, that these were the women's real experiences.

The vast majority of the women were married and had children. The Indians attacked them at home where their children were involved. Women tended to have large families in those days, so it is reasonable to expect that they usually were indeed either pregnant or just recovering from pregnancy. Many women captives went into details about their experiences with newborns and breast-feeding while a captive. Derounian-Stodola theorizes that one reason for the detail of this issue is that many eighteenth and nineteenth century women used breast-feeding as a contraceptive. In the seventeenth

---

[12] Richard Drinnon. *White Savage: The Case of John Dunn Hunter.* P. 106.

[13] Derounian-Stodola, in her book *Indian Captivity Narratives*, presents these examples as being a stereotypical feature that was used for propagandistic effect.

century narratives the captives rarely wrote much about breast-feeding, possibly because northeastern Indians did not rape. So nursing, and contraception, was not an issue. By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, women captives faced the Plains Indians, who did rape captives.[14] The lack of breast-feeding could possibly result in unwanted pregnancies, so "breast-feeding" in the narratives could be a type of shorthand or code which showed a concern for pregnancy among women captives. Though Indians rarely tortured women, and compared to their chores in white society, Indian chores were probably easier, the women nevertheless felt keenly their status as slaves, and the emotional, if not physical, abuse that slavery entailed. As the British became more of a problem to the Americans, the Indians and their French "masters" became less a threat, and attention turned to the British and their Indian allies. During the American Revolution, and the subsequent War of 1812 with Britain, the Americans accused the British and their Indian allies of many atrocities. Once the Americans believed the British were no longer a threat, the narratives simply reflected anti-Indian feeling.

Between 1830 and 1860, a new ideology of "Domesticity" became the standard to which women were judged. Domesticity meant that women were to be pious, virtuous, honorable, lacking any egotism or pride, charming, affectionate, sheltered, and uninterested in the outside materialistic world. They were supposed to dedicate themselves to others, not themselves.[15] This had a huge impact on the captivity narrative.

---

[14] Derounian-Stodola and Levernier, *The Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 124-125.

[15] Jeffrey, *Frontier Women: The Trans-Mississippi West 1840-1880.* Pgs. 6-7.

Women were supposed to be frail and in need of protection, and the loss of a husband (to Indians) supposedly left a woman totally defenseless. Instead of blatant anti-Indian feeling, the narratives became masterpieces of excessive titillation. In some cases, they were so exaggerated and fictionalized they were based only loosely on actual fact, and by the early nineteenth century captives were having to swear that their accounts were true. Some even went to the extent of attaching affidavits verifying the truth of their claims.

The language changed dramatically from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth century. Consider Elizabeth Hanson' sparse language as she describes the death of her children:

> ...Two of my younger Children, One Six, and the other Four ear old, came in sight, and being under a great Surprize [sic], cryed [sic] aloud, which one of the Indians running to them, takes one under each Arm...My Maid prevailed with the biggest to be quiet and still; but the other could by no Means be prevailed with, but continued screaking [sic] ...to prevent the Danger of a Discovery that might arise from it, immediately before my Face, [the Indian] knockt [sic] its Brains out. I bore this as well as I could, not daring to appear disturb'd [sic], or shew [sic] much Uneasiness... Now having kill'd [sic] two of My Children, they scalp'd 'em [sic] (A Practice common with these People....)[16]

Whether it is called Puritan fortitude, or even callousness (which is not borne out by the rest of her narrative), it is clear that Hanson, along with many other Puritans, saw the world, and their place in it, differently than later generations did. Tragedies happened; they were not pleasant, but it was the will of God. If one's soul was in order, then one

---

[16] Elizabeth Hanson account. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* P. 115.

could cope with anything. The Puritans considered these tragedies as God's punishment or trial, in preparation for the eternal world to come.

In contrast, later writers like Mary Kinnan and Mary Godfrey simply gush melodrama:

> The morning of the third day, although clear and pleasant, found us, if possible, in a still more wretched condition...and what added still more to my afflictions, I found in consequence of my long fasting, in addition to other sufferings, I could but a little while longer afford that nourishment to my babe...and in addition to which, the lamentations of my other children...it is impossible to describe correctly what were my feelings at this melancholy moment! mothers can best judge, and they can have but a faint conception of them unless similarly situated!...[17]

Hanson witnessed the massacre and scalping of her children, and she remained fairly calm and stoic; Godfrey's children were merely hungry, and yet Godfrey writes as if she was almost on the verge of hysteria. Those narratives that were not first-person were even worse. An unnamed editor obviously added to this narrative:

> Little did they dream of the awful cloud about to burst over their innocence; little imagine that their peaceful and happy homes should soon swim with their own blood and that of their beloved wives and tender children, and become the scene of the foulest, most savage barbarity ever recorded on the bloody page of history.[18]

It was not that Indian massacres grew more horrible in one hundred years, at least not to those involved, but the public's idea of women, and story-telling, had changed so

---

[17] Godfrey narrative. Derounian-Stodola, *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* P. 224.

[18] Lorenzo Porter Lee. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 72.* P. 12.

much. In 1838 Charles Quill wrote a piece in *The American Mechanic* which described the ideal woman:

> I have such a ...wife in my mind's eye; gentle as the antelope, untiring as the bee, joyous as the linnet; neat, punctual, modest, confiding. She is patient, but resolute; aiding in counsel, reviving in troubles, ever pointing out the brightest side, and counseling nothing but her own sorrows. She loves her home...The place of woman is eminently at the fireside. It is at home that you must see her...[19]

It must have been horrible not to live up to expectations like this, but these qualities were not the ones needed by a woman under Indian attack. It is easy to see how a woman might hide certain things that had happened to her while a prisoner, in order to fit into her society's expectations of her.

The audience for captivity narratives had changed dramatically by the nineteenth century; now educated young ladies, no longer bound to the wearying circle of bearing children and working as a pioneer on a farm, had more leisure time to read. A growing middle-class educated their daughters, and expected them to run and rule the home, without the necessity of hard labor. Although the work in running a home was still labor-intensive, many women had some type of day-help, and many more, in towns and cities, had no cows to milk or cloth to spin. This left them with more free time to pursue a leisurely life. No longer was life short and harsh on the farm, although this was not true at the frontier, and a more sentimental view of God and family prevailed.

---

[19] Charles Quill, "The Mechanic's Wife". *The American Mechanic.* (Philadelphia, 1838.) (Reprinted by Carl Bode, editor. *American Life in the 1840s.*(New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.) P. 76.

Consequently, readers of captivity narratives did not want a lesson in Godliness or suffering for their soul's sake, nor did they particularly want a travel monologue; they wanted a titillating and thrilling story that would engage their emotions as a person of refined sensibilities. Therefore, the narratives nearly always started with blissful domestic scenes with which the reader could identify. Horror came with the Indian attack, which usually resulted in the death of someone dear to the captive, and the reader could live vicariously through the struggles and adventures of her new heroine. In nearly every case, the captive victim survived and conquered, due not to any spiritual help from God, but because of her higher code of civilized behavior. As a semi-fictional character, she (the captive victim) set an example for the primitive Indians. The spiritual victory of the Puritan accounts gradually changed to materialistic victory in the nineteenth century. The "American way of life", with all its civilizing influences, could overcome any obstacle put in its way by barbaric Indians. It was Manifest Destiny in the flesh.

