

THE SITE OF THE STRUGGLE

THE SITE OF THE STRUGGLE:
COLONIALISM, VIOLENCE, AND THE CAPTIVE BODY

By

ROBBIE RICHARDSON, B.A.H.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

© Copyright by Robbie Richardson, September 2006

MASTER OF ARTS (2006)

McMaster University

(English)

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Site of the Struggle: Colonialism, Violence, and the Captive Body

AUTHOR: Robbie Richardson, B.A.H. (University of Winnipeg)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Peter Walmsley

NUMBER OF PAGES: v, 65

Abstract

This thesis examines the ways in which the bodies of British captives among Native North American peoples in the mid- to late eighteenth century become sites of violence that implicate British colonial practices and policy, as well as domestic systems of discipline and justice. The captivity narratives which inform this work are from the period beginning in the mid-1750s and ending shortly before the American Revolution; these years witnessed arguably the most intense and widespread conflicts between First Nations and European powers than at any other time in the century. The narratives produced during this time reflect this heightened violence, and as such have long been dismissed as anti-Aboriginal propaganda or hyperbolic spectacles of violence meant to excite or elicit sympathy from the reading public. When considered in their colonial context, however, they become much more ambivalent documents.

The first chapter traces the moments of capture, or “forced contact,” throughout several narratives in an attempt to establish the economies of exchange and violence that circulate captive bodies even before they are taken into “Indian” hands. Chapter two examines the strategies of representation employed by the captives, including stereotypes and scenes of torture, and suggests that these methods implicate the British themselves in Indian savagery. Finally, the last chapter looks at the ways in which captives “go native,” despite the seeming lack of (willing) transculturation in the narratives as a whole.

The captivity narrative is frequently considered to be a uniquely North American form of writing that announced the emergence of American writing and subjectivity. This thesis argues instead that they must be considered within the context of British colonialism, and to a certain degree within the broader, global captivity genre. Only then can their role as conflicted accounts of aggressive European expansion be fully assessed.

Acknowledgments

I would like to first thank my supervisor, Peter Walmsley, for turning my attention to the remarkably captivating body of eighteenth-century captivity narratives, and for providing excellent support and direction in the writing of this thesis. To the other members of my committee, Daniel Coleman and Jacques Khalip, I extend my thanks for helping me along the way and, more importantly, providing me with some guidance for where my work can go from here. Given the profound sense of isolation that sets in while writing a thesis over the beautiful summer months, I would like to thank Phaniel Antwi for his solidarity in completing our tasks at hand. My friends and family were very patient in letting me talk both with and at them, and their support helped me know there was more to the world than myself and a glowing computer screen. I am also indebted to Pabineau First Nation and the North Shore District Tribal Council for their help and encouragement to continue with my studies, which gave me added (and much needed) incentive to finish my work. Finally, I would like to thank Laurie Bertram for her love and constant support, as well as her critical eye and sympathetic ear. I dedicate this work to my grandfather, George Richardson, who passed away before I could finish my thesis. Welálin.

The Site of the Struggle: Colonialism, Violence, and the Captive Body

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: <i>Forced Contact</i>	13
Chapter 2: <i>Strategies of Representation</i>	27
Chapter 3: <i>From Captive to Convert</i>	44
Conclusion: <i>Battle Scars</i>	61
Bibliography	63
 <i>List of Illustrations:</i>	
<i>Peter Williamson in the Dress of a Delaware Indian</i>	43

Introduction

The Captive Body and the Body of the Condemned

“[C]olonization, I repeat, dehumanizes even the most civilized man; [. . .] colonial activity, colonial enterprise, colonial conquest, which is based on contempt for the native and justified by that contempt, inevitably tends to change him who undertakes it; [. . .] the colonizer, [. . .] in order to ease his conscience gets into the habit of seeing the other man as *an animal*, accustoms himself to treating him like an animal, and tends objectively to transform *himself* into an animal. It is this result, this boomerang effect of colonization, that I wanted to point out.”

-Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*

While on a mapping expedition for the British army to “sound the lakes” around Detroit in 1763, during what would turn out to be the onset of the colonial war known as Pontiac’s Rebellion, 17-year-old Yorkshire-born Scotsman John Rutherford was captured by Ojibway people (or, as Rutherford knew them, and as they are still called in much of the United States, the Chippewa). After several months of captivity, Rutherford would escape and subsequently record his experience, which in turn would join the larger body of work collectively known as captivity narratives. Rutherford was but one of many British captives who wrote tales of suffering at the hands of non-European peoples throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. With a few notable exceptions, many of these texts remain remarkably under-studied, despite the vast amount of scholarly interest in the intersections of European colonialism and literature. Captivity narratives document moments, real and imagined, where European subjects lose control of the boundaries separating themselves from the Other, and become entangled in colonial violence. In altered ways, representations of captivity have existed continually to the present day; the videos of Western captives in places such as Iraq continue to provoke many of the same reactions that early narratives aimed to produce. The violence, or threat of violence, to the Western body still produces horror and outrage, and the experience of captivity still resonates in the cultural memories of Anglo-Europe and North America. Also like their predecessors, current representations of captivity call the imperial or interventionist actions of the nation-states involved into question and bear witness to the underlying violence of those actions.

I will be focusing on the captive British body, which becomes an important site in captivity narratives as it is inscribed with the violence of the contact zone in colonial North America. Other white bodies circulate throughout the narratives in a violent economy that threatens the integrity of the English self. These bodies are tortured, mutilated, dismembered, or marked in other ways by the Native people whose land is meant to be surrendered and whose presence is an obstacle to that possession. The struggle for land is carried out on the body of the captive. Michel Foucault argues in *Discipline and Punish* that in eighteenth-century European societies “the condemned man published his crime and the

justice that had been meted out to him by bearing them physically on his body” (Foucault 43). The body of the criminal becomes a site for the truth of his or her crime and a demonstration of the sovereign’s power. Truth and the exercise of power are thus united on the body of the condemned. The captive is thrust into a similar role as the condemned criminal; his or her body too becomes a site of truth and power. But whereas the criminal’s body demonstrates a judicial truth, the captive body presents what we can call a “colonial truth”; the captive must bear the anxieties of empire on his or her body. This “truth” is manifested in the various scenes depicting the torture of British bodies in the narratives and in the objectification and commodification of captives, or what Césaire has called the “thingification” that occurs in colonialism. Michelle Burnham notes that “[t]he body of the captive, exchanged as an unusual sort of commodity between two social and military antagonists, consequently told a history in which often contradictory economic, cultural, and religious signs were articulated” (11). These narratives show the stakes that are involved in getting white bodies into the colonies, and show that colonialism, to paraphrase Césaire once again, is brutalizing for both colonizer and colonized.

North American captivity narratives, which are perhaps simultaneously the most well-known and the most consistently misunderstood of captivity literatures, reflect the uneasy exchange between European and First Nations cultures while destabilizing British colonial hegemony. These texts provide valuable insight into the fears and tensions felt by British people at home and in North America over their constant expansion as an empire, and thus often undermine the commercial, military, and otherwise strategic aspirations of that empire. More specifically, they chronicle the creation of the “Indian” in European and Euroamerican consciousness through first-person testimony and narratives of trauma. While later discourse on Indians would mirror that of other settler societies by making the Indigenous presence benign or absent altogether, captivity narratives present the dangerous possibility of resistance and the erasure of a British self. Though the Native people that are represented are frequently depicted as cruel and incomprehensible savages, they still threaten the “imperial eye” of Britain by interrupting its gaze with an often menacing return. All too often, First Nations people are utterly benign or completely absent from imperial histories; as Vine Deloria Jr. observed in the late 1960s, “[o]ur foremost plight [as Native people] is our transparency” (9). In captivity, the European lacks mastery over the Indian, and is forced to face the anger and violence engendered by colonial policy and practice. There are no empty lands for the taking and no further expansion without repercussions.

These texts have a political importance for First Nations people. Critics in the past have rightfully condemned the ways in which Native peoples are portrayed in the narratives, but there are many important aspects that need to be explored. Roy Harvey Pearce writes that “[t]he Indian of the captivity narrative

was the consummate villain, the beast who hatcheted fathers, smashed the skulls of infants, and carried off mothers to make them into squaws" (*Savagism* 58). While this is partly true, this reading is reductive. As Homi Bhabha and others have shown, colonial discourse is ambivalent and unable to easily resolve the problem of "Others." Captivity narratives reflect this ambivalence by placing Europeans in the hands of Indians and thus upsetting the usual, though by no means stable, power relationships between colonizers and colonized. It is important to understand how and why this is done, and not be single-mindedly concerned with debunking the negative representations of Native people. As Terry Goldie notes, "Indigenous peoples in [white] literature are not a reflection of themselves but of the needs of the white culture which created that literature" (78), and this is certainly the case with captivity narratives. Understanding the context of colonization and the anxieties and traumas it inflicts on all people is more important than the reductive and dismissive reading of Pearce.

Captivity narratives are often considered too broad to be considered a single 'genre' per se, given the disparate contexts and authors; indeed, Linda Colley describes them as a "mode of writing rather than a genre" (*Captives* 13). Classifying the genre is an issue which I believe to be important to a broader study of captivity narratives, but which is perhaps too large to be sufficiently addressed in my more focused discussion of specific narratives. For the present it is important to note that captivity narratives, while perhaps occupying several genres in and of themselves, share a number of specific elements. Most predominant among their shared attributes, of course, is the captivity itself, when the European, usually British subject, is taken into the possession of a foreign culture. I will be focusing on captivities that involve North American Aboriginal peoples capturing British colonists, soldiers, and travelers in the eighteenth century; these so-called "American" captivity narratives are also a diverse group of texts, and they continually changed over time depending on various political, cultural, and religious circumstances. However, an important shared structural element is that the author, or captive, always escapes or is released in some form from his or her temporary masters. David R. Sewell notes that the notion of a narrative documenting a captive who is completely absorbed into Aboriginal society or "transculturated" is "conceptually impossible" and a "contradiction in terms"; he argues that "the very form of the captivity narratives requires a point of view that makes the languages unequal; the movement of the genre is a descent *down into* the primitive and *back up* into the discourse of civilization" (53). As I will discuss later, the act of writing itself signifies this escape from the savage

orality and illiteracy of the “Indians,”¹ and a return to the stable position of European author.

These texts chronicle profoundly traumatic and disorienting experiences in which British bodies risk becoming Indian bodies; there are few examples of colonial literatures in the eighteenth century that so anxiously and urgently address the dangers of British expansion. Colley argues that Britons felt an almost pathological fear over their own smallness in both numbers and geographic area throughout their empire’s growth during the eighteenth century and experiences of captivity reflect this anxiety (*Captives* 4). Colley goes so far as to suggest that “[c]aptives and captivities were the underbelly of British empire” (4). I am more concerned with the specific experience of North American captivity and the ways in which the narratives construct and undermine British subjectivity under the gaze of First Nations people. Furthermore, as I have already stated, I will address to what extent the struggles over land and resources are played out in the economy of captives, or “body trade”; what it means when a European body is made into an object or commodity in the hands of a savage Other; how the boundaries between Self and Other become compromised or enforced in captivity narratives; whether there is a similar experience between captivity and colonization that calls the colonial enterprise into question; and finally, what specific role First Nations people played in the colonial discourse of the day, based upon these ambivalent accounts.

Captivity narratives from North America have long been subsumed under the umbrella of American history and have been largely read as either the beginning of a new, distinctly American literature, or as an expression of a unique spiritual and cultural sensibility. These readings have a deep history going back for at least a century; Gary L. Ebersole notes that “[s]cholars have long noted the importance of the captivity narrative in American literary history and its crucial role in initiating an American literature” (9). Indeed, Roy Harvey Pearce writes in his 1947 article “The Significances of the Captivity Narrative” that “[t]he narrative of Indian captivity has long been recognized for its usefulness in the study of our history and, moreover, has even achieved a kind of literary status” (1). Pearce somewhat downplays the actual importance of the narratives in creating a new kind of writing, arguing instead that they allow contemporary scholars “to see more deeply and more clearly into popular American culture, popular American issues, and popular American tastes” (20). They do not, he

¹ I will be using the term “Indians” throughout when discussing the Native people in the texts themselves; this is to emphasize their textuality and monolithic presence in the narratives. Furthermore, as Gerald Vizenor argues “[t]he word *Indian* [. . .] is a colonial enactment,” making the Indian “an occidental invention that became a bankable simulation” (11). If I am speaking of historical events outside the narratives, I will use more culturally appropriate language such as “First Nations” and “Aboriginal.”

maintains, allow us to learn more about the “Frontier mind” or how colonists felt about First Nations people. Though Pearce’s work is not unproblematic, he does demonstrate very early on that “American” captivity narratives do not form a single genre or point to one significance, but instead comprise a multitude of genres and significances. Ultimately, however, like many contemporary American scholars, Pearce does not question the place of captivity narratives as a kind of uniquely American writing. He would go on to write his most famous work, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*, without sufficiently bringing in the broader context of British colonialism. Though the work is certainly important in calling many canonical American writers to account for their depictions of Native peoples, Pearce lumps in early ethnographic and missionary writing into his reading of the “American mind” in such a way that is typical in dealing with seventeenth and eighteenth-century writing from colonial North America. He describes early-seventeenth-century writing in particular as coming from “Renaissance Englishmen who became Americans” (*Savagism* 3). Though I do not intend to discuss the emergence of a unique American culture or sensibility in any great detail, I do believe that statements such as this, despite the author’s best intentions, are symptomatic of the erasure of colonial violence in the Americas. By depicting early European inhabitants of North America as nothing more than settlers seeking to create a new and utterly distinct society, the presence of global imperialism is reduced or disavowed. There is a kind of inevitability of American national emergence read into early encounters that is both anachronistic and troubling for First Nations people (who were, incidentally, known as “Americans” in European writing throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries). As such, I am writing against this American exceptionalism and its tendency to separate the formation of American identity from the larger context of British colonialism.