Life in the New World was unique and separate from life in Europe, with adventures and dangers that were uncommon in the more settled European landscape. The settlers of the New World had many motives for going to the New World: adventure, glory, gold, land, and spiritual freedom. There were as many motives for going as there were colonists. They brought their European backgrounds, experiences, and expectations into the new land, where they met a completely new people who had a different background and different experiences of life. The conflict between the two peoples set in motion a movement which is one of the dominating influences in the world today.

The colonists, men and women, though sharing a common background,

nevertheless experienced the new world and the frontier in different ways, based on their gender. Most of the men captured by Indians had only themselves to worry about. They were usually in an all-male environment of exploration or work, and rarely did they suffer the agony of watching beloved family members taken away. Women, on the other hand, were nearly always taken from their homes, where they might suppose themselves to be safe. In the twenty-first century, this would be the equivalent of having a car crash through a family's living room window, killing all the occupants of the house. There is always the chance of a car wreck when one is in a car on the street; that is why people carry insurance and there are strict seat-belt laws and air bags for protection. But no one really expects to be hit by a car in the safety of their home. There is no doubt that the majority of these pioneering women felt safe in their homes. Day in and day out, they performed the hundreds of chores necessary to keep their families alive, and only rarely, statistically, did Indians strike. Even the men must have felt safe; there are many occasions where men left the door to the house or garrison open while they went back to bed or work.

Once captured, the colonists even then divided along gender lines. Men had a much higher rate of escape than did the women. Part of the reason is that men probably felt more comfortable on their own in the wilderness. Many were trappers, traders, soldiers, or workers, and they knew the ways of the animals and the woods. They knew what to eat, and how to catch it, and knew how to find their way home. Women, however, rarely ventured off the family farm, except to visit friends or go to church. Though many no doubt knew how to catch small game and live on berries, it is clear

from reading their accounts that they still felt helpless in the wilderness.

It was also easier for men to escape when they had no one to worry about except themselves. Even if they were married and had families, few men were captured with their families. Narrative after narrative relates how men walked off and left the Indian camp with no qualms except that of getting caught. The vast majority or men, in fact, though no doubt somewhat in shock from finding themselves captive, seem in their accounts to adjust rather quickly to Indian life. "...in their writing, most men worried more about their animals than protecting their women and children. Men worried about the safety of their animals; women worried about the safety of their children".[20]

For the women it was different. In nearly all cases Indians took the women from their family units, usually with bloodshed and trauma. Many saw their children killed right before their eyes, along with their husbands and other loved ones. Many more women found themselves prisoners along with their children. Very few attempted to escape as long as their children were hostages. Only upon the death of all their captive children did they then make any attempt to escape their captivity.

Even in the aftermath of their captivity and release, the roles of men and women differed. Many men continued their employment as guides or traders. Some even became translators, capitalizing on their experiences among the Indians. Other men wrote of their experiences, relating Indian tactics and strategies for the benefit of future Indian fighters. Few of the men reported any lasting trauma or physical health problems as a result of

---

[20] Riley, *Women and Indians on the Frontier.* Pgs. 195-196.

being held a prisoner by the Indians.

No so for women. Though of course they published their stories, few reported any lasting benefits because of their experiences. Many of the latter narratives read as if the writing were a form of purging, and the women give the impression they would never forget their experiences as captives. Mrs. Francis Scott was inconsolable over her losses, and Mary Kinnan refused to even step foot in the state where her daughter was buried.

Many people were suspicious of the women's experiences among the Indians, especially in the later years. Particularly in the Southwest, the opening of which coincided with the Victorian Age, most women tried to claim that they themselves had never been rape, though other women had been.[21] The consequences of admitting that such things had happened to oneself could never be lived down in nineteenth century America. Many of the women, or their editors, reported that they "suffered ill health" as a result of their captivity, and this also gave rise to speculation among the readership as to what had really happened to the women to put them in such physical and emotional trauma. In the manner of the time, it was perfectly acceptable to report the grief and shock associated with losing ones' children; it was not acceptable to admit that one had been raped, or even worse, had admired or fallen in love with an Indian. Women had to admit grief or trauma, but not too much, and not of the wrong kind. The differences in experiences between men and women colonists were indeed vast.

Even when Indian no longer took captives, the captivity narrative has remained a

---

[21] Derounian-Stodola and Levernier, *The Indian Captivity Narratives.* Pgs. 127-129.

popular theme in fiction and now in film. The Indian is a symbol of America, recognized around the world. As the Indians vanished, their image began to change from one of negativity to a romantic stereotype. Even some of the narratives, first written as anti-Indian, were changed to reflect a more sympathetic view of the Indians. For example, Hannah Dustan, seen by Cotton Mather as "heroic", became "temporarily insane" in John Greenleaf Whittier's words and a "bloody old hag" to Nathaniel Hawthorne.[22]

Even in the movies, the images of Indians have changed. Once played by white actors in dark make-up, uttering ridiculous grunts, the Indians of today's films are perhaps as romantic in their view of Indians, as the earlier Indians were pathetic villains. The Indians in the movies from the 1930s to the 1950s were the obvious bad guys, with few exceptions, and John Wayne or his equivalent was always the winner. Beginning in the 1960s, the view of Indians has changed. Thomas Berger's "Little Big Man" (1964), Larry McMurty's "Lonesome Dove" (1985), Kevin Costner's "Dances With Wolves" (1991), and the remake of "Last of the Mohicans" (1992), along with countless other movies, view Indians in a different medium, but perhaps not so much in a different way than the captivity narratives did. Audiences still determine what type of Indian is popular and how the Indian is viewed.

The Indian captivity narrative, and the frontier, has shifted in the five hundred years since Columbus discovered America. There still are actual captivities taking place

---

[22] Derounian-Stodola and Levenier, *The Indian Captivity Narratives.* See p. 176 for Whittier's quote from his book *Legends of New England* (1831) and Hawthorne's quote in his article "The Dustan Family" in his book *The American Magazine of Useful and Entertaining Knowledge (1836.)*

in the jungles of South America and the Amazonian rain forest, though in many more cases it is the Indians who are captured and forced to work as slaves or prostitutes. It will be interesting in the future to continue to trace the evolution of the captivity narrative. "It is not a nation's past that shapes its mythology but a nation's mythology that determines its past".[23] As the world becomes a smaller and smaller global village, it is important for everyone to see people as they truly are, not as stereotypes. The conflict between, and the combination of, European, African, and Native American needs to be recognized, acknowledged, and then put behind us. Native Americans are not devilish, Satanic barbarians, but neither are they the sentimentalized, romantic inhabitants of some hazy, peaceful New Age world, to be stripped of any part of their religion or culture that appeals to the popular imagination. They were, and are, real people with real problems and needs, and their destiny is tied, as it has always been, with Europe's and the rest of the world's destiny.

---

[23] Derounian-Stodola and Levernier, *The Indian Captivity Narratives.* P. 190.

CHART #1: LIST OF CAPTIVES IN THIS STUDY

(Found in Chapter One)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED	WHERE	HOW LONG	CHILD WAS INVOL	CHILD AT HOME	ATTACK AT HOME	ATTACK ELSEWHR
John Ortiz	1528	Florida	9 yrs	No	No	No	Yes

Was looking for another Spanish explorer when captured. Held as a prisoner, was eventually released. (Drake, pgs. 11-20.)

Issac Jogues	June 1642	Canada	5 mo	No	No	No	Yes

Was French-Catholic Priest, escaped from captivity, captured again & tortured to death by Mohawk. (VanDerBeets, pgs. 3-40)

KING PHILIPS WAR 1675-1678

Mary Rowlandson	Feb 1676	Mass.	2 mo	Yes	No	Yes	No

All children killed except for three; baby died later, son and daughter eventually ransomed. Mary also ransomed. (Drake, pgs. 20-60)

Quentin Stockwell	Sept 1677	Conn	3 mon	No	No	Yes	No

Attacked at dusk on his farm. (Drake, pgs. 60-68.)

PEACE 1678-1689

KING WILLIAMS WAR 1689-1697

Elizabeth Heard	June 1689	Dover NH	----	Yes	No	Yes	No

Had 10 grown children who escaped capture. Elizabeth attacked but spared because she had been kind to one of the Indians nine years before. (Drake, pgs. 71-73.)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter One)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/					HOW CHILD WAS A	ATTACK	ATTACK ELSEWHR
Sarah Gerish	June 1689	NH	6 mo	Yes	Yes-7 yrs old	Yes	No	
Sent to a nunnery in Canada. Was ransomed, later died at age 16. (Drake, pgs. 68-70)								
John Gyles	Aug 1689	Maine	6 yrs	Yes	Unknwn	Yes	No	
Brother and father killed by Indians. John was ransomed. (Drake, pgs. 73-100.)								
Robert Rodgers	Mar 1690	NH	-----	No	No	Yes	No	
Was a prisoner of the Indians; Tortured to death. (Drake, pgs. 109-110.)								
Thomas Toogood	Mar 1690	NH	----	No	No	Yes	No	
Fought off Indians and escaped. (Drake, pgs. 112-113.)								
Mehetable Goodwin	Mary 1690	NH	5 yrs	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Indians killed her child. Mehetable was eventually released. (Drake, pgs. 111-112.)								
Hannah Swarton	May 1690	Mass	5 yrs	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Her four children were captured and one was killed by the Indians. Hannah eventually ransomed but had to leave children in Canada. (Vaughan & Clark, pgs. 145-157.)								
Hannah Duston	Mar 1697	Mass	1 mo	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Had 8 children involved in attack. Hannah, newborn, and midwife captured. Newborn baby died. Hannah, midwife, and another supposedly kill and scalp ten Indians, and escape. (Had famous sister who was hanged for murder.)Derounian-Stodola, pgs.58-60.								

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/					HOW CHILD WAS A ATTACK	ATTACK ELSEWHR
				PEACE 1697-1702			
				QUEEN ANNE'S WAR 1702-1713			
				PEACE 1713-1744			
Elizabeth Hanson	June 1721	NH	1 yr	Yes	No	Yes	No

Two children killed in initial attack. Elizabeth and three children eventually released. One daughter married a Frenchman and stayed in Canada. (Drake, pgs. 113-126.)

Briton Hammon	June 1742	Florida	13 yrs	No	No	No	Yes

Was an "African-American" on board a ship under his Master's orders. Captured by Indians, became Spanish Governor's servant. Eventually released.
(Garland Library, Vol. 8.)

				KING GEORGE'S WAR 1744-1748			
Nehemiah Howe	Oct 1745	Mass	7 mo	No	No	No	Yes

Out chopping wood when attacked & captured. Sent to Quebec, eventually died of fever. (Drake, pgs. 127-138.)

Mary Fowler	Apr 1746	NH	3 yrs	Yes	Yes-(was 16 Yrs old)	Yes	No

Men left door open. Severl siblings also captured. Eventually redeemed.
(Drake, pgs. 140-143.)

John Fitch	July 1746	Mass	17 yrs	Yes	No	Yes	No

Was a trader at a fort when John & family was attacked by Indians. Entire family captured; eventually released after 17 years in Canada. (Drake, pgs. 139-140)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/					HOW CHILD WAS A ATTACK	ATTACK ELSEWHR
Isabella M'Coy	Aug 1747	NH	16 yrs	Yes	No	Yes	No

Children involved in attack but not captured. Wanted to stay in Canada for fear of abusive husband, but missed children. Returned to NH. (Drake, pgs. 143-147.)

PEACE 1748-1754

FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR 1754-1763

Jane Frazier	Apr 1754	Penn	18 mo	Yes	No	No	Yes

Attacked while riding to town for supplies. Was pregnant and had child during captivity. When child died, Jane escaped and returned home. (Garland Library, Vo. 109.)

Peter Williamson	Oct 1754	Penn	14 mo	No	No	Yes	No

Attacked while at home awaiting wife. Escaped 14 mo. later. (Drake, pgs. 147-156.)

Frances Noble	1755	Maine	12 yrs	Yes	Yes-(was 13 mo. old)	Yes	No

Boys left door open so Indians attacked. One sibling killed during attack; the rest go to Canada. Frances returned to Boston at age 14. (Drake, pgs. 165-172.)

James Smith	May 1755	Penn	6 yrs	No	No	No	Yes

Doing roadwork in Penn. when attacked. Later noted Indian fighter and wrote book on the subject. (Drake, pgs. 178-264.)

Jemina Howe	July 1755	NH	5 yrs	Yes	No	Yes	No

Men were attacked in the fields; women thought it was their men returning so opened doors to Indians. Several of Jemina's children die in attack, two remain in Canada after Jemina is ransomed. (Drake, pgs. 156-165.)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/				HOW CHILD WAS A	ATTACK	ATTACK ELSEWHR
Capt. John Carver	Aug 1755	Ft.Wm.Henry	---	No	No	No	Yes

Was soldier at fort when attacked. Was a prisoner briefly; fought & escaped. (Drake, pgs. 172-178.

Robert Eastburn	Mar 1756	Penn	32 mo	No	No	No	Yes

Was traveling to Oswego when attacked. One of the few men to have poor health as as result of his experience. (Drake, pgs. 265-283.)

Jean Lowry	Apr 1756	Penn	2 yrs	Yes	No	Yes	No

Her five children were captured during attack; fate unknown. Jane very pregnant when captured. Had baby while among French; baby died. Jane eventually released. (Garland Library, Vol. 8)

Thomas Brown	Jan 1757	Ft.Wm.Henry	3yrs	No	No	No	Yes

Was accomplished Indian fighter. Was wounded, escaped, captured, released, captured, and released again. (Garland Library, Vol. 8)

Molly Finney	Jun 1757	Maine	2 mo	Yes	No	Yes	No

Younger siblings and relatives involved in attack, but not captured. Molly escaped after 2 mos with help of sea-captain. (Garland Library, Vol. 109)

Mary Jemison	Jun 1758	Penn	Entire Life (70+ yrs)	Yes	Yes-(was 15 yrs old)	Yes	No

Voluntarily stayed with Indians. Had several husbands and children. Remained in contact with white family also. (Derounian-Stodola, pgs. 122-210.)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE	LONG	INVOL	CHILD/AT HOME	ATTACK ELSEWHR
Mrs. Clendenin 1763	Virginia	3 days	Yes	No	Yes / No

Invited Indians into home for supper when they attacked. Was captured with newborn. Left newborn baby with Indians while she made her escape. Indians killed baby. (Drake, pgs. 284-286)

Alexander Henry Jun 1763	New York	1 yr	No	No	No	Yes

Was a trader at a fort when attacked and captured. He later escaped. (Drake, pgs 286-332.)