Overview of Important Work in the Field

There has, of course, been an abundance of scholarship on captivity narratives since Pearce’s article and book were written, but, as Colley notes, the vast majority of this work “remains determinedly inward-looking,” as the narratives are “overwhelmingly scanned for the light they can throw on the evolution of *American* national identities and cultures” (*Captives* 140, author’s emphasis). This inwardness, as I have suggested, tends to obfuscate the colonial context from which these narratives emerged and miss the broader context of European expansionism. Joe Snader maintains that North American captivity tales fall “within a larger Anglophone tradition of captivity narratives that began with the earliest British ventures into alien seas, during the late sixteenth century” (1). Most of the work produced in the United States tends to ignore this fact and instead carries on the search for American origins within texts produced in a

colonial context where cultural independence is decidedly fraught. One of the more influential works in establishing captivity narratives as a defining national text is Richard Slotkin's *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (1973). Slotkin argues that "captivity narratives constitute the first coherent myth-literature developed in America for American audiences" (95). While they were undoubtedly popular in colonial North America, others have shown that there was a clear precedent for them, and they shared in various trans-Atlantic influences.² Though he is not unsympathetic to Aboriginal perspectives, Slotkin's work downplays the role of England in shaping culture and policy in colonial North America and instead focuses on the creation of myths by the settlers that would define the American experience. This mythic reading, as Joe Snader suggests, relies on a perceived structural unity to captivity narratives that is inaccurate (27). The narratives are not coherent enough to form a single myth to shape American identities, and they are not unique expressions of Puritan or other colonial American sentiments. Rather, they are a part of colonial discourse, and as such are ambivalent texts that require a careful and measured study. To place them solely in the realm of myth is both unfair and irresponsible to Aboriginal people, who are, after all, a substantial subject in the narratives. Placing them mythically, rather than understanding the narratives in more materialistic and historically grounded ways, continues the erasure and romanticization of First Nations cultures and peoples.

Gary L. Ebersole's 1995 work *Captured By Texts: Puritan to Postmodern Images of Indian Captivity* is a book that has some very useful scholarship, but it too is ultimately plagued by the same shortcomings of its earlier American predecessors. Ebersole, a historian of religions, poses the question, "How has the American Indian captivity narrative been used to explain the human condition?" (Ebersole, jacket). Though he gestures towards the "primitive-civilized dichotomy," he asserts that "the captivity tale has been viewed by both authors and readers primarily as a vehicle of moral improvement or spiritual instruction" (12). Ebersole does note that "[w]e do not have any texts that present in detail the perspective of Native Americans on the abduction of whites" (13), but he does not include any consideration of British colonialism or contemporary postcolonial thought. While it may not be Ebersole's goal to address the colonial context of these narratives, since he is focusing on the moral and religious elements, this wider context would enrich his work and point to the broader significance of his readings. Instead he participates in the long standing tradition of glossing over the significance of depictions of Native people in captivity narratives and the colonial struggle for land and resources.

² See Snader, Burnham, Colley, whose work I discuss in some detail, as well as Nancy Armstrong, "Captivity and Cultural Capital in the English Novel" and Paul Baepler, "The Barbary Captivity Narrative in American Culture."

Snader's *Caught Between Worlds*, one of several book-length studies of captivity produced over the last decade or so, is perhaps the most forceful voice in arguing for the broader, distinctly British context of captivity narratives. He analyses many of the texts from British subjects who found their way into foreign hands all around the world, while placing them into what he defines as the "Anglophone tradition." Snader's work is very useful, but he does not focus on the specific position of First Nations people in the British tradition. His focus is, instead, on the whole concept of captivity as dealt with in English writing in both "fact" and "fiction," without paying sufficient attention to some of the specific colonial contexts on which the narratives depend.

Michelle Burnham's 1997 book *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature 1682-1861* is another work that provides a very useful contribution to captivity scholarship. Burnham focuses specifically on texts that contain the figure of the female captive and examines the ways in which that figure evokes sympathy and sentimentalism. Though her title seems to suggest that she, like many American literary historians, glosses over the colonial process, Burnham in fact attempts to reassess this position "by situating captivity literature within its intercultural context and by establishing its affectivity as a function of that context" (4). She notes that this is necessary since "exceptionalist narratives of American literature and culture have historically obscured their colonialist origins and the production of cultural difference within them" (4). Burnham attempts to show the exchange between colony and metropolis as well as between European and Indigenous people, but her focus is exclusively on the more popular narratives by or about captive women.

Linda Colley has offered perhaps what amounts to the most valuable, or at least the most historically grounded, contribution to the area of captivity narrative scholarship. Her book *Captives* chronicles the experiences of British captives in the Mediterranean, North America, and India, all the while providing valuable historical context which shows British imperial interests in the region. Colley also shows the relationships between domestic Britons and those abroad as colonists, soldiers, traders, and the like, and discusses how the narratives were received among both populations. She argues that captivity narratives "usefully disrupt the notion that there was ever a single identifiable British, still less 'European' perspective on the non-European world, any more, of course, than there was on anything else" (15). Colley argues that these texts are particularly useful because they generally do not come from "the slender basis of testimonies by a few conspicuous actors in positions of power or notoriety," but instead from "rather different people who always made up the majority of British imperial

personnel in fact" (15-16).³ Ultimately, however, "irrespective of the social status and sentiments of their authors, captivity narratives were *always* disturbing texts at some level simply by virtue of what they described" (16, author's emphasis). Despite their popularity, the narratives anxiously presented the dangers of empire by inscribing them on English bodies and demonstrated the real costs of unchecked expansion.

Principles of Selection

Narratives of North American captivity have themselves been captured by the American canon, in particular the Puritan narratives from New England written during the late-seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. These Puritan accounts have been privileged over later narratives for their supposed spiritual element and continue to dominate the study of captivity narratives. Predominant among these is Mary Rowlandson's *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, which was published in Massachusetts and London in 1682 and frequently reprinted since that time (*Captives* 148). Rowlandson's narrative is generally regarded as the foundational text of the "American" captivity tradition, and her writing, along with several others by Puritans from New England, is the most widely studied of captivity narratives in the United States. Indeed, Rowlandson's text is among the most studied and written about of all colonial writings in America (Sayre 258). As such, I will not be discussing it or any of the other Puritan narratives. I will focus instead on the neglected narratives from the mid-eighteenth century that continue to be ignored or dismissed in contemporary scholarship.

There is a longstanding notion that later narratives are a more commodified form; Pearce insists that "[t]he first, and greatest, of the captivity narratives are simple, direct religious documents," whereas in the later narratives, "the propagandist value [. . .] became more and more apparent" ("Significances," 2-3). Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, in their influential collection of narratives *Puritans Among the Indians*, maintain that later captivity narratives of the eighteenth century evolved into "ornate and often fictionalized accounts that catered to more secular and less serious tastes" (3). While it is undoubtedly true that later narratives are for the most part more secular, why they are "less serious" or appealed to different tastes is unclear. It is perhaps the case that they are understudied because they cannot be reconciled with the generic demands established by Puritan narratives and the scholarship established around them. In

³ At the same time, we must remember the words of Césaire: "the decisive actors here are the adventurer and the pirate, the wholesale grocer and the ship owner, the gold digger and the merchant, appetite and force, and behind them, the baleful shadow of a form of civilization which [. . .] finds itself obliged, for internal reasons, to extend to a world scale the competition of its antagonistic economies" (11).

fact, they disrupt many common assertions about the captivity tradition in North America and more forcefully articulate the violent ends of colonial domination.

I will read captivity narratives as being a part of colonial discourse; though the narratives may arguably be too disparate to compose a genre as such, they do, by definition, share a context of colonial encounter. I will be focussing primarily on narratives written between the mid-1750s and 1774. It is this time period when the tensions and struggles for land had reached perhaps a level of intensity higher than at any other time in eighteenth-century North America; colonial wars ravaged the land for much of this period. The French and Indian War, also known as the Seven Year's War, (1754-1763) and Pontiac's Rebellion (1763-1766) created a seemingly endless and unwinnable British war with both First Nations people and the French who supposedly controlled them. I am not including any post-Revolutionary narratives of captivity; they fulfilled a different ideological function than those produced earlier, and in many ways they go to even greater lengths to disavow their own colonial context by emphasizing American differences from the British and claiming a unique cultural identification with the land. Most of the narratives I have selected come from British soldiers and colonists during or immediately preceding and following the conflicts above. It was during this period, after 1750, that texts depicting North American captivity were most widely read in Great Britain. Though there were some narratives that saw success prior to this period, they were generally more singular and not *en masse*. Rowlandson's narrative was one such early success, as were those of Quakers Elizabeth Hanson and Jonathan Dickinson. Colley notes that for the most part, however, captivity narratives were most widely read in the colonies prior to 1750, and were only read in Britain "intermittently" prior to this time (*Captives* 151).

The most substantial narratives which I will include in my discussion range in length and place of publication (Britain or the colonies), but they are written exclusively by men who self-identified as British, whether they were born in Britain or not. Indeed, as Philip D. Morgan suggests, "[f]or exiles, Britishness became a reality abroad in ways it never did at home" (45). The reason I am using only male authors is primarily due to the reasons above-- the nature of the field of study, the previous privileging of spiritual captivity narratives, and other problems inherent with the American approach. Elizabeth Denlinger notes that the assumption in the vast majority of captivity scholarship is that "the protagonist [is] typically a female captive who figures the vulnerability of the colonists, and whose rescue prefigures their eventual victory over both the land and its original inhabitants" (392). The later, male narratives of my study contradict this assumption, which is, as I have already suggested, perhaps why they have been dismissed as a lesser form. The captives in these narratives are mostly strong young men actively involved in some aspect of the colonial enterprise, whether as soldiers, traders, or new settlers. Their bodies, so

important in producing labour and military force to the British empire, are taken and used by Indians or, worse, taken apart and discarded. The captives whose narratives will be discussed include ones written by William Fleming, a 20-year-old Scottish settler; Robert Eastburn, a tradesman on his way to work at an English fort; Thomas Brown, a young soldier born in the colonies and recently enlisted in the army; Charles Saunders, a trader and entrepreneur; Henry Grace, a career English soldier; Peter Williamson, a recently liberated indentured servant who was kidnapped in Scotland as a boy; and John Rutherford, a young man working for both a trading company and the British military. All these men represent aspects of the colonial venture, but are not necessarily those who controlled policy or held powerful positions in the government and trade organizations. They are, as Colley describes above, the “majority of British imperial personnel”; she notes that though captives were undoubtedly writing about their misery at the hands of non-Europeans, they “also felt constrained and subordinated by their own society of origin, and wrote accordingly” (16). Many experienced abjection well before their captivities, and they would continue to experience it long after.

Outline

In chapter one I will discuss the specific points of forced contact in the narratives; that is, I will discuss the moments and locations in the texts where British bodies are captured and subjected to the often overwhelming experience of captivity. I will argue that these points represent a rupture in colonial claims of knowledge and ownership over the land and peoples of North America. It is often the case that both captive and Indian are involved in implicit and explicit struggles over land and position at the moment of ‘forced contact.’ In Rutherford’s *Narrative of a Captivity*, for example, he is seized while on a “pleasure jaunt” to map the land with army officers. Despite a warning from a group of “Canadians” that some Indians “were waiting six miles up the river to seize and destroy us,” Rutherford and his party continue on their voyage and are violently attacked (223-225). The imperial gaze is thus disrupted and the will to knowledge is deferred. Henry Grace, in his *History of the Life and Sufferings*, is seized while guarding the “[m]en that were mowing Wheat,” and is forced back to a Mi’kmaq village. The use of the land is therefore not an inalienable right for the British colonizers but something which must be guarded and can even be taken away. Indeed, in William Gatenby’s *A Full and Particular Account of the Sufferings*, his wife and daughter are kidnapped from his newly purchased and “cultivated” homestead, and the Indians “wrecked their fury” on his property “[a]s if my little estate had offended them” (4). These contact zones, then, contest imperial claims of ownership and return their assertions violently.