PEACE 1763-1776

Daniel Boone Jun 1769	Kentucky	7 days	No	No	No	Yes

Had several escapades with Indians. Always escaped or tricked Indians into releasing him. Was respected Indian fighter. (Garland Library, Vol. 38.)

AMERICAN WAR FOR INDEPENDENCE 1776-1783

Robert Benham 1778	Ohio	1 mo	No	No	No	Yes

On river when attacked. Wounded but escaped. Later became Indian guide. (Garland Library, Vol. 85.)

Jasper Parrish July 1778	New York	8 yrs	Yes	Yes-(was 11 yrs old)	Yes	No

Lived with Indians for 8 years and was formally adopted. Returned when treaty was signed and all prisoners released. Later became guide and Indian interpreter. (Garland Library, Vol. 105)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/					HOW CHILD WAS A	ATTACK	ATTACK ELSEWHR
Moses Van Campen	1779	Penn	3 days	No	No	No	Yes	

Moses often sent on spy missions among Indians. Attacked on farm; adult brother killed. Moses escaped, was captured, then exchanged for Indian prisoners. Later became friends with Indian attackers. (Drimmer, pgs.105-118)

Elizabeth Bozarth	1779	Kentucky	----	Yes	No	Yes	No

Children in house and yard when attacked; some killed. Experience killed three Indians then shut the door, leaving some children outside. Rescued by neighbors after 3 days. (Drake, pgs. 334-335.)

Maria Manheim	1779	New York	----	Yes	Yes- (was 16 yrs old)	Yes	No

Was captured with her twin sister and father. Indians quarelled over whose she was, so Indian leader ordered Maria and her sister tortured to death. (Drake, pgs. 333-334.)

Christina Manheim See Above.

John Slover	1780	Ohio	20 days	No	No	No	Yes

Had previously been prisoner of Indians when younger. Was employed as guide when captured. He escaped. (Drimmer, pgs. 142-182.)

Abel Janney	Mar 1782	Ohio	1 yr	No	No	No	Yes

Was out trapping when captured. Escaped but was recaptured. Traded to British and released. (Garland Library, Vol. 104.)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/	HOW CHILD WAS A	ATTACK	ATTACK ELSEWHR
John Corbly	May 1782 Kentucky ----	Yes	No	No	Yes

Was out with family walking to church when attacked. Wife and three children killed; two daughters scalped but escaped. (Drake, 335-337.)

Dr. Knight	June 1782 Ohio	21 days	No	No	No	Yes

Was volunteer fighter. Captured but escaped. (Garland Library, Vol. 38.)

PEACE 1783-1812

Frances Scott	June 1785 Virginia	----	Yes	No	Yes	No

Husband left door open so Indians attacked. All four children killed in front of Frances. She was captured but escaped. Left in very poor health due to grief. (Drake, pgs. 338-342.)

Charles Johnson	May 1790 Ohio	8 mos	No	No	No	Yes

Was an attorney travelling on business. Was ransomed. (Drimmer, pgs. 184-215.)

John Tanner	1789	Kentucky	30 yrs	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Was child when captured. Known as a "white Indian" because he voluntarily stayed with his adopted Indian parents. Moved between white and Indian world until vanishing under a murder charge (probably stayed permanently with the Indians.) (Drimmer, pgs. 144-182)

Mary Kinnan	May 1791	Virginia	3 yrs	Yes	No	Yes	No

Children killed. Mary eventually escaped. (Derounian-Stodola, pgs. 109-116.)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE	LONG	INVOL	HOW CHILD WAS A CHILD/AT HOME	ATTACK ELSEWHR	ATTACK
Massy Herbeson	Mar 1792 Penn	3 days	Yes	No	Yes	No

Scout left door open. Indians attacked, killed all her children. Massy captured but escaped. (Drake, pgs. 349-352.)

Segt. Munson	Oct 1793 Ohio	8 mo	No	No	No	Yes

Was a soldier escorting pack horses when attacked. Eventually won Indians trust and escaped. (Drake, pgs. 352-353.)

(Found in Chapter Three)

John R. Jewitt	1803 Brit.Columbia	2 ½ yrs	No	No	No	Yes

Was ship's blacksmith. Attacked by Indians; everyone killed except John and one other. Was kept as tribe's blacksmith until he tricked the Indian leader into releasing him. (Drimmer, pgs. 216-255)

WAR OF 1812

CREEK INDIAN WAR IN FLORIDA 1813-1814

Elias Darnell	1813 Michigan	1 week	No	No	No	Yes

Was in Army when attacked. Adult brothers and others massacred. Elias held as prisoner until he escaped, though wounded. (Drimmer, pgs. 256-268)

PEACE 1814-1817

FIRST SEMINOLE WAR IN SOUTH 1817-1818

PEACE 1818-1830

INDIAN REMOVAL WAR 1830-1836

MEXICAN WAR 1846-1847

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Two)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/					HOW CHILD WAS A	ATTACK	ATTACK ELSEWHR
			SECOND SEMINOLE WAR 1835-1842					
Ransom Clark	1835	Florida	-----	No	No	No	Yes	
Was a soldier. Was wounded in Indian attack and left for dead. (Drake, pgs. 355-357.)								
John W.B. Thompson	1836	Florida	-----	No	No	No	Yes	
Attacked by Indians at lighthouse. Severly wounded but escaped. (Drake, 357-360)								
Cynthia Ann Parker	May 1836	Texas	25 yrs	Yes	Yes-(was 8 yrs old)	Yes	No	
Was captured by, lived, and raised family as Comanche. Recaptured by whites at age 35 & returned to white family; died in 1864 of "broken heart" after repeated attempts to return to Comanches. (Garland Library, Vol. 95)								
Rachel Plummer	May 1836	Texas	21 mo	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Was related to Cynthia A. Parker. Pregnant when captured by Comanches, had child but Indians killed it. Son James also captured & eventually ransomed but Rachel died of her injuries before knowing his fate. (VanDerBeets, plgs 333-366.)								
			PEACE 1842-1846					
Nelson Lee	1855	Texas	3 yrs	No	No	No	Yes	
Was horse-and mule-trader. Captured by Comanches; only alarm clock saved his life. Eventually escaped. (Drimmer, pgs. 278-313)								
Abigail Gardiner	1857	Iowa	3 mo	Yes	Yes-(was 14 yrs old)	Yes	No	
Initially Indians came in for food, then attacked. Parents and some siblings were killed. Abigail eventually ransomed. (Garland Library, Vol. 72.)								

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Four)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE/LONG/INVOL/CHILD/AT HOME/ ELSEWHR			HOW CHILD WAS A	ATTACK	ATTACK
			CIVIL WAR 1861-1865 / INDIAN WARS 1862-1877			
Emeline Fuller	1860	Idaho	-----	Yes	Yes-(was 13 yrs old)	No Yes

Was in immigrant wagon train on way to Oregon when attacked. Entire family involved; all survive initial attack, but parents & siblings later die from injuries & starvation (except for Emeline). (Derounian-Stodola, pgs. 320-337)

Sarah Wakefield Aug 1862 Minn. 6 wks Yes No Yes No

Husband was Indian's physician. Sarah and her children were held for 6 weeks until they escaped with help of sympathetic Indians. (Derounian-Stodola, pgs. 243-313.)

Lavina Eastlick Aug 1862 Minn ---- Yes No Yes No

All her children were killed in Indian attack. Lavina escaped from captivity. (Drimmer, pgs. 314-329)

Urania F. White Aug 1862 Minn 1 mo Yes No Yes No

Oldest son killed during attack. Other children treated well because Urania was extremely nice to the Indian children. Was eventually released to U.S.Army. (Garland Library, vol. 104)

Minnie Carrigan Aug 1862 Minn 5 wks Yes Yes-(was 5 yrs old) Yes No

Parents and some siblings killed. Eventually released and raised by guardians. (Garland Library, Vol. 106.)

CHART #1 Continued-

(Found in Chapter Four)

NAME	DATE CAPTURED/WHERE	LONG	INVOL/CHILD	HOW CHILD WAS A	ATTACK AT HOME	ATTACK ELSEWHR
Helen Tarble	Aug 1862 Minn	3 wks	Yes	No	Yes	No

Was extremely friendly with Indian Medicine Man. He and other kind Indians helped her and her children escape after three weeks. (Garland Library, Vol. 105)

Fanny Kelly	Dec 1864 South Dakota	5 mo	Yes	No	No	Yes

Was in wagon train immigrating to Idaho. All the men killed or escaped. Fanny taken prisoner, helped her daughter escape. Eventually Fanny tricked Indians into releasing her. (Drimmer, pgs. 330-369)

SEMI-PEACE 1877-1890

Theresa Delaney	Apr 1885 Canada	2 mo	No	No	Yes	No

Husband was Indian Agent. Theresa liked Indians and was treated well. She did have any children. Eventually escaped. (Garland Library, Vol. 95)

Theresa Gowanlock	Apr 1885 Canada	2 mo	No	No	Yes	No

Had no children. Disliked Indians. Husband killed in attack. Eventually escaped and returned to parents. (Garland Library, Vol. 95)

CHART #2

PRISONER		ESCAPED	RELEASED/ RANSOMED	DIED KILLED	STAYED W/ FRENCH OR INDIANS
MALE	25	16	12	2	1 (Tanner)
FEMALE	29	16	16	2	2 (Jemison & Parker)

	FAMILY INVOLVED	NO FAMILY INVOLVED
MALE	5	25
FEMALE	34	2

*Note: Two of the males were children so family was involved. Eight of the females were children so family was involved. Two of the males had grown family members involved in the attack. Overwhelming number of females had family involved, in relation to males having family involved.

	WITH CHILDREN INVOL	W/OUT CHILDREN INVOL
MALES ESCAPE	1	15
FEMALES ESCAPE	14**	2

Note: Two males were children. John Corbly had children involved but only he was captured.

** Hannah Duston: other children not captured. Newborn died, then Hannah escaped
Jane Frazier: Baby died, then Jane escaped
Lavina Eastlick: child killed, then Lavina escaped
Molly Finney: children not captured
Experience Bozarth: children killed, but she never captured
Frances Scott: all children killed during attack
Massy Herbeson: Children killed, then Massy escaped
Mary Kinnan: child killed in attack
Helen Tarble: escaped with children (had outside help)
Elizabeth Heard: grown children escaped
Fanny Kelly: she and children escape with outside help
Mary Godfrey: escaped with children (had outside help)
Emeline Fuller: attacked but escaped with siblings; all died except for Emeline
****Only Mrs. Clendenin escaped & left behind a living child

CHART #2 continued-

EXPLANATIONS:

"Family" or "No Family Involved" means that some member of the captured person's family was involved in the attack, whether they were parents or siblings, adults or children.

"With Children Involved" or "Without Children Involved" means that at some point in the incident, their children under the age of sixteen were involved in the attack, even if the children were not captured.

Bibligraphy: Primary Sources

Benham, Robert. "Robert Benham's Narrative of an Encounter With the Indians" from the *Western Review and Miscellaneous Magazine* published by William Gibbs Hunt. (Found under: Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 38.* Reprinted New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1976.) Pgs. 72-75.

Boone, Daniel. "A Collection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives of Indian Warfare in the West Containing an Account of the Adventures of Colonel Daniel Boone...". Samuel L. Metcalf, Lexington, KY, 1821. (Reprint of the 1821 edition printed by W.G. Hunt, Lexington, KY under the title: "A Collection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives of Indian Warfare in the West.") (Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 38.* Reprinted New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1976.) Pgs. 7-35.

Bozarth, Experience. "Signal Prowess Of a Woman, In a Combat With Some Indians. In a Letter To a Lady of Philadelphia. Westmoreland, April 26, 1779." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 334-335.

Brown, Thomas. "Death in the Snow." Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured By the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* (Reprinted Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 1985.) Pgs. 61-73.

Carrigan, Minnie. "Captured by the Indians: Reminiscences of Pioneer Life in Mineesota". Forest City, SD: Forest City Press, 1907. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 106.* New York: Garland Publishing company, 1976.) Pgs. 1-40.

Carver, Jonathan. "Captain Jonathan Carver's Narrative of His Capture, and Subsequent Escape From the Indians, At the Bloody Massacre Committed By Them, When Fort William Henry Fell Into the Hands of the French, Under Gen. Moncalm, In the Year 1767. Written By Himself." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 172-178.

Clark, Ransom. "Narrative of the Escape of Ransom Clark, (Of Livingston County, New York,) From the Massacre In Which Major Dade and His Command Were Cut Off By the Seminole Indians, In Florida, on the 28th of Dec. 1835; as communicated by himself....". Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 355-357.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Clendenin, Mrs. "Narrative of the Destruction of the Settlement of Greenbriar, Virginia, Together With the Capture and Surprising Conduct of Mrs. Clendenin, Who Was Among Those Who Escaped the Tomahawk of the Indians At that Massacre." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 284-286.

Corbly, John. "Rev. John Corbly's Narrative." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 335-337.

Darnell, Elias. "Remember the River Raisin!". Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured By the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* (Reprinted Mineola, NY: Dover Publication, Inc., 1985.) Pgs. 256-268.

Delaney, Theresa. "Two Months in the Camp of Big Bear". Parkdale, Times Office, 1885. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 95.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.) Pgs. 79-130.

Dustan, Hannah. "*A Notable Exploit; wherein,* Dux Faemin Facti from *Magnalia Chrisit Americana: Of, the Eccelesiasstical History of New-England."* by Cotton Mather, London: Thomas Parkhurse, 1702. (Reprinted Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1998.)) Pgs. 58-60.