Chapter two will focus on the depictions and othering of Aboriginal men and women in the narratives, and the ethnographic descriptions that frequently appear throughout. I will discuss the stereotypes encountered in captivity narratives, such as the rampant drunkenness and cruelty of the Indians (the former generally leads to the latter), as well as the frequently occurring practices of scalping and dancing. As Homi Bhabha observes, “[t]he objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types [...] in order to justify conquest” (70). The captive tries to reassert colonial hegemony through a radical othering, but ultimately fails because of the inherent ambivalence of stereotypes (the stereotype, according to Bhabha, represents both “phobia” and “fetish,” so that a colonized subject can be created who is both ‘Other,’ yet “entirely knowable and visible” [71]) . Charles Saunders vividly, almost pornographically describes numerous acts of violence in *The Horrid Cruelty of the Indians*, including one instance when they seize a captive and “cut him across the belly with a scalping Knife by which his bowels came out” (8). Grace notes several times where the Indians “drank to such a Degree, that they were all stark staring mad” (21). But Native women play an interesting role in many captivities that counters this “savagery.” Though they are frequently condemned for their “immodest gestures” and propensity to drink alcohol, it is often the “squaws” who interject on the captives’ behalf, shielding them from the bloodthirsty men when they are out to kill “English dog[s]” (Rutherford 228). Grace discusses one such occasion in which “had it not been for the Kindness of the Squaws we must have been all killed” (22). Rutherford is similarly saved when his “Master’s wife, seeing the danger I was in [. . .] made me lie down behind her and covered me with skin and furs” (228), while Robert Eastburn records in *A Faithful Narrative* that “the Squaws were kind to us” (18). Indeed the captives, as Rutherford and Grace experience, are often relegated to the company and care of women, helping with cooking, chopping wood, and other ‘domestic’ chores. The task of constructing “degenerate types” is thus profoundly ambivalent, and the claims to ethnographic authority are undermined by the author/captive’s frequent descent into stereotypes and depictions of unspeakable violence to their bodies and those of the Europeans around them.

Finally, in chapter three I will focus on the instances of “going native” and other moments of complicity, ambivalence, and resistance by the captives. Grace’s captors make him dance with them, and he “took a great deal of Pains to do as they did” (15). Eastburn continually refuses the demand to dance throughout his narrative, despite threats of bodily harm, but does shave his beard to appease his tormentors (17). Rutherford is adopted and renamed “Addick” by his master’s family, who he thereafter refers to as his “father”, “mother” and “three brothers” (243). Despite his claim that they grow very fond of him, they sell him. He does find his way back into the “family,” however, only to escape soon after. While fleeing, he must hide in the woods and cover what he calls “the

whiteness of my skin” by rubbing his body “with black moss and mire” (266). Peter Williamson, who wrote several editions of his narrative that changed drastically over time, accounts that when he finds his way to a colonial homestead, the family “took me to be an Indian” and almost kill him (1796 edition, 15). The captives frequently transgress the bounds of racial difference, which often results in paranoid reassertions of their English identities. This cannot prevent, however, the destabilization of Self and Other, and the forbidden allure of 'going native.'

Chapter 1

Forced Contact

“But then I ask the following question: has colonization really placed *civilizations in contact*? Or, if you prefer, of all the ways of *establishing contact*, was it the best?

I answer *no*.”

-Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism*

An essential element to these texts is the precise moment of encounter between the European body and its Other; I have named this point “forced contact” in order to relate it to broader European zones of contact with Aboriginal peoples, to unsettle notions of “first contact” that privilege Eurocentric perspectives, and to emphasize the violence of colonial encounters in the eighteenth century. Forced contact frequently appears when there is an implicit struggle for land, resources, and knowledge. It is a trope that is opposed to first contact, where the European narrator holds a stable and fixed position over the unknown but wholly knowable Other; forced contact, by contrast, destabilizes power relations and the division of Self and Other, colonizer and colonized. English subjects are thrust into the violence of colonial struggle, and their bodies become objects for Indian use and exchange. As we shall see, their bodies frequently become commodified or objectified even before they enter the Native economies and tribes. This process often precipitates forced contact, making it an almost inevitable experience that is in part a physical manifestation of existing social inequalities.

Mary Louise Pratt’s notion of the “contact zone” is useful in discussing captivity narratives and forced contact. In *Imperial Eyes*, Pratt describes the “contact zone” as “the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict” (6). Her use of the word “contact” aims to “foreground the interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters so easily ignored or suppressed by diffusionist accounts of conquest and domination” (7). Pratt stresses the importance of interactions between subjects, and looks at them “not in terms of separateness or apartheid, but in terms of copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power” (7). In the case of forced contact, these “asymmetrical relations of power” are still present, but it is the European who feels their weight. Pratt maintains nonetheless that “captivity narrative traditionally constituted a safe context in which to narrate the terrors of the contact zone because the story is told by a survivor who has returned, reaffirming European and colonial social orders” (185). In contrast, Colley argues that “it is

emphatically not the case, as has sometimes been suggested, that captivity narratives were comprehensively 'safe' texts that only corroborated pre-existing and dismissive European viewpoints about other societies" (Colley 15). In one sense, the very existence of the narratives makes them already a safe form in which the act of writing contains the threat of the Indigenous Other. Sewell argues that "[b]y describing and interpreting the experience of captivity, the captive reverses after the fact the 'natural' power relations between 'savage' and 'civilized' that imprisonment has temporarily reversed" (42). Writing or representing the Other allows the captive to regain her or his preferred sense of self and order, though I do side with Colley in stressing the real traumas experienced and described in the texts.

The figure of writing itself occurs frequently in colonial discourse surrounding both First Nations and African peoples and is particularly important to the identity of the European captive. Native people are often figured in terms of orality in captivity narratives, and their presence is marked by sound. Their skill in rhetoric was widely documented in European sources; Alexander Kellet notes in his "Letter from North America, Concerning the Indians" (1778), "[w]ithout doubt, you must have heard, Sir, of the rhetoric of the Indians, and seen probably some of their pretended orations" (Kellet 27). Kellet, however, discounts this notion, and claims that "they are not, nor can be eloquent; for their ideas are few, and their language is unpleasingly guttural, and extraordinarily barren" (27). Yet, William Henry, a captive whose account was excerpted in *The London Chronicle* in 1768, writes that "eloquence [is] an art [. . .] carried much higher among these Savages than it is now in any part of Europe, as it is their only polite art" (vol. XXXIII, no. 1798). Thus the Indians of the captivity narratives, despite their capacity for oratory, are marked for exclusion by the written word, and the "terrors of the contact zone" are partially contained.

The Preexisting Economy

Even before they are captured, captives are involved in a cycle of exchange in which their bodies are circulated amongst various interests. This is in part the nature of colonialism, since white bodies, or simply non-indigenous bodies, are necessary in peripheral spaces to mark and enforce Empire. John Rutherford, Henry Grace, and Peter Williamson are very good examples of this, as I will discuss below, but they are certainly not the only ones who are caught up in an economy of bodies before they are ultimately captured and commodified. Charles Saunders, "employ'd by several Companies of Merchants," sails goods between colonies at great personal risk; Gamaliel Smethurst goes to Acadia to establish fisheries and a trade with the French for the British colonial administration after "the taking of Canada"; Robert Eastburn is a tradesman working on British forts, who is willing to "serve my King and Country" by

risking his life for others; and Briton Hammon is a black slave, owned by a British general, who notes that he will not emphasize his bodily suffering in his narrative since his “[c]apacities and Condition of Life are very low” (3). All these men are in positions where they must sacrifice their bodies in one way or another, and they are all involved explicitly in the colonial economy. The extent to which captives’ bodies become entangled as agents and victims of Empire before they are captured will become clear in looking at the following narratives.

John Rutherford

John Rutherford’s captivity is emblematic of the layered events that comprised North American colonialism in the eighteenth century, and as such it is worth discussing how this bewildered seventeen-year-old came to be caught up in colonial struggle. Much of this background comes from sources outside the narrative, but it effectively shows the economy that is in place before the moment of capture. Rutherford was born in Yorkshire in 1746, but was orphaned as an infant and raised by his grandfather, Sir John Rutherford, in Scotland (Rutherford xxix). When he was sixteen he was sent to New York, to the care of an uncle who was a soldier and a successful partner in a trading company, thanks to a generous land grant of 10,000 acres obtained through General Jeffrey Amherst (xxviii). Amherst is well-known for, among other military accomplishments, his desire to infect Aboriginal people with smallpox through gift blankets. Captain Walter Rutherford, the uncle of the teenaged John, sent his nephew to work under the Superintendent of his trading company, located in Detroit. The young man is thus thrust into the midst of British colonial interests, and becomes involved, however indirectly, in both the bureaucratic administration and the violent enforcement of colonialism. His body, already traded between family members and friends, has acquired significant symbolic value, and is needed for the British Empire to mark its presence and promote its interests.

Rutherford arrived in Detroit very shortly after the French and Indian War, which was the North American offshoot (and the American name) of the Seven Years’ War in Europe. With the defeat of the French the Native people around the Great Lakes and Ohio were left with the English as the primary European presence, as the French were forced out of the territory or made into British subjects (Rutherford xxi). As the English began to take over the French forts and outposts beginning in 1760, Milton Quaife notes that “British traders swarmed over the country, eager to exploit the Indian trade” (Rutherford xxi-xxii). This transition between competing colonial forces, unsurprisingly, did not work in favour of the Indigenous populations. The aforementioned General Amherst was an unsympathetic administrator who refused gift exchanges with Native people on the basis that it constituted “bribery” (White 183). This refusal to exchange gifts was both insulting and threatening to the established way of life that Native

people had grown accustomed to with the French. It also points to the unstable nature of trade in contact zones generally, which I will discuss below. In light of these changes in British policy, there was a mounting tension upon Rutherford's arrival; his timing was at a very significant juncture in the history of colonialism in North America, and he would soon both bear witness and become entangled in the single largest anti-colonial campaign ever waged by First Nations people.

Rutherford's narrative begins with the orders of Major Gladwin, who is "desirous to know whether the lakes and rivers between that place and Michilimackinac were navigable for vessels of a greater burden than the small bateaux they made use of" (219). If there is room for larger ships, the British outposts "might be more conveniently and expeditiously supplied with provisions and military stores" (219). This knowledge of the land is meant to expand British control and mastery over the area, and the explicit mention of military supplies invokes the violence of this mastery. Gladwin thus sends Lieutenant Charles Robertson along with six soldiers and two sailors to "sound the lakes." They are accompanied by Sir Robert Davers and his "Panee or Indian slave"; Davers' reason for attending is nothing more than a "curiosity to see farther into the country" (219). Davers and Robertson invite Rutherford on the expedition which, as Rutherford writes, "had all the appearance of a pleasure jaunt" (220). Pratt describes "the strategies of representation whereby European bourgeois subjects seek to secure their innocence in the same moment as they assert European hegemony" as a kind of "anti-conquest" (Pratt 7). This strategy is at play here, as the military mapping expedition is portrayed as a harmless foray into the surrounding rivers and countryside. Rutherford writes that they plan to hunt the abundant water fowl for sport, "not in the smallest degree dreading any interruption from the savages around us, who but a little before in full council had renewed their profession of friendship for the English and received from them presents to a considerable amount" (220). However, trade is an unstable space, an uncertain exchange that can mask and engender violence in the contact zone.

Sir Robert Davers is an interesting figure both in the narrative and historically, since his supposed reason for being at Detroit in the first place was a driving curiosity to see and know the lands and people of North America. He was born around 1735, probably near Bury St. Edmunds, England, and in 1742 he would inherit the title of 5th baronet of Rushbrook. He came to North America in 1761, after extensive travels throughout Europe. Anne Grant's *Memoirs of an American Lady* contains an account of Davers, claiming he fled a family affliction of melancholy, manifested by a "hypochondriac disorder" that led his older brothers to commit suicide (qtd. in Rutherford 221). Other accounts note that his mother was also afflicted with depression, surely not helping his situation at home; Harry Kelsey quotes one unnamed writer who maintains that Davers "left England in a pique careless what his fate might be, and visited America seeking the most savage and uncultivated spots" (*Dictionary of Canadian Biography*

Online). In Grant's account, Davers chose to live amongst the Native people of North America because they were unfamiliar with the practice of "self-destruction" (qtd. in Rutherford 221). In either case, he hopes to "go native" in the hopes of shedding his potentially dangerous Europeanness. However, his melancholy apparently did not abate and, following Sir William Johnson's advice, he sought out the Huron to join their tribe (221). He appropriated their "native dress and manners" and lived with them for two years, writing to friends at the time that his melancholy had ceased (221). He planned on returning home to England, safe in the belief that should his malady return he could rejoin the Hurons. It is at this point in his strange life that Davers enters Rutherford's account.