Eastlick, Lavina. "Revolt of the Sioux." Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured By the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* (Reprinted Mineola, NY: Dover Publication, Inc., 1985.) Pgs. 314-329.

Eastburn, Robert. "A Faithful Narrative of the Many Dangers and Sufferings, As Well As Wonderful and Surprising Deliverances, of Robert Eastburn, During His Late Captivity Among the Indians. Written By Himself." Printed Boston: Reprinted and sold by Green & Russell, oposite the Probate Office in Queen Street, 1758. (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851.) (Reprinted Facsimile Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 265-283.

Finney, Molly. "The Means Massacre: Molly Finney, the Canadian Captive" by Charles P. Illsley. Issued with the reprint of the 1927 edition of Meredith, G.E. "Girl Captives of the Cheyennes." (Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109.* Reprinted New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1976.)

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Fitch, John. "Particulars Relating to the Captivity of John Fitch, of Ashby, Mass. Related by Mr. Enos Jones, of Ashburnham." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 139-140.

Fowler, Mary. "Captivity of Mary Fowler, of Hopkinton." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 140-143.

Frazier, Jane. "Narrative of the Captivity of Jane Frazier." Issued with the reprint of the 1927 edition of G.E.Meredith, "Girl Captives of the Cheyennes." (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor.*The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.)

Fuller, Emeline. "Left by the Indians. Story of My Life." Mt. Vernon, Iowa: Hawk-Eye, 1892. (Reprinted Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1998.)) Pgs. 320-337.

Gardiner, Abagail. "History of the Spirit Lake Massacre! 8th March, 1857 and of Abigail Gardiner's Three Month's Captivity Among the Indians. According To Her Own Account, As Given To L.P. Lee." L.P. Lee, Publisher. New Britain, CT. 1857. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 72.* New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.)

Gerish, Sarah. "Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Miss Sarah Gerrish, Who Was Taken at the Sacking of Dover, In the Year 1689, By the Indians; As Communicated to the Reverend Dr. Cotton Mather, by the Reverend John Pike, Minister of Dover." (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851.) (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 68-70.

Godfrey, Mary. "An Authentic Narrative of the Seminole War; and of the Miraculous Escape of Mrs. Mary Godfrey, and Her Four Female Children". Providence, RI: D. F. Blanchard, 1836. (Reprinted Kathry Zabelle Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1998.) Pgs. 217-234.

Goodwin, Mehetable. "Three Narratives of Persons Taken at the Destruction of Salmon Falls, ...New Hampshire...The Five Years Captivity of Mehetable Goodwin...". Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 111-112.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued -

Gowanlock, Theresa. "Two Months in the Camp of Big Bear". Parkdale: Times Office, 1885. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 95.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.) Pgs. 2-78.

Gyles, John. "Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, Etc., in the Captivity of John Gyles, Esq., Commander of the Garrison on St. George River, in the District of Maine. Written by Himself. Originally Published at Boston, 1736. (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities of Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851.)(Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 73-100.

Hammon, Briton. "A Narrative of the Uncommon Sufferings and Surprising Deliverance of Briton Hammon, A Negro Man". Reprint of the 1760 edition printed and sold by Green & Russell. (Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.)

Hanson, Elizabeth. "God's Mercy Surmountint Man's Cruelty, Exemplified in the Captivity and Surprising Deliverance of Elizabeth Hanson, Wife of John Hanson, of Knoxmarsh, at Kecheachy, in dover Township, Who Was Taken Captive With Her Children and Maid-Servant, By the Indians in New England in the Year 1724. Reprinted and sold by E. Russell, next the Bell Tavern, MDCCLXXX. (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities of Life in the Wigwam.*Auurn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 113-126.

Heard, Elizabeth. "Narrative of the Remarkable Escape of Widow Elizabeth Heard, also Taken at the Destruction of Major Walkron's Garrison in Dover, as Communicated to Doctor Cotton Mather, By the Rev. John Pike, Minister of the Place." (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 71-73.

Henry, Alexander. "Narrative of the Captivity of Alexander Henry, Esq., Who, In the Time of Pontiak's War, Fell Into the Hands of the Huron Indians. Detailing a Faithful Account of the Capture of the Garrison of Michilimackinac, and the Massacre of About Ninety People. Written By Himself." (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 286-332.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Herbeson, Massy. "An Account of the Sufferings of Massy Herbeson, and Her Family, Who Were Taken Prisoners By a Party of Indians, Given on Oath Before John Wilkins, Esq., One of the Justices of the Peace for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pittsburgh, May 28, 1792." (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs . 349-352.

Howe, Jemina. "A Particular Account of the Captivity and Redemption of Mrs. Jemina Howe, Who was Taken Prisoner By the Indians at Hinsdale, New Hampshire, on the Twenty-Seventh of July, 1755, as Communicated to Dr. Belknap by the Rev. Bunker Gay." (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 156-165.

Howe, Nathaniel. "A Narrative of the Captivity of Nehemiah Howe, Who Was Taken By the Indians at the Great Meadow Fort Above Fort Dummer, Where He Was an Inhabitant, October 11th, 1745." (Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 127-138.

Janney, Abel. "Narrative of the capture of Abel Janney by the Indians in 1782. From his diary in *Ohio Archaelogical and Historical Publications, Vol. 8, Columbus, 1900. Pp. 465-473. Published by Fred J. Heer.* (Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 104.* Reprinted New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.).

Jemison, Mary. "A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison." Canandaiguam, NY: J.D. Bemis, 1824. (Reprinted Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1998.) Pgs. 122-210.

Jewitt, John Rodgers. "The Headhunters of Nootka". Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured by the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* (Reprinted Mineola, NY: Dover Publishing, Inc., 1985.) Pgs. 216-255.

Jogues, Isaac. "Captivity of Father Isaac Jogues, of the Society of Jesus, Among the Mohawks."Richard VanDerBeets, editor. *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives 1642-1836. (Knoxville: The University of Tennesse Press, 1973.) Pgs. 3-40.*

Johnson, Charles. "Three Came Back". Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured by Indians:15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* (Reprinted Mineola, NY: Dover Publishing, Inc., 1985..) Pgs. 184-215.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Kelly, Fanny. "Ho for Idaho!". Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured by Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* (Reprinted Mineola, NY: Dover Publishing, Inc., 1985.) Pgs. 330-369.

Kinnan, Mary. "A True Narrative of the Sufferings of Mary Kinnan" by Shepard Kollock. Elizabethtown, NJ: Shepard Kollock, 1795. (Reprinted Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1998.) Pgs. 109-116.

Knight, Dr. "The Narrative of Dr. Knight". Printed by W.G. Hunt. "A Collection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives of Indian Warfare in the West." Lexington, KY: 1821. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol.38.* (New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.) Pgs. 36-52.

Lee, Nelson. "Three Years Among the Comanches." Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured By the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 1985.) Pgs. 278-313.

Lowry, Jean. "A Journal of the Captivity of Jean Lowry and Her Children". Printed by W. Bradford, Philadelphia, 1760. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8.*(New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.)

Manheim, Christina and Maria. "Narrative of the Captivity of Frederick Manheim." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 333-334.