Davers is an unstable figure; despite his hereditary title, his psychological inheritance forces him to join the ranks of savagery. Like Rutherford and other Europeans that fill captivity accounts, he is an outcast body, but he is even further from the metropolis than most. Though Rutherford notes that Davers spent the previous winter at Detroit amongst the English, he adds parenthetically that this is "excepting some little excursions he made among the Indian villages in the neighborhood" (219). On the mapping expedition, Davers rides separately from the other British people, in a "little wooden canoe" that allows him and "his boy" to "cross the lakes and go up the creeks, among the Indian villages" (220). He and the boy ride ahead of the expedition, and Rutherford and company find him smoking a "pipe of friendship" with some chiefs (224). Thus, despite his title, Davers is a liminal figure who occupies the margins of identity. He is continually associated with the Indians, but seems to possess a kind of mobility that allows him to traverse between cultures. His canoe is "easily navigated," allowing him to go from Detroit to the outlying Indian lands. It is when he is living among the Huron that the disease of his bloodline abates, suggesting he has "gone Native," and yet he still possesses an Indian slave boy to mark himself as a privileged European.

Trade continues to be an uncertain yet inevitable site throughout, and two days into the expedition, Rutherford writes that they "overtook a canoe with an Indian family in it" and "exchanged our bread and tobacco with them for fish newly caught and parted very good friends" (222). Though they depart on good terms, there is an ambivalence in the account; to suggest that they "overtook" the family implies pursuit and an unequal power relation. Both accounts of relations with the Indians to this point revolve around exchange, pointing to the British belief that a commodified relationship with native populations across the empire is a stable one. Attempts to engage populations in trade occur throughout British travel accounts and colonial literature, but trade is an ambivalent site. It is, on the one hand, one of the "strategies of innocence" that Pratt labels as "anti-conquest"; it frequently appears as the benign outcome of contact with indigenous cultures and is represented as mutually beneficial to both cultures (and, to be sure, to a

certain extent it very frequently does serve the interests of both parties). At the same time, it is, like Homi Bhabha's colonial mimicry, a practice that constantly produces its own slippage. Trade is beneficial in that it can form friendships and alliances with native populations, and create markets for European goods, yet trade is also the cause, and often site, of violent encounters. As Emma Lewis Coleman writes in her distinctly dated 1925 work *New England Captives Carried to Canada*, "[t]he friendship between the Indians and whites [. . .] was doubtless based upon trade," and at the same time she observes a short while later that "the chief cause of our intercolonial trouble was commercial" (1). The foundation of contact between cultures is therefore also in this case the root of conflict.

The day following the exchange with the family, Rutherford notes that there are few Indians in their villages. Though the British assume at the time that they are out hunting, Rutherford points out in retrospect that they were "collected at the place where we were afterwards attacked by them" (222). Indeed, the following day they are warned by some "Canadians" that "all the nations of Indians around were in league to take up the hatchet against the English," and they were waiting to attack them upstream. Despite this warning, they continue on their way for a number of somewhat unclear reasons. Though he believes the Canadians "had our safety very much at heart," Rutherford also notes they try to dissuade the expedition using "all the rhetoric they were masters of" (222-3). The French Canadian settlers are thus linked to the Indians, as rhetoric was generally considered to be an area of Indian expertise among eighteenth-century Britons. Captain Robertson doubts them, though there is no reason given that the Canadians should lie. He believes also that "the English upon first acquaintance with Indians are generally too apt to conceive of their bravery, and [he] imagined they would not dare attack us till under cover of night" (223). As such, Robertson determines that they should forge on. Given the hindsight of the text, this can be read as a critique of supposed British knowledge over the actions of the Indians. As it turns out, their actions cannot be predicted, but are rather dangerous and unstable.

The expedition reaches the place where the Canadians warned them they were to be attacked, and Captain Robertson discovers "the truth of the information we had got, for the whole bank of the river was covered with Indians to the amount of three or four hundred" (224). This teeming mass of savage humanity threatens to utterly destroy the small group of Englishmen; Sir Robert Davers, on shore smoking a "pipe of friendship," urges them to keep rowing and pretend not to suspect anything. Rutherford gloomily notes that "the Indians could walk faster than we could row" (224). They are impotent, seeing that the Indians are ready in their canoes to pursue them if they choose to flee. The Indians give the expedition "the friendly appellation of Brothers, telling us they were glad to see us, and begging us to come ashore and we should have whatever was good, the squaws or Indian women showing us fish, maple sugar, &c, in

order to induce us to land" (225). There is a menace underlying Indian promises of friendship, a barely concealed threat of violence that can erupt at any time. The site of trade is again dangerous; the offers of trade are set up as a distraction, and the men file away to carry out the attack. The women, Rutherford writes, attempt "to divert our attention by ridiculous stories and immodest gestures" (225). The description is vague, making it difficult to ascertain exactly what these stories and gestures may entail, but it seems clear enough that they are sexually suggestive. Despite the fact that they are apparently aware of the designs of the Indians, the English soon find themselves in front of the "squaws", who run away "as fast as they could" (225). Though it is discounted by the text, the English appear to be lured in by the overt sexuality of the women. The women successfully obscure the Indian men behind them, so that the English cannot tell what they were doing; this points to the potentially dangerous sensuality of Indian women, who lure the English like Sirens to a brutal encounter.

As soon as the women flee, the "warriors" fire on the English, wounding Captain Robertson who, after telling his men to "sheer off," is killed by a second shot. Two other soldiers are killed, and Rutherford and the five remaining men are unable to steer the boat under the incoming volley of shots. The Indians, seeing the confusion of the English, board the boat and "according to their custom upon such occasions, making the most dreadful cries and yellings, what they call the *death hollow*" (226). Instances of this cry, often referred to as a "whoop" or "war cry," are peppered throughout English accounts of various tribes in North America. There is an obsessive fear of this sound, which is the ultimate vocalization of savagery. It is a recurring trope in captivity narratives, often preceding the moment of forced contact and declaring that a captivity is to follow. It is sound and orality, as I have suggested, that identifies the Indian presence. Samuel Johnson noted in one of his essays for *The Idler* that, among British soldiers fighting in North America,

fear is received by the ear as well as the eyes, and the *Indian* war-cry is represented as too dreadful to be endured; as a sound that will force the bravest veteran to drop his weapon, and desert his rank; that will deafen his ear, and chill his breast; that will neither suffer him to hear orders or to feel shame, or retain any sensibility but the dread of death. (Johnson 32)

He observes, "[t]hat the savage clamours of naked barbarians should thus terrify troops disciplined to war, and ranged in array with arms in their hands, is surely strange," but concludes that "this is no time to reason" (32). Instead, Johnson suggests sardonically that soldiers can be prepared to deal with the "howl of the *Americans*" if "a noise might be procured equally horrid with the war-cry"; this can be created with "a proper mixture of asses, bulls, turkeys, geese, and tragedians" (32-33). Henry Grace is one such soldier who is paralysed by fear at the sound of the Indians, writing that "their Voices are so sharp, shrill, loud and

deep, that when they join together after one has made his Cry, it makes a most dreadful horrible Noise, that stupifies the very Senses" (12).

Rutherford observes that the Indians "had changed their dress from what it was when they spoke to us as brothers, having at that time their blankets and ornaments on, whereas now they were naked and painted black and red, making a very frightful appearance"(226). This physical transformation unveils the naked aggression of the Indians, the sheer otherness contained underneath their ornamentation. But it points to a fluidity, suggesting that they occupy, or at least can play, two different roles: "as brothers" and as cruel masters. Rutherford writes that "[e]very one of us was seized by our future master" (226). Finally, the captivity occurs, and it is "by their custom whoever first seizes a captive by his hair, to him he belongs, and none may take him from him" (226). Rutherford himself is "laid hold of by one whose hideous appearance was enough to have banished any hope of obtaining quarter," even though he has already "given up all hope of being saved, and became in a manner resigned to the worst" (226-7). It is at this precise moment in the text that the surviving Englishmen become Indian possessions, casualties of Pontiac's War to reclaim First Nations' land. They become embroiled in colonial resistance and are held as symbols of English treachery and theft and of the expanding appropriation of Native land. Before the captives are taken anywhere, the Indians scalp Captain Robertson and the two dead soldiers. They strip them of all their clothing as well, thus enacting a violent exchange for English commodities that leaves the bodies as valueless objects. The first sight of scalping is always the shocking moment of brutality that commodifies and quantifies English deaths. It objectifies English bodies in a way that threatens to destabilize the whole colonial enterprise of North America. Scalping is synonymous with Indians in literature, and is a trope that I will encounter and unpack throughout this work. Though it appears as perhaps the quintessential act of savagery, there are frequent mentions of European complicity in the action, and some captives even come to practice it themselves.

Immediately following the stripping and scalping of the corpses, Rutherford begins to refer to his captor as "my Master"; he is resigned to his new role as slave to a savage. He is dragged by his hair from the boat, through the water, and onto land where he is bound "with a rope adorned with trinkets" and delivered to the charge of his Master's "squaw" (227). He is unceremoniously thrust into a new world, bound in trinkets like an object of trade. Rutherford enters another new and dangerous economy, but, unlike his uncle's trading company, the Indians set the stakes. In this case, these stakes are nothing less than the very right to possess colonial lands.

While Rutherford is exchanged for the first time, Sir Robert Davers tries to escape in his boat as the Indians yell to him that they will not harm him if he surrenders. He does not listen, and tries to paddle away, forcing them to shoot him. His body plunges into the river, where they retrieve it, bring it on shore, and

promptly cut off his head and bury his body. After they scalp the head, they bury it separately. Thus ends the relatively short (he was roughly 28) but eventful life of Sir Robert. His melancholy can be said to have been exorcized, though his was, like his brothers before him, a suicide of sorts. There is something of the tragic in Davers' story, which presents a man who cannot find a people to be amongst until he is literally divided in two; one half becomes object or token, the other the headless body of a gentleman. In a separate account, Davers is boiled and eaten, which is somehow more redeeming since he is at last fully incorporated into a society. In Rutherford, however, Davers is the stand-in for English colonialism, divided between old world stability and new world fluidity. They do not eat him, and he becomes forever split in the ground.

Rutherford is soon taken back to the village and to his Master's hut. Shortly afterward, he claims, "a great many Indians came in and got drunk upon some shrub they had got as part of the plunder." He believes he is in grave danger because he "knew that in their cups they often killed one another" (228). Sure enough, Rutherford writes of a striking moment when "[o]ne of them, dressed in Captain Robertson's clothes, came in very drunk and seeing me lying in a corner with my hands tied, gave a *hollow*, calling out *English dog*, and made a stroke at me with his tomahawk" (228). Captain Robertson has been appropriated by this menacing Indian; another account, contained in Anna Jameson's *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*, claims that one man "had seen an Indian have the skin of Captain Robertson's arm for a tobacco pouch" (Jameson 297). Robertson is fully consumed and commodified by the Indians, and it is fitting that they feast upon his body during a night of drinking and dancing. Unlike Davers, Robertson has been to this point a stable English officer with no apparent inklings toward savagery. But the Indians quite literally take apart this identity and show its unstable foundation. If the English body can be fully objectified and incorporated by Indians, how can a European maintain a stable identity in the face of such a threat?

Rutherford observes that the Indians do not perform cannibalism "for want of food," but rather as "a religious ceremony" (229). Colley notes that here Rutherford draws on "the greater reserves of knowledge about Native Americans that the war had allowed Britons like himself to acquire," and furthermore he is able "to recognise some of the nuances both of his captors' behaviour and his own" (193). His limitations for understanding are severely tested, however, when the next day his Master's son brings "some small pieces of the body to the hut" and roasts them on a stick. He tries to persuade Rutherford to eat it, assuring him "that *Englishmen's flesh was very good to eat*" (229). This would amount to Rutherford literally consuming his own humanity, and his Master understands this: "My Master requested me to taste it, telling me I was never to think of going back to the English and so ought to conform to the custom of the Indians" (229). But Rutherford cannot do it, and he pleads that he will do anything other than that

act of consumption. This occurs throughout captivity narratives, where captives insist in the texts upon their limitations despite the physical danger that comes with refusing such actions. It is a means to affirm their white identity in the face of its utter destruction. Rutherford boasts that “by a seeming readiness to obey him I avoided eating the body of my friend” (229). He therefore maintains a separation from the Indians by avoiding the ultimate savage practice of cannibalism; like Crusoe, Rutherford understands that consuming the body of another person is the mark of utter savagery which must always separate the civilized self from the degenerate Other. Yet later Rutherford writes that one of the other captives with whom he converses “told me he was obliged to eat of Captain Robertson’s body” (235). For some, then, survival will be bought at any cost or compromise to the self. Here we will leave Rutherford for now, balanced between obedient Indian slave and proud English soldier.

Henry Grace

The moment of forced contact in Henry Grace’s *The History of the Life and Sufferings* occurs at a similar point in the struggle for land and ownership. Grace begins his self-published narrative with a catalogue of misdeeds on his part as a youth and young man, admitting that while at Winchester College from 1740-1746 he “indulged [...] in Idleness, and keeping bad Company, neglected all the Advice of my Friends, and incurred the Displeasure of my Tutor, and the Hatred of my School-fellows” (4). Grace decides to enlist as a soldier, and does so “in the first Regiment that came to *Winchester*” (4). After various marches throughout England, the regiment is sent to Guernsey in the Channel Islands; they depart in the ship *True Love* with three weeks supply but they are caught up in a storm and lose sight of land for seven weeks. Grace laments that “[t]his was the first Fruits of following my own Will, in Opposition to the Advice of my Parents, and happy would it have been for me, had it been the last” (4). Like Crusoe, he is incapable of following parental advice, yet it is a constant source of grief that he cannot.

After a couple of years of domestic assignments, the regiment is ordered to Nova Scotia. They depart in June of 1750, and immediately encounter another terrible storm that scatters the ships. Grace and his ship wait out the weather in Cork, but once they finally set out “a worse Misfortune attended us, for we sprung a Leak under the Fore-Mast of our Vessel” (5). The crew has to constantly pump out the water until they finally reach Halifax on August 15th. Halifax offers dangers of its own, as Grace observes that it is “very dangerous to walk about in the Night, especially in wet Weather, because the Streets were so slippery and rough, and full of stumps” (6). He also describes several forts, containing “a Blockhouse in each, to put some small Pieces of Cannon in, to be used against the Indians” (6). Every turn he makes, it would seem, is fraught with a different peril.

Grace's account of his trip to North America frequently reads like travel writing or ethnography; he goes into varying degrees of detail describing the buildings, the flora and fauna (including the masses of "moskitoes" and black flies), and the land itself. He writes that "[a]ll round *Halifax* the Land is very bad, sandy and gravelly, and produces no Vegetables, but all Sorts of Timber both hard and soft" (6). Shegnecto, the land initially possessed by the French and Indians on Grace's arrival, by contrast "produces all Sorts of Grain, with less Trouble than in *England*, and there is no Occasion for Dung, the Soil is so good of itself" (7). Grace notes that "an English Fort is since erected there, which is called *Lawrence*, after the Name of the Commander of our Detachment" (7). His own complicity in this colonial struggle, hinted at through his commander's name, will become clear a short while later in his narrative.

Grace and his detachment march through several English forts, and he describes the land and resources throughout. His descriptions now read like those of a land surveyor, documenting the benefits and drawbacks of large tracts of land. From the Menas Fort, the soldiers "proceed to the taking of *Shegnecto*," where they are ordered to "drive the Indians out of their Intrenchments" (9). The land, which Grace earlier described as bountiful, is clearly a disputed site. But they succeed in taking it "without great Loss of Men," and Grace is put on guard to protect their new possession (9-10). The soldiers find there is little fresh meat to be had, until they discover some pigs and sheep that can be acquired with a great degree of danger. He explains that "[t]his Danger consisted of these two Circumstances: First, from the Indians, who constantly lay in Ambush to fire at us: And Secondly, from our own People; for if we were seen far from the Line [. . .] we run the hazard of being taken up for Deserters" (10). In the colonial encounter, the British must police themselves to ensure a stable divide from the Indians; they will violently enforce this division, pointing to the fear of losing one's self in the face of the dangerous Other.

After three weeks, Grace is sent to "guard the Men that were mowing Wheat" (10-11). He observes that the wheat is "much better there than in *Europe*, and makes whiter Bread" (11). It is his job to guard this valuable land and resource from the Indians, from whom they have recently taken it. Grace writes that he "had not been there half an Hour before I was surrounded by the Indians, who knocked me down and stunned me with one of their Tomahawks" (11). At this point in the text, at the moment of forced contact, he goes on to give a detailed description of the tomahawk and its many uses, in an attempt to relocate the imperial gaze back on the Indians. When Grace wakes up, or as he writes, "[comes] to myself again," an Indian tells him in English that many of the tribe speak the language and he "should have very good Quarters" (11). Grace takes this opportunity to again act as ethnographer, explaining that "[e]very Tribe and Nation have a different Language, yet there are some Words to be understood amongst them all" (11).

Grace decides that escape is impossible, and he follows the Indians through the woods for about twelve miles, "till we came to a little Light, which was in one of their Wiggwams or Huts where they live" (12). Again, Grace takes this moment to explain how the dwellings of the Indians are constructed, how long they live in them, and so forth. So far he has controlled the trauma of becoming an Indian possession by containing their technologies and bodies in his ethnography. The cry of savagery unsettles the colonist's sense of being as Grace enters the village to its horrible sound, which "stupefies the very senses" (13). He admits he is "ignorant what these Barbarians were going to do to me" (13). He is made to run between them, while they beat him with sticks, hands, and "any Thing they could lay their Hands on" (13). This running of the gauntlet is very common in captivity accounts, and indicates the moment of first entry into a tribe. Finally Grace reaches the seat of power, the "Chief Man's Wiggwam," where they begin "stripping me of every thing I had in the World, and then put me on my Knees close to a great Fire" (13). He is stripped of his commodities and made to lean by the fire until his skin "was burnt into Blisters." All the while they dance around him, threatening to kill him with gestures using their tomahawks, and pretending to scalp him. After this finally ends, they allow Grace to stand and give him "a Bridge Clout to cover my Nakedness" (14-15). He has been remade into an Indian, but he does not seem to be aware of it; they dress him in full Indian clothes, and they even give him a tomahawk to use. He is sent to chop wood with it, however, and he does so "with great Reluctance, but durst not refuse to do any thing they commanded me" (15). Thus, like Rutherford, Grace's initiation into Indian life occurs with great resistance, but occurs nonetheless. His attempt to control the stability of his English identity with constant ethnographic observation cannot prevent his own body being thrust into Indian hands and clothes.

Peter Williamson

Peter Williamson's *French and Indian Cruelty* was one of the most successful and widely-read captivity narratives in Britain, and it saw numerous editions between its initial publication in 1757 and Williamson's death in 1799. Colley suggests that "[i]f there was a popular British classic about Native Americans in this period, this was certainly it" (*Captives* 190). Each subsequent edition saw often drastic changes, but I have chosen to use the 1762 version for the same reason Michael Fry chose it for re-printing in the *Scottish Thought and Culture 1750-1800* series of memoirs; this edition proclaims that it contains "large improvements," and Fry notes that it is apparently the last edition that Williamson himself printed and sold (Williamson viii). As such, it "offers us an idea of the tastes of the reading public, since Williamson clearly meant to give it what it wanted" (viii). For Williamson, his brief captivity would shape the rest of his life and identity.

Williamson, like Rutherford, was circulated through various people before he found himself in the hands of the Indians. He was born in rural Scotland in 1730 to, as he writes, "if not of rich, yet of reputable parents, who supported me in the best manner they could, as long as they had the happiness of having me under their inspection" (3). Despite this pleasure of observing their son, Williamson's parents send him to Aberdeen to live with an aunt. When he is ten, he is "taken notice of by two fellows belonging to a vessel in the harbour, employed (as the trade then was) by some of the *worthy* merchants of the town, in that villainous and execrable practice called *kidnapping*" (3). The young Williamson is lured into the ship, where he spends the next month in the hold until "the ship set sail for *America*" (3). Thus, as Colley notes, Williamson undergoes his "first experience of captivity" (*Captives* 188). It is also his first experience as a commodity, for upon his arrival in North America, after barely surviving a shipwreck, he and his fellow captives are sold "at about 16 *l. per* head" (5). Williamson is purchased by Hugh Wilson, whom he describes as "one of my countrymen" (5). Wilson buys the young man for a term of seven years, and is a sympathetic master because he himself suffered the same fate as Williamson when he was kidnaped as a boy in Scotland and sold into servitude in the colonies. The economy of bodies is clearly in place well before a single "Indian" enters the text.

Williamson's master allows him to attend school and to learn to read in exchange for an extra year of service. He gladly spends his leisure time pursuing his studies, until his master dies when Williamson is seventeen. He is left with an inheritance and becomes his "own master." After working for a number of years, Williamson marries a planter's daughter and is given a "tract of land [. . .] on the frontiers of the province of *Pensylvania*" (7-8). He settles there with his wife and begins a happy life. However, not too long after they settle, Williamson's wife goes away to visit some relatives. One night, while awaiting her return, he hears "the dismal war-cry, or war-whoop of the savages, which they make on such occasions, and may be expressed *Woach, woach, ha, ha, hach woach*" (9). Again, this sound of the Indians, described in great detail, precedes disaster; the house is soon attacked by twelve of them. Williamson tries to ask them what they want, but they do not answer him. He threatens them with his gun, and one tells him that they will burn down his house if he does not come out. And so the melancholy Williamson can do little else but to surrender into their hands. The Indians go on to plunder his house, burn it anyway, and utterly destroy the rest of his property and possessions. Williamson writes that it is all "intirely consumed to ashes" (10). He claims that "to describe the thoughts, the fears, and misery that I felt, is utterly impossible, as it is even now to mention what I feel at the remembrance thereof" (10). His newly-built life, guided by equal parts Providence and hard work, is reduced by the Indians to blackened land in a few short minutes.

Once his material life has been destroyed, one of the “monsters” threatens Williamson with a tomahawk (which Williamson explains in an ethnographic footnote, to place some control over the situation), claiming he will face “the worst of deaths, if [he] would not willingly go with them, and be contented with their way of living” (11). He writes, “[t]his I seemingly agreed to, promising to do every thing for them that lay in my power; trusting to Providence for the time when I might be delivered out of their hands” (11). Williamson thus “seemingly” puts himself into Indian hands, agreeing to be taken at the point of forced contact.

Rutherford, Grace, and Williamson are all taken at points where they have already entered an economy of bodily exchange or are implicated in colonial practices. They devote a significant amount of their narratives to describe what I have called the preexisting economies and summarized above. Other narratives begin with the moment of capture, but they still involve similar tropes. Robert Eastburn, for example, is caught in a skirmish with Indians while on his way to work at the English fort Oswego as a smith. After shooting two Indians he flees, only to “[f]all into a deep Mire, which the Enemy, by following my Track in a light Snow, soon discovered, and obliged me to surrender, to prevent a cruel Death. (They stood ready to drive their Darts into my Body, in case I refused to deliver up my Arms)” (6). Thomas Brown is also captured while involved in military violence as a ranger. Indeed, he and his troop capture seven French prisoners after ambushing a battalion; Brown is wounded in a later encounter with predominantly French forces, after which he writes “I retir’d into the Rear, to the Prisoner I had taken on the Lake, knock’d him on the head and kill’d him, lest he should escape and give Information to the Enemy” (5). This is an action that resonates throughout the narrative, and it makes Brown no different in his own actions from the Indians who capture him a short while later, though he asks the French interpreter “if this was the Way they treated their Prisoners, to let them be cut and beat to Pieces by the *Indians*?” (9). It is difficult to read his later descriptions of Indian torture and cruelty as anything other than continuations of the violence set in motion by the British themselves. Charles Saunders is not so clearly involved in the violent colonial economy, but is rather, like Rutherford, involved in the economy of commodity trade. He and his boat crew are captured while attempting to acquire beaver pelts from some Indians, who “came aboard, and in a hostile manner seiz’d the Boat, stabbing one of the hands who seem’d to make some resistance” (5). Saunders notes that “we had no recourse but to yield submissively” (5), thus making them victims of the ambivalent site of trade. The captives are all therefore already entangled in economies of violence and exchange that are continued during the experience of captivity, though localized on European bodies.

Chapter 2

Strategies of Representation

“They have all blood-thirsty Minds, and are a very jealous sort of People; insatiable in their Revenge, to gratify which they will refuse no Difficulty or Danger. Otherwise they are lazy and sluggish, and hate all Employment except hunting and fighting; in their Lodging, Diet, and Dress, they are filthy and nasty to the last Degree, Strangers to all Rules of Decency and Modesty, and seem almost void of natural Affection, being more careless of their Offspring than Brutes.”

-Henry Grace, *The History of the Life and Sufferings*

The experience of captivity demands the reclamation of a stable subject position in order for the captive to record the narrative. The author must liberate his or her body from the captor's hands by writing, which reverses the gaze. Two strategies are employed by the authors to do this, often within the same text; one method is to adopt a detached, 'objective' voice that exploits the ethnographic authority that captivity grants redeemed captives, while the other is to appeal to the sympathy of the European reader with depictions of bodily suffering and mental anguish.⁴ Both techniques are meant to reverse the power relations experienced during captivity and reclaim a British identity. However, this power reversal proves impossible on the one hand since stereotypes and brutal torture scenes undercut an objective, ethnographic voice. On the other hand, a demand for sentiment or sympathy is problematized by the captive's own complicity in colonial activities or, worse, Indian practices. The continually shifting first-person pronouns of "I" and "we" while among their captors also undermine the captive's objective authority and claim to innocence. Despite their slippages, the captives still must employ writing strategies that enable certain representations of Indians and their practices to come up again and again in the narratives, anxiously repeated so as to reaffirm colonial hegemony. I will first look at the relation of ethnography to the narratives and the ways in which the captive assumes a kind of authority as a cultural insider; while the ethnographer needs to "efface the speaking self," as Pratt suggests ("Scratches" 143), the captive must reclaim that self, and these separate demands cannot be maintained in practice. I will then provide a specific look at Peter Williamson's narrative functioning as what Pratt describes as "autoethnography." A subsection will follow this on depictions of torture, which in many ways contradict the ethnographic assumption that all practices can be rationally contained. Finally, I will discuss the use of stereotypes in the narratives as a means of othering the Indians, though their deployment

⁴ For studies of affect in captivities, see Burnham, Ebersole, and Castiglia. Burnham and Castiglia focus on female-authored narratives and the ideological function of sentiment within them.

ultimately implicates the Europeans and shatters the innocence of the captive. In the end, the narratives cannot maintain a divide between civilization and savagery, and any attempt to do so collapses under the demand to both rationalize and demonize the actions of the Indians.