M'Coy, Isabella."Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Isabella M'Coy, Who Was Taken Captive at Epson, N.H., in the Year 1747. Collected From the Recollections of Aged People Who Knew Her, By the rev. Jonathan Curtis, a Minister of That Town, About Seventeen Years Ago, and By Him Communicated to the Publishers of the New Hampshire Historical Collections." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 143-147.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Munson, Serg. Lent. "Narrative of the Captivity and Escape of Sergeant Lent Nunson, Who Fell into the Hands of the Western Indians at the Time of Lieut. Lowry's Defeat." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 352-353.

Noble, Frances. "Narrative of the Captivity of Frances Noble, Who Was, Among Others, Taken by the Indians from Swan Island, in Maine, about the Year 1755; Compiled by John Kelly, Esq., of Concord, New Hampshire, From the Minutes and Memoranda of Phinehas Merrill, Esq., of Stratham, in the Same State; and by the Former Gentleman Communicated for Publication to the Editors of the Historical Collections of New Hampshire." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 165-172.

Ortiz, John. "Narrative of the Captivity of John Ortiz, a Spaniard, Who was Eleven Years a Prisoner Among the Indians of Florida." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 11-20.

Parker, Cynthia Ann."Cynthia Ann Parker, The Story of Her Capture." by James T. DeSheilds. St. Louis: 1886. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 95.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.) Pgs. V-80.

Parrish, Jasper. "The Story of Captain Jasper Parrish, Captive, Interpreter, and United States Sub-Agent to the Six Nation's Indians." Originally published in 1903 by Buffalo Historical Society Publications, Vol. 6. Pgs. 527-546. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 105.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.)

Plummer, Rachel. "Narrative of the Capture and Subsequent Sufferings of Mrs. Rachel Plummer. Written by Herself." Reprinted Richard VanDerBeets, editor. *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836.* Knoxville:The University of Tennessee Press, 1973.) Pgs. 333-366.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Quill, Charles. "The Mechanic's Wife", *The American Mechanic.* Philadelphia, 1838. (Reprinted by Carl Bode, editor. *American Life inthe 1840s.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.

Rodgers, Robert. "Three Narratives of Excessive Distress of Persons Taken at the Destruction of Salmon Falls, in the State of New Hampshire, on the Twenty-Seventh of March, 1690; viz, the Cruel Torture of Robert Rodgers...From the Magnalia Christi Americana, of Doctor Cotton Mather." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 100-110.

Rowlandson, Mary. "Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson, Wife of the Rev. Joseph Rowlandson, Who Was Taken Prisoner When Lancaster Was Destroyed, in the Year 1676; Written by Herself." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., .1995.) Pgs. 20-60.

Scott, Francis Mrs. "A True and Wonderful Narrative of the Surprising Captivity and Remarkable Deliverance of Mrs. Francis Scott, an Inhabitant of Washington County, Virginia, Who was Taken by the Indians on the Evening of the 29th of June, 1785." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 338-342.

Slover, John. "The Narrative of John Slover". Originally printed in 1821 under the title of "A Collection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives of Indian Warfare in the West." by W.G. Hunt, Lexington, KY. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 38.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.) Pgs. 53-71.

Smith, James. "An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Colonel James Smith (Late a Citizen of Bourbon County, Kentucky) During His Captivity With the Indians, In the Years 1755, '56,'57, '58, and '59. In Which the Customs, Manner, Traditions, Theological Sentiments, Mode of Warfare, Military Tactics, Discipline and Encampments, Treatment of Prisoner, &are better explained, and more minutely related, than has been heretofore done by by author on that subject.....Written by himself." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD:Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 178-264.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Stockwell, Quintin. "Narrative of the Captivity of Quintin Stockwell, Who was Taken at Deerfield, in Massachusetts, by a Party of Inland Indians, in the Year 1677; Communicated in His Own Words, and Originally Publisedh by the Eminent Dr. Increase Mather, In the Year 1684." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 60-68.

Swarton, Hannah. "A Narrative of Hannah Swarton Containing Wonderful Passages Relating to Her Captivity and Deliverance." Cotton Mather, editor. *Humiliations Followed with Deliverances.* Boston: 1696. (Reprinted Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, editor. *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981.) Pgs. 145-157.

Tanner, John. "White Indian". Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured by the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* Minelola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 1985. Pgs. 144-182.

Tarble, Helen. "The Story of My Capture and Escape During the Minnesota Indian Uprising of 1862.". St. Paul: Abbott Printing Company, 1904. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 105.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.) Pgs. 1-65.

Thompson, John W.B. "The Following Narrative of One of the Most Extraordinary Escapes from a Dreadful Death, Anywhere Recorded, as Contained in a Letter Written by the Sufferer to the Editor of the Charleston (S.C.) Courier, Immediately After It Happened. It Took Place at Cape Florida Lighthouse, in 1836." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 357-360.

Toogood, Thomas."Three Narratives of Excessive Distress of Persons Taken at the Destruction of Salmon Falls, in the State of New Hampshire, on the Twenty-Seventh of March, 1690; viz, ...the Fortunate Escape of Thomas Toogood. From the Magnalia Christi Americana, of Doctor Cotton Mather." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Captured by Indians or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs.112-113.

VanCampen, Moses. "An Inch of Ground to Fight On". Frederick Drimmer, editor. *Captured by the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 1985. Pgs. 106-118.

Bibliography: Primary Sources continued-

Wakefield, Sarah. "Six Weeks in the Sioux Tepees: A Narrative of Indian Captivity, 2nd Edition". Shakopee, Minn: Argus, 1864. (Reprinted Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1998. Pgs. 242-313.

White, Urania Frazer. "Captivity Among the Sioux, August 18 to September 26, 1862." *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society, Volume IX.* St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1901. (Reprinted Wilcomb E. Washburn, editor. *The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 104.* New York: Garland Publishing Company, 1976.) Pgs. 393-426.

Williamson, Peter."A Faithful Narrative of the Sufferings of Peter Williamson, Who Settled Near the Forks of the Delaware in Pennsylvania. Having Been Taken by the Indians in His Own House, October 2nd, 1754. Written By Himself." Samuel G. Drake, editor. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. Reprinted Facsimile Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, Inc., 1995.) Pgs. 147-156.

Bibliography: Secondary Sources

Allen, Thomas B., editor. *We Americans.* Washington, DC: National Geographic Society, 1975.

Axtell, James. "The White Indians of Colonial America," *William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Ser., 32* (1975).

Berkin, Carol. *First Generation: Women in Colonial America.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1996.

Berkin, Carol Ruth and Mary Beth Norton. *Women of America: A History.* Boston: Hougton Mifflin Company, 1979.

Bode, Carl, editor. *American Life in the 1840s.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967.

Boorstin, Daniel J. *The Americans: The Colonial Experience.* New York: Random House, 1958.

Brown, Kathleen M. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches & Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Racism and Power in Colonial Virginia.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Calloway, Colin G., editor. *The World Turned Upside Down: Indian Voices from Early America.* Boston: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Carter, Sarah. *Capturing Women.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997.

Clifton, James A., editor. *Being and Becoming Indian: Biographical Studies of North American Frontiers.* Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1989.

Davidson, James West, et. al. *Nations of Nations: A Narrative History of the American Republic, 2nd Edition.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1990.