Captivity and Ethnography

Ethnography is integral to captivity narratives; it is here that, as I have argued, the captive ostensibly attempts a reversal of the power dynamic experienced in captivity. As already suggested in the moments of forced contact, ethnographic observation slows down the narrative and allows the reader to obtain a more objective distance by presenting a timeless Indian way of life. The captive attempts to reassert his or her authority by writing on Aboriginal bodies and practices, as in the case of Henry Grace, who inserts ethnographic paragraphs throughout his narrative, frequently following particularly traumatic scenes of violence to his or other European bodies. This ethnographic authority is gained, in part, through the experience of captivity itself; the observations are seemingly authentic because the position of the captive as insider lends credibility to their ethnographic descriptions. Pratt writes that

[t]he authority of the ethnographer over the 'mere traveller' rests chiefly on the idea that the traveller just passes through, whereas the ethnographer lives with the group under study. But of course this is what captives [. . .] often do too, living in another culture in every capacity [. . .] learning indigenous languages and lifeways with a proficiency any ethnographer would envy, and often producing accounts that are indeed full, rich, and accurate by ethnography's own standards. At the same time, the experience of captivity resonates a lot with aspects of the experience of fieldwork-- the sense of dependency, lack of control, the vulnerability to being isolated completely or never left alone. ("Fieldwork" 38)

Colley similarly notes that captivity narratives "at their best" provide "the closest approximation we have from the past to the kind of analyses supplied by anthropologists and ethnographers immersed in alien societies today" (*Captives* 13). This authenticity has long been a claim of historians and ethnographers and forms part of the appeal of captivity narratives; Canadian scholar Marius Barbeau remarks in his 1950 article "Indian Captivities" that "their value is enhanced by the candor of the observers who found themselves among the natives before the ancient customs had been abandoned, and the ethnographers had entered the field" (qtd. in Heard 6-7). However, as Pratt maintains, the key difference is that "captivity is a rather higher-risk business than fieldwork," since captives must take a place in the society which holds them in order to survive, while

anthropologists “establish a relationship of exchange with the group based on Western commodities” (38). This exchange in many ways contradicts the work of the anthropologist since she is contributing to the compromise of her object of study; the captive, by contrast, is “innocent” and serves as a “compelling image to the contradiction-ridden ethnographer” (38). According to this thinking, captives’ experiences provide the most convincing depiction of another culture because they must participate in its inner workings to ensure their continued usefulness. Indeed, the captive’s experience with Western trade, unlike that of the anthropologist, is a decidedly negative and unstable one, as European commodities such as alcohol and firearms frequently lead to Indian “savagery,” which threatens the captive body.

The captive, however compelling an image he makes as the ideal provider of cultural knowledge, must also face contradictions in his role as ethnographer.⁵ Snader argues that “[t]he captivity genre’s most basic epistemological conflict stems from its claim to mount a generalized cultural description on the experience of a single captive,” since “the extreme violence and strangeness of the captivity experience tends to weaken its potential for dispassionate empiricism” (17). Of course, this is not unique to captivity, as ethnographic writing generally experiences a contradiction between what Pratt describes as “personal and scientific authority” (“Fieldwork” 32). Snader maintains that this issue is partially resolved in many captivity narratives by referring to external sources or other accounts as a means of verification (17), yet this is rarely present in the North American captivities from 1750 to 1774. Instead, the moments of ethnography are often juxtaposed alongside torture scenes or other scenes of violence, which even further estranges the possibility of objective detachment.

The frontispiece for most captivity narratives, like other texts of the eighteenth century, provides a generally detailed summation of the events and contents contained within the work. Snader notes that the titles of narratives in the broader Anglophone tradition frequently attest to their accuracy or ethnographic insight by “advertis[ing] captivity as an effective means of intellectual access to alien cultures” (39), but the title pages of the later North American narratives I am examining here often emphasize the bodily suffering of the captives and other British subjects. Henry Grace promises a description of “the Hardships he underwent during several Years Captivity among the SAVAGES in NORTH AMERICA, and of the Cruelties they practise to their unhappy Prisoners” (1). The frontispiece of *The Horrid Cruelty of the Indians, Exemplified in the Life of Charles Saunders* claims the text offers “[a]n accurate and concise Account of [Saunders’] Captivity and unheard of Sufferings among the Indians, the bloody

⁵ The male voice is most associated with ethnographic authority, as Pratt and others maintain. This also seems to be the case with captives, as the more popular female-authored works are generally read in relation to sentimental fiction and providential narratives rather than travel writing or manners and customs descriptions.

Death of his unfortunate Companions, the murder of young Mr. YORK,” and other “wonderful Incidents” (1). The first two editions of Williamson’s *French and Indian Cruelty* combine the violence to the body with ethnographic knowledge, describing the contents as being “[a] particular Account of the Manners, Customs, and Dress, of the SAVAGES; of their *scalping, burning*, and other *Barbarities*, committed on the ENGLISH, in NORTH AMERICA, during his Residence among them” (1). Thomas Brown’s *A Plain Narrative of the Uncommon Sufferings, and Remarkable Deliverance* does not pretend to offer ethnographic insight, promising instead an account of an engagement “in which Capt. *Spikeman* was kill’d; and the Author of this Narrative having receiving three wounds (one of which thro’ his Body),” and a description of “the Mortification of being an Eye-Witness of divers Tortures, and shocking Cruelties, that were practised by the *Indians* on several *English* Prisoners;— one of whom he saw burnt to Death, another tied to a Tree and his Entrails drawn out, &c. &c.” (1). The knowledge that is offered in all these descriptions is gained through being a victim or witness to bodily suffering.

The relationship between ethnographic descriptions and torture scenes is difficult to account for, since they appear to contradict one another. Snader suggests that torture in captivity narratives serves to “augment the ethnographic evidence for the depravity of archaic, captive-taking cultures and to establish the character of the captive protagonist, as one capable of withstanding the threat or the actuality of physical coercion” (76). Indeed, descriptions of torture and ethnographic observation entered North American captivity accounts at the same time during the mid-eighteenth century in John Gyles’ account from 1736 (Sayre 259, Snader 77), which suggests they have a close relationship. Though Snader is certainly correct in maintaining that torture backs up the ethnographic depictions of indigenous populations as backward or degenerate, it is also the case that ethnography is intended to compensate for the torture. That is, it attempts to create what Pratt terms a stable I/eye from which to observe the Indians, and this is particularly important in narratives from colonial North America when the English body is the site of struggle. This is in part why ethnography is a driving force in the captivity genre, playing a “central and recurring role” within its formation to the point that it can “overwhelm narration of the captive’s personal experiences” while also being “a source of textual disorder” (Snader 38, 49). I will discuss scenes of torture in greater detail below.

Ethnographic knowledge can be potentially useful for captives because it allows them to become informants to the European expansionist project. Snader notes that “[t]he captive’s ethnographic knowledge grants him an authority within the settler’s program for exploration, rescue, and revenge,” and his inclusion of useful knowledge in the colonial context is “heroic reversal of the captivity experience’s violation of assumed cultural hierarchies” (90). Williamson joins an expedition “to go against the savages,” since he is “pretty well acquainted with

their manners and customs” and wishes to “tak[e] an opportunity of being revenged to the utmost of my power” (36). Rutherford similarly joins a military regiment and writes, “I feel not a little pleased to join the army at this time, as I shall have an opportunity, perhaps, of seeing the savages get a complete drubbing” (273). Snader claims that often “an early experience of foreign captivity authorizes an unlimited personal license for individualistic economic and colonial activity” (279). This is a similar notion to Terry Goldie’s “indigenization,” which demands that the settler appropriate the Native connection to the land in order to justify or enable possession.⁶ Gamaliel Smethurst certainly seizes his opportunity following his captivity and runs a monopoly on fisheries for a time (27). At the same time, he lays out a detailed plan for conquering North America, specifically what is now New Brunswick, noting that “[t]his part of the country wants nothing but men and money, to make it the most flourishing spot in America, or perhaps on the globe” (40). He also warns that “[u]nless we can civilize [the Indians], they will retard the settlement of this part of the world greatly” (17). And yet captivity can leave captives alienated and isolated from their former lives and families, and prevent rather than enable financial opportunities. Colonial success does not necessarily lead to success in other aspects of the captive’s lives beyond the periphery of empire, in the metropolitan centre.

Peter Williamson as Autoethnographer and the Impossibility of Captive Ethnography

Williamson’s narrative promises to provide descriptions of “the customs, dress, &c. of the Savages” on the front page of the edition of 1762. On the opposing page is an engraving of Williamson himself, “in the Dress of a Delaware Indian” (Williamson I). A list of the Indian elements to his costume and the scene around him are provided below the picture, including “scalping knife,” “belt of wampum,” “bush fighting,” and a “war dance” (Williamson I- see image at end of chapter). The very first page introduces an ethnographic scene, but Williamson himself participates in it. He is in the middle of the picture, fully dressed as one of the “Savages” he promises to describe. The dancing and fighting in the background emphasizes his full immersion in Delaware society. More importantly, Williamson has inscribed Indian manners and customs onto his own body, turning it into a site of ethnographic knowledge. In a very problematic way that is indicative of the unique space of captivity narratives, Williamson has composed what Pratt describes as an “autoethnography” or “autoethnographic expression” (*Imperial Eyes* 7). Pratt writes that these terms “refer to instances in which colonized subjects undertake to represent themselves in ways that *engage*

⁶I will discuss this in relation to ‘going native’ in the following chapter.

with the colonizer's own terms" (7, author's emphasis). She distinguishes ethnographic texts from autoethnographic texts in that the former "are a means by which Europeans represent to themselves their (usually subjugated) others," whereas the latter "are those the others construct in response to or in dialogue with those metropolitan representations" (7). They generally involve "partial collaboration with and appropriation of the idioms of the conqueror" (7). Pratt adds that "autoethnographic expression is a very widespread phenomenon of the contact zone, and will become important in unraveling the histories of imperial subjugation and resistance as seen from the site of their occurrence" (8).

This claim that Williamson has engaged in a form of autoethnographic expression is problematic since he is a European writing in a European language. In this sense, he cannot be writing from a colonized perspective. However, Williamson's life as a commodified body suggests that he has experienced aspects of colonization or, to revisit Césaire's term, "thingification." His kidnapping at a young age and subsequent life spent in indentured servitude marks him as an outsider to European bourgeois life. Indeed, his work was so scandalous amongst the Aberdeen merchants he condemned for their "commerce" in bodies that they sued him for libel. To be sure, Williamson greatly exaggerated his life story; J. Bennet Nolan describes him in his 1964 article as "one of the greatest liars who ever lived" (24-25). Later in life Williamson claimed that he was a person who "from his infancy, was brought up with those Savages" (*The Trial of Divorce*, xxiii), yet this points to the extent which he identified with the colonized subjects of North America. His portrayal of himself in Delaware dress on the first page sets the tone in which his narrative can be read, and no matter how cruel or reckless he portrays the actions of the Indians, he is implicated in some form. The two facing title pages tell the captive's tale of both physical complicity and textual resistance to "Indian cruelty."

Captivity narratives are not unique in their incorporation of ethnographic observations; Sayre notes that a kind of hybrid writing on North America, though "epistemologically incompatible," brought together individual narrative and "manners and customs" writing for centuries. He argues that this writing "organized partial knowledge so as to make it appear complete, and to enable colonials to impose a sense of order and control over the land and the Indians" (79). This is precisely what the captive does, gathering a partial vision obtained through his own bodily exchange, and attempting to fix the Indian. Pratt notes in "Scratches on the Face of the Country" that

[t]he portrait of manners and customs is a normalizing discourse, whose work is to codify difference, to fix the Other in a timeless present where all "his" actions and reactions are repetitions of "his" normal habits. Thus, it textually produces the Other without an explicit anchoring either in an observing self or in a particular encounter in which contact with the Other takes place. (140)

However, this attempt to fix the Other can never be complete, since manners-and-customs descriptions “usually appear embedded in or appended to a superordinate genre” (140). In the case of captivity, these embedded moments are of course framed by actual, violent encounters told by an existing, if not stable, self. There is a temporal shift when the narratives switch from personal narrative to manner and customs descriptions, from a first-person past-tense to an anonymous, ethnographic present. Pratt describes this kind of voice as “like the self-effaced, noninterventionist eye that scans the Other’s body” (143). The narrator effaces his presence at the moment he is trying to stabilize it. The captive cannot fix the Indian, since he cannot fix himself into a stable subject position. This is ultimately the ambivalence of manner and custom writing placed within captivity writing which Snader describes: the constant threat of Indian brutality and descriptions of English bodies being literally taken apart is irreconcilable with the passive gaze of the ethnographer.

Torture and the English Body

Though Snader links torture to the broader captivity tradition, it is also a distinct trope that is constantly applied to the indigenous people of North America in contact literature. Sayre notes that “[t]orture takes a privileged place in nearly every ethnographic description of the Indians of northeastern America- it might be considered the northern equivalent of cannibalism, an obligatory part of the savagist representation” (296). But whereas cannibalism is a frequently contested cultural practice whose existence and portrayal has been questioned by modern social scientists and historians, Sayre rightly points out that no such study exists in relation to accounts of Indian torture. It is difficult to speculate why this is the case, but it is possible that torture is a necessary myth to account for the emergence of the unified colonial American subject. Sayre writes that “[i]f the body is frequently a locus of social communication, the destruction of body parts in torture seems to be not another means of inscription but a destruction or negation of the possibility of individual signification” (302). The torture victims, and all their qualities, are appropriated by the Indians upon their death. To survive torture is to re-inscribe the power of the individual, specifically the European subject. If the individual body in captivity is able to survive this negation, it emerges as a powerful, albeit damaged representation of the body of the nation. Instead of being destroyed by Indian practice, the self is capable of appropriating indigenous claims to land and liberty. Torture would in this reading be a kind of crucible for the captive and the nation, and its survival as an untouched historical and anthropological fact of the frontier is ideologically important for American exceptionalism. It also masks the widespread violence, slaughter, and injustice perpetrated by both colonial and, later, American forces on First Nations across the continent.

The specific moments of torture are frequently filled with vivid, almost pornographic descriptions of violence to the body of the victim. Peter Williamson writes of three prisoners who meet a particularly gruesome death:

[T]wo of them were tied to a tree, and a great fire made round them, where they remained till they were terribly scorched and burnt; when one of the villains with his scalping knife, ript open their bellies, took out their entrails, and burnt them before their eyes, whilst the others were cutting, piercing, and tearing the flesh from their breasts, hands, arms, and legs, with red-hot irons, 'till they were dead. (19)

The third prisoner is "if possible, sacrificed in a more cruel manner," when he is buried neck-deep in the ground, scalped, and left for several hours "in the greatest agonies." The Indians then light a fire near his head and he pleads for them to kill him, "for his brains were boiling in his head" (19). However, "[i]nexorable to all his complaints they continued the fire, whilst shocking to behold! his eyes gushed out of their sockets" (19). Earlier in the narrative a colonist and all nine of his family members are scalped, "then cut in pieces and given to the swine, which devoured them" (18). The Indians clearly represent a threat to the bodily integrity of the British subject, who can be utterly annihilated in savage hands by a remarkable excess of violence. At the same time, the author of the narrative sees fit to include these scenes, which turns these moments into spectacles for the reading public. Ebersole maintains that scenes of torture "were constructed with an understanding of the moral significance of the circulation of feeling in sentimental reading practices," and "they were part of the currency in the economy of feeling and sympathy in the eighteenth-[. . .] century culture of sentiment" (166). As such, depictions of torture could potentially provide "a form of rational entertainment and a means of moral improvement" for the reader through sympathetic identification (Ebersole 167). As Adam Smith writes on sympathy,

[b]y the imagination we place ourselves in his situation, we conceive ourselves enduring all the same torments, we enter as it were into his body, and become in some measure the same person with him. [. . .] His agonies, when they are thus brought home to ourselves, when we have thus adopted them and made them our own, begin at last to affect us, and we then tremble and shudder at the thought of what he feels. (qtd. in Mitchell 330)

If read through Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, however, the sympathy evoked by scenes of torture in captivity narratives is similar to the functioning of justice in British society.

The spectacle of torture is a curious element to these later narratives that is largely absent from Puritan narratives. They were clearly integral, and Captain Thomas Morris acknowledges in his narrative, "[t]hese modes of torture I should

not have mentioned, if the gentleman who advised me to publish my journal, had not thought it necessary”(21). It has been frequently suggested that the remarkable catalogues of cruelty existed solely to demonize or Other the Indians; Pearce writes that later narratives came to almost exclusively serve as propaganda in order to “register as much hatred of the French and Indians as possible” (6). He maintains that depictions of Indian cruelty as in Williamson are merely “vulgar, fictional, and pathological” (9). Torture, however, is more important to the narratives than simply acting as a means to create cultural Others or even fetishize violence; by making the European body a site of hyperbolic violence, the savage Other is allowed to write their experience of colonial struggle on the captive body. While the sympathy of the European reader is evoked, at the same time the Indian enacts a form of justice on the British body. Robert Mitchell suggests in “The Violence of Sympathy: Adam Smith on Resentment and Executions” that “fear and justice cannot be distinguished easily from sympathy, for the fear that underwrites justice is itself *based on* sympathy” (329). Indeed, citing Adam Smith, Mitchell writes, “the sense of justice operates by turning our gaze toward the possibility of our own harm or death” (330). Smith himself argues that “[i]n order to enforce the observation of justice, therefore, Nature has implanted in the human breast that consciousness of ill-desert, those terrors of merited punishment which attend upon its violation” (qtd. in Mitchell 330). It is important, therefore, to consider some of the broader issues surrounding the public display of torture and the extent to which Indian torture scenes function as a carnival form of British justice.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault defines some of the necessary elements to the spectacle of public torture. First, it must produce pain; Foucault focuses on the regulation of the production of pain (33-34), and there is indeed a ritualistic element to the descriptions of torture in captivity narratives. Bodies are progressively and violently taken apart by the power of the state or sovereign until they are utterly destroyed. More importantly, Foucault insists that torture “must mark the victim”; it is intended to “brand the victim with infamy,” and “it traces around, or, rather, on the very body of the condemned man signs that must not be effaced” (34). Thus Henry Grace describes how he is grabbed by his captors, all holding sticks with thorns on them, and they tie his arm to a tree and “pricked it to such a Degree, that the Flesh worked above the Skin, and then they rubbed their Indian Paint in it till it swelled as big as my leg” (42). He laments that he can “feel the ill Effects of it to this Hour,” and concludes his narrative with the claim that he has “no Way to get my Living but by Day-Labour, of which I am very incapable, by the Wound which I received in my Right Arm” (55-6). Grace finds that even in his home country he bears this mark of captivity and infamy; more than just a tattoo, it serves as a sign of exclusion from his countrymen and constant reminder of colonial justice.

As Williamson so clearly demonstrates, a key element to Indian torture is its sheer excess; Foucault notes that in public spectacles of torture,

[t]he very excess of the violence employed is one of the elements of its glory: the fact that the guilty man should moan and cry out under the blows is not a shameful side-effect, it is the very ceremonial of justice being expressed in all its force. Hence no doubt those tortures that take place even after death: corpses burnt, ashes thrown to the winds, bodies dragged on hurdles and exhibited at the roadside. *Justice pursues the body beyond all possible pain.* (34, my emphasis)

And so European bodies are dismembered, decapitated, scalped, devoured by pigs, turned into tobacco pouches, and so forth, after they have already met their end. It is in these excesses, Foucault maintains, where “a whole economy of power is invested” (35). However, the torture of which he is speaking is more deliberately aimed at a specific purpose, whether to extract a confession or punish a criminal. Indian torture is, as presented in the narratives and interpreted by the captives, meaningless. There is no attempt to gain a confession, but instead to simply produce the maximum amount of pain and suffering. Most captives, such as Grace and Williamson, are in a state of constant fear, knowing that they too can meet such a ghastly end at any moment. This makes them comply with every demand put on them; in Williamson’s case, he admits after the brutal scene of torture cited above that he had to “dig the graves, which feeble and terrified as I was, the dread of suffering the same fate, enabled me to do” (19).

Ethnography and torture scenes are both strategies that ultimately efface the European subject—ethnography makes the speaking subject disappear in an attempt to assert the passive, male gaze over the Indians, while torture physically brutalizes and fragments the body. The desire to reassert colonial hegemony and authority through ethnographic writing is rejected by torture scenes that undermine this authority with a parody of European justice and state power exercised on the captive’s and other European bodies. The captive must therefore also deploy a more powerful form of othering through the use of stereotypes in order to retrieve the elusive and damaged self.

Stereotypes: Repetition, Enforcement, and Complicity

The stereotype is another important element to the written experience of captivity. Like ethnography, it functions to revert the gaze on English bodies back on the Indians. But whereas ethnography attempts to provide “new” and authoritative knowledge to the reading audience, stereotypes are based on shared cultural knowledge and can therefore be easily deployed. Bhabha suggests that the stereotype, which is [the] major discursive strategy [of colonial discourse], is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates

between what is always 'in place,' already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated . . . as if [the racial stereotype] that needs no proof, can never really, in discourse, be proved. (66)

The familiar scenes of scalping and crazed, drunken Indians are convenient tropes for the author to include, and require little claim to textual authority and authenticity. Many of the stereotypes that appear in captivity narratives have been discussed in great detail in relation to more contemporary literature. Terry Goldie, in *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian and New Zealand Literatures*, describes some of the "standard commodities" in "the 'economy' created by the semiotic field of the indigene" (15). These "commodities" include sex, violence, orality, mysticism, and the prehistoric. Goldie argues that "[t]he image of the indigene has been textually defined and, through an extended intertextuality, national and international, diachronic and synchronic, [. . .] it constantly reproduces itself, a pervasive autogenesis" (6). This textual production extends back to the earliest accounts of contact between indigenous and European people, and provides an almost sacred repertoire of images. As Gordon M. Sayre notes, "[t]he popular myths about Indians in early colonial texts are also still pervasive" (123). This is why it is important to revisit these myths and determine what roles they play in these early representations and how they in fact reflect back on the colonizer. Bhabha insists that the study of stereotypes "should shift from the ready recognition of images as positive or negative, to an understanding if the *processes of subjectification* made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse" (67). Images of scalping and drunkenness form a large part of the captive's experience, and have informed a great many other depictions of Indians, real and imagined. These practices are meant to produce the savagery of the Indians and establish them as the brutish Other, but they in fact implicate British colonialism and even the captives themselves. The figure of the "squaw" in male-authored narratives also collapses the binary separation of cruel heartless savage and sentimental hero, and disrupts the heroism of the captive's survival by making it oftentimes entirely dependent upon the intervention of the female Other.

There are frequently occurring practices that are associated with Indians in the narratives, such as the "war whoop" or running the gauntlet, but none is more prevalent and threatening to the European subject as scalping. It appears in almost every narrative, frequently, as I have suggested, at the moment of forced contact or during extended scenes of torture. It marks the transition from subject to commodity, and appears again and again in the narratives beyond the initial forced contact between peoples. Scalping is, if it is considered separate from the practice of torture, the most pervasive practice of savagery enacted on British bodies in captivity narratives. Though there was, and is, a debate as to whether it was a European or an indigenous group who first started the practice, it is undeniably linked to Indian culture in contact literature of the eighteenth century.

Scalping is often understood in the narratives as a site of contest between colonial powers; captives often note that English scalps are to be sold to the French, which therefore makes them in part responsible for the practice. This is the ambivalence of the scalping, since Europeans are also known to engage in it. Williamson writes of he and his fellow soldiers “cutting, hacking and scalping the dead *Indians*; and so desirous was every man to have a share in wreaking his revenge on them, that disputes happened among ourselves who should be the instruments of further shewing it on their lifeless trunks” (38). They resolve that they “should cast lots for this bloody, though agreeable piece of work” (39), understanding the importance of the body as a site of vengeance and justice. The British soldiers triumphantly walk away with fifty scalps, and upon their arrival in Boston Williamson writes that they were “rewarded handsomely for the scalps of those savages we had brought with us” (40). There is thus a whole economy of scalps in colonial North America, and all the peoples struggling for the land are entangled in it. Armstrong Starkey writes in *European and Native American Warfare* that “[t]he most troubling aspect of European involvement in scalping was the offer of bounties for enemy scalps. Bounties transformed scalping into a financial transaction and encouraged its spread” (31). As a symbol, the scalp stands in for the body of the person killed, but it also erases any individuation. It becomes only a French scalp, an English scalp, or an Indian scalp for its possessor. The scalped body is generally destroyed in some fashion, through burning or dismemberment, leaving only the scalp as a trace of their presence.