Demos, John. *The Unredeemed Captive.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1995.

Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle, editor. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives.* New York: Penguin Books, 1998.

Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle and James Arthur Levenier. *The Indian Captivity Narrative 1550-1900.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993.

Bibliography: Secondary Sources continued-

Drake, Samuel. *Indian Captivities or Life in the Wigwam.* Auburn: Derby and Miller, 1851. (Facsimile reprint, Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1995.)

Drimmer, Frederick, editor. *Scalps and Tomahawks: Narratives of Indian Captivity.* New York: Van Rees Press, 1961. (Reprinted as *Captured By the Indians: 15 Firsthand Accounts, 1750-1870.* Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, Inc., 1985.)

Drinnon, Richard. *White Savage: The Case of John Dunn Hunter.* New York:Schocken Books, 1972.

Driver, Harold E. *Indians of North America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Ebersole, Gary L. *Captured by Texts: Puritan to Postmodern Images of Indian Captivity.* Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1995.

Erickson, Kai T. *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Evans, Sara M. *Born for Liberty: A History of Women in America.* New York: The Free Press, 1989.

Friedman, Jean E. And William G. Shade. *Our American Sisters: Women in American Life and Thought, 3rd Edition.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Company, 1982.

Hallowell, A. Irving. "American Indians, White and Black: The Phenomenon of Transculturation", *Current Anthropology, No. 4,* (1963).

Heard, Norman J. *White Into Red.* Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1973.

Hurse, David Thomas, et. all. *The Native Americans: An Illustrated History.* Atlanta: Turner Publishing, Inc., 1993.

Hymowitz, Carol and Michaele Weissman. *A History of Women in America.* New York: Bantam Books, 1980.

Jeffrey, Julie Roy. *Frontier Women: The Trans-Mississippi West 1840-1880.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1979.

Josephy, Alvin M. Jr. *The Indian Heritage of America.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

Bibliography: Secondary Sources continued-

Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. *Settling with the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580-1640.* Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.

Lec15.htm at intranet.rutgers.edu (January 1998).

Levenier, James and Hennig Cohen. *The Indians and Their Captives.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977.

Longstreet, Stephen. *Indian Wars of the Great Plains.* New York: Indian Head Books. 1993.

Mails, Thomas E. *The Mystic Warriors of the Plains.* New York: Barnes and Nobles edition, 1995.

Messick, Hank, and Burt Goldblatt. *Kidnaping: An Illustrated History.* New York: The Dial Press, 1974.

Namias, June. *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina press, 1993.

Riley, Glenda. *Women and Indians on the Frontier, 1825-1915.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.

Sayre, Gordon M. *Les Sauvages Americians: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860.* Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973.

Thomas, David Hurse, et. all. *The Native Americans: An Illustrated History.* Atlanta: Turner Publishing, Inc., 1993.

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England 1650-1750.* New York: Random House, 1991.

VanDerBeets, Richard. *Held Captive By Indians: Selected Narratives 1642-1836.* Knoxville: The University of Tennesse Press, 1973.

Bibliography: Secondary Sources continued -

Vaughan, Alden T. and Edward W. Clark, editor. *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981.

Vaughan, Alden T. And Daniel K. Richter. *Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763.* Worcester, MA: American Antiquarian Society, 1980.

West, Elliott. *The Way to the West: Essays on the Central Plains.* Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.

Williams, Marty and Anne Echols. *Women in the Middle Ages: Between Pit and Pedestal.* Princeton, Markus Wiener Publisher, 1994.

Woloch, Nancy. *Women and the American Experience.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Bibliography: Other Sources Consulted

Ashburn, P.M., Colonel. *The Ranks of Death: A Medical History of the Conquest of America.* New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1947.

Bailyn, Bernard and Philip D. Morgan, editor. *Strangers within the Realm: Cultural Margins of the First British Empire.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Barnett, Louise K. *The Ignoble Savage: American Literary Racism, 1790-1890.* Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1975.

Billington, Ray Allen. *Land of Savagery, Land of Promise: the European Image of the American Frontier.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1981.

Burnham, Michelle. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861.* Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1997.

Cartwright, Frederick F. And Michael D. Biddiss. *Disease and History.* New York: Barnes & Nobles, 1972.

Cott, Nancy F. *The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture.* New York: Doubleday, 1977.

Fiedler, Leslie A. *The Return of the Vanishing American.* London: Jonathan Cape Ltd, n/d.

Fiske, John. *New France and New England.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1902.

Hamilton, Edward P. *The French and Indian Wars.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1962.

Hamilton, Milton W. *Sir William Johnson: Colonial American 1715-1763.* Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1976.

Bibliography: Other Sources Consulted continued-

Hoxie, Frederickk E., editor. *Encyclopedia of North American Indians: Native American History, Culture, and Life from Paleo-Indians to the Present.* Boston:Houghton Mifflin Company, 1996.

Hunter, John D. *Memoirs of a Captivity Among the Indians of North America, from Childhood to the Age of Nineteen: with Anecdotes Descriptive of Their Manners and Customs (3rd Edition).* Originally printed- London: Longman, Hurse, Rfes, Orme, Brown, and Green, Paternoster-Row, 1824. (Reprinted Milwaukee, WI: Lee Foundation for Nutritional Research, 1964.)

Karttunen, Frances. *Between the Worlds: Interpreters, Guides, and Survivors.* New Brunswick: NJ:Rutgers University Press, 1994.

Keegan, John. *Fields of Battle: The Wars for North America.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1997.

Keiser, Albert. *The Indian in American Literature.* New York: Octagon Books, 1970.

Kessler-Harris, Alice. *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Kupferer, Harriet J. *Ancient Drums, Other Moccasins: Native North American Cultural Adaptation.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentic Hall, 1988.

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

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

Nash, Gary B. *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America.* London: Prentice-Hall International, Inc., 1974.

Norton, Mary Beth, David M. Katzman, Paul d. Escott, et. all. *A People and A Nation.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1984.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. *The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1953.

Bibliography: Other Sources Consulted continued-

Olson, Alison Gilbert and Richard Maxwell Brown, editors. *Anglo-American Political Relations, 1675-1775.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1970.

Porter, H.C. *The Inconstant Savage: England and the North American Indian 150--1660.* London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1979.

Race, Timothy D. *Fettered Puritans: Captivity as American Symbol and Formula.* Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green State University as Master's Thesis, 1980.

Reich, Jerome R. *Colonial America, Fourth Edition.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Rister, Carl Coke. *Border Captives: The Traffic in Prisoners by Southern Plains Indians, 1835-1875.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1940.

Savage, William W., Jr., editor. *Indian Life: Transforming an American Myth.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977.

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

Szasz, Margaret Connell, editor. *Between Indian and White Worlds: the Cultural Broker.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.

Tilton, Robert S. *Pocahontas: The Evolution of an American Narrative.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

VanDerBeets, Richard. *The Indian Captivity Narrative: An American Genre.* Lanham: University Press of America, 1984.

Winger, Otto. *The Lost Sister Among the Miamis.* Elgin, IL: The Elgin Press, 1936.

Zolla, Elemire. *The Writer and the Shaman: A Morphology of the American Indian.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973 edition.