The often menacing presence of drunken Indians is ubiquitous in captivity narratives; of course, the actual effects of alcohol on First Nations communities is a massive historical and contemporary reality, and its part in the colonization of North America must not be disregarded. Unscrupulous traders, colonists, and soldiers would frequently and deliberately introduce alcohol, usually rum, into tribes to build a dependency and ensure a constant demand, a fact not lost on eighteenth-century writers on the colonies. Charles Thomson, in his 1759 work *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware and Shawanese Indians from the British Interest*, acknowledges that there are traders who are guilty of “cheating and debauching the *Indians*,” and quotes one unnamed chief on the issue:

Your Traders, says he, bring scarce any Thing but Rum and Flour: They bring little Powder and Lead, or other valuable Goods. The Rum ruins us. We beg you would prevent its coming in such Quantities by regulating the Traders [. . .] These wicked Whisky-Sellers, when they have got the *Indians* in Liquor, make them sell the very Cloaths from their backs. (75-76)

The colonial administration formally agrees and regrets “the miserable Situation of our *Indian* Trade carried on (some few excepted) by the vilest of our own Inhabitants and Convicts imported from *Great-Britain* and *Ireland*, by which

Means the *English* Nation is unhappily represented among our *Indian* Allies in the most disagreeable Manner” (76). But despite the apparent illegality of it, many traders continued bringing alcohol to Aboriginal communities. In John Long’s *Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter and Trader*, he notes that rum has “become an essential requisite in every transaction with the Savages; for though they used formerly often to complain of the introduction of strong water by the traders [. . .] to the prejudice of their young men, yet they have not now the resolution to refrain from the use of it” (13). Long writes of numerous occasions where Indians descend into drunken violence, and is often threatened if he does not provide them with more rum. At the same time, he continues to provide it to them and bring it with him everywhere he goes. European traders created the demand for alcohol, turning it into what the colonial assembly in Thomson’s text calls “the principal Article of their Trade” (77). And yet its effects continues to haunt them, nowhere more pronounced as in captivity narratives.

Alcohol frequently plays a role in Indian savagery, and it is not uncommon for a captive to hide in terror from the drunken wrath of his master or other members of the tribe. Henry Grace writes that during his captivity, his captors seize a boat, kill its crew, and take all the “spiritous Liquors” on-board. After burning the vessel along with the remains of the crew,

they began drinking, and drank to such a Degree, that they were all stark staring mad, and then sought out after the poor unfortunate Prisoners, in Order to kill them for their Diversion; but as for me, I had a very narrow Escape, having luckily gained the Favour of some of the Squaws, who were so kind as to hide me under a great Tub before a Frenchman’s Door, where I continued for three Days.
(21)

Were it not for the intervention of the Indian women, Grace would have met “the most cruel Death they could think on” (21). Alcohol creates the greatest threat of bodily harm for captives in numerous narratives. John Rutherford anxiously observes that “a great many Indians came in and got drunk upon some shrub they had got as part of their plunder, and as I knew that in their cups they often killed one another I thought myself in as much danger as ever” (228). But alcohol is also a distinctly European commodity, and can only be acquired by Indians through some form of exchange (this can, as in these particular instances, include violent exchange). This is an ambivalent point, since trade is also the basis for European-Indian relations. Rutherford reflects this ambivalence in an account of his first experience among the drunken Indians, when the Indian dressed in Captain Robertson’s clothes threatens him. As I have already discussed, this is a moment of appropriation, a complete consumption of an English body. But at the same time it reflects a British presence or complicity to the drunken savagery. Indeed, the Indian is insistent in his attempt to kill Rutherford, and demands that “*no English dog should be left alive,*” while he is at the same time dressed as one.

A drunken, menacing "savage" in English clothes clearly owes his condition to European exchange. Again though, as in Grace's narrative, Rutherford is saved by a woman from his community, in this case his Master's wife, who "made me lie down behind her and covered me with skins and furs" (228). He is kept safe from a larger group that wishes to kill him too, and notes that they depart and "[t]he whole night they kept drinking what little liquor *we had brought with us* and making a most hideous yelling, dancing, and singing, while they were feasting upon Captain Robertson's body" (229, my emphasis). The British are thus implicated in their own destruction. In a strange twist, Grace is later sold by his captors to the French for a sum of money and "a Cask of Rum that held sixteen Gallons and a half" (51).

Williamson notes that the Indians "if drunk, are very dangerous and troublesome," but claims that they would not "at any time be guilty of such barbarous depredations as they are, did not those calling themselves Christians, intice them thereto with strong liquors, which they are vastly fond of; as well as by the pecuniary rewards which they give for the scalps" (22). He argues that these Europeans "render themselves as obnoxious, cruel, and barbarous, to a humane mind, as the very savages themselves" (23), and suggests that Indian savagery is a product of the contact zone. Pointing to this dangerous exchange, Williamson writes that Indians "often kill and destroy their tempters" after drinking their "horse-loads of rum" (though they will also "consume all their own effects, beating, wounding, and sometimes killing their wives and children") (23).

Indian women, as I have already suggested, play an important role in these narratives. There has been much written on gender representations in North American captivity narratives, but it is usually in relation to the earlier Puritan narratives written by or about captive women such as Mary Rowlandson.⁷ The role femininity plays is quite different from these later narratives, which focus more on (male) colonial wars and violence to the body. Tiffany Potter notes that Rowlandson "occasionally describes the women she encounters in terms that she associates with the stereotype of the savage, but for most of the narrative she describes the indigenous women not as an incomprehensible Other, but as a fairly minor variation on normative English femininity" (153). This allows Rowlandson to maintain a Eurocentric superiority but also to insist on the importance, and aid in the naturalization, of gendered spheres (though, as Potter rightly points out, the role of editor and Puritan minister Increase Mather adds a "layer of implication to Rowlandson's construction of indigenous femininity as failure") (164). The male authors of narratives from the mid- and late eighteenth century offer a different image of the "squaws" they encounter in the texts. Though they can sometimes be as "savage" as the men, they are frequently kind to the captives and even, as we have seen, intervene to save their lives.

7

See Castiglia, *Bound and Determined*, and Burnham.

Male captives are often placed into the care and charge of women. They occupy a decidedly domestic sphere, performing chores and duties around the village or encampment. Upon his capture, Rutherford writes that his master "bound me and delivered me over in charge of his squaw" (227). Grace also notes that he is "obliged to go with the Indian squaws" (16), while Eastburn claims "the *Indian Women* being more merciful interposed, took me into a House, brought me Water to wash, and gave me boiled Corn and Beans to eat" (20). These male captives are taken into the company of women, into a completely new gendered sphere. When they are within this sphere, the captives are safe from violence, and even develop feelings for and relationships with the Indian women. Eastburn notes that "God could make Friends of cruel Enemies," and gratefully acknowledges an "old *Squaw*" who observes his shirt "all in *Rags, Dirt, and Lice*; she said it was not *good*, and brought me a new One, with ruffled Sleeves (saying that is good) which I thankfully accepted" (24). Though the descriptions of women are frequently more sympathetic, they still vary greatly. Williamson writes that "[t]he females are very chaste, and constant to their husbands; and if any young maiden should happen to have a child before marriage, she is never esteemed afterwards" (21). By contrast, Henry Grace claims "[t]he old Squaws drink as bad as the Men, but the young ones do not care for it, so that they get out of their Way when they are drinking, but the Squaws that have their companions, which they call their Husbands, will dance and drink quite naked along with the Men" (22). They nonetheless save him on several occasions.

The actions of the women as described in the narratives can potentially be read as part of the European assumption that indigenous women desired white bodies more than their own men. Alexander Kellet claims in a letter from the 1770s that Native women are "very prone to European attachments" (21), and the enduring Pocahontas story was widely circulated in the eighteenth century. However, the captives most often attribute the intervention of the women to "kindness," and there is rarely any indication of romantic interest or exchange. "Squaws" are therefore important actors in the preservation of the British body, and their disruption of often drunken male violence on behalf of captives challenges both the heroism of the European survivor and their subsequent deployment of the discourse of savagery. The "squaws" do not, however, directly aid in escape, only bodily preservation. In fact, they frequently appear in maternal roles and encourage captive assimilation; Thomas Brown writes that he "was ordered to live with a Squaw, who was to be my mother," during which time he "was employed in Hunting, dressing Leather, &c. being cloth'd after the *Indian Fashion*" (19). In this case, the Native woman recreates British family life and threatens to replace it with the dangerous yet tempting possibility of transculturation, which I will explore in the following chapter.

The captive is ultimately unable to effectively distance himself textually from his captors and turn them into savage Others. Ethnography requires a

greater, objective distance, torture turns into a dangerous mirror of European justice, and stereotypes collapse under the implication of European cultural intervention and Native female agency. The captive body emerges as marked by the Indians and potentially robbed of its essential British identity. From here I will turn to the threat and stakes involved in transculturation.



PETER WILLIAMSON
In the Dress of a Delaware Indian.

1 Tomohawk.	5 Powder horn.
2 Scalping Knife.	6 Indian Canoe.
3 Shot Bag.	7 Bush Lightning.
4 Arrow & Belt of Wampum.	8 War Dance.

Chapter 3

From Captive to Convert: Going Native in the Eighteenth Century

"This gentleman made a very good Indian, being of a dark complexion, and was much liked by his Master, who soon adopted him into his family, which exempted him from all drudgery."

-John Rutherford, *Narrative of a Captivity*

The possibility of a captive going native is a significant element to the transgressive potential and the appeal of nearly all narratives of captivity. Snader maintains that "[o]f all the tensions that mark the captivity genre, the sharpest stem from the possibility of transculturation that sits uneasily at its heart" (97). And it is clearly based on an historical reality, since, as Colley notes, becoming a member of a non-European society, "whether from compulsion or out of choice, was [. . .] a recurrent phenomenon of this period, and an experience in which thousands of men and women from Great Britain and Ireland participated" ("Going Native," 173). However, captivity narratives from North America prior to the period of the American Revolutionary war show little or no transculturation. The captive instead tries to prove how he or she held onto his or her British identity in the face of potentially overwhelming savagery, and any notion of transgressing that identity is either dismissed or excused as essential to bodily survival. This is particularly pronounced in the Puritan narratives, in which the often female captive holds on to her Protestant faith despite Indian brutality and French Papist trickery. The fear that her children should be raised by Indians is frequently reiterated throughout, and this possibility is mourned more than the children who are slaughtered. The later, male-authored narratives do not generally have this same narrative of religious perseverance running through them (though, as we shall see, Eastburn's narrative is a notable exception), but instead a more intangible nationalism replaces the religiosity.⁸ This is in part due to the increased colonial struggle going on during the period, which also accounts, as I have discussed above, for the heightened focus on the captive body. These narratives show an awareness of the stakes involved in losing colonists or soldiers to the ranks of savagery, and as such make sure the captive preserves her or his national identity. This is why Pratt has described captivity as a traditionally "safe" form, since "the story is told by a survivor who has returned, reaffirming European and colonial social orders" (*Imperial Eyes*, 185). But as I have already suggested, Pratt's description does not entirely account for the struggle documented in these narratives for land and bodies. While the endings may enforce the "colonial social order," the captive must experience and collaborate with Indian culture in many unsettling ways to get to

⁸ Snader argues that "compared to the generality of English texts from the late sixteenth through the eighteenth century, the British captivity narrative is a distinctly secular genre" (280).

that escape. As Snader argues, though escape and subsequent military or colonial success do more or less “reverse the terms of subjugation” experienced in captivity, “such activity often depends on the captive’s successful participation and accommodation within an alien culture” (93). This marks the heroism of the singular male captive as decidedly ambiguous, since his liberation is bought at the cost of compromising his own cultural identity (and, as I have shown, through the aid of supposedly “savage” women). In many cases, liberation only leads to abjection, recalling Anne McClintock’s notion that “[a]bject peoples are those whom industrial imperialism rejects but cannot do without” (72). The captive is often left on the margins of his home society, alienated from the spoils of Empire that he helped procure.

Compared to other British captivity narratives, such as many written by captives held in Islamic societies from the seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, pre-Revolutionary North American narratives offer few instances of obvious transculturation. This is the case because of the inherent danger in British colonists or soldiers joining French or Indian ranks at a time of escalating struggle. It was also a distinct reality that had to be countered in the North American colonies; Colley cites Peter Way, who observes that desertion by British soldiers into Indian societies was so widespread that “any redcoat discovered living alongside Indians and claiming to have been captured, risked being court martialled unless he could somehow prove that he really had been forced to cross the culture line against his will” (*Captives* 195-96). Colley notes that the reason for the government and military’s opposition to the adoption of whites into Native societies was both practical, because of the relatively small number of available soldiers and the conflicts that could arise between colonists and various tribes, and ideological, in that it “affronted British national, religious, and racial pride, now much enhanced by successful global war” (196). Going native was therefore a potentially dangerous practice for the colonial administration and for the individual captive.

The ability of First Nations societies to adopt and assimilate white people was a confusing and troubling fact that various Europeans noted and could not explain. As James Axtell argues, “by the close of the [early] colonial period, very few if any Indians had been transformed into civilized Englishmen,” yet “large numbers of Englishmen had chosen to become Indians” (326). Despite widespread efforts at conversion, Europeans were often themselves the ones who were appropriated into Native cultures. Even more troubling was that white children who were raised in these cultures lost any former connection to British society; when Colonel Henry Bouquet was offered up captives held by several tribes, many of the children wept and pleaded not to be taken, and still others fled back to their adoptive families. Adult English women who had married and had families with Native men also returned to their tribes, and in one case Bouquet “requested that no pursuit should be made, as she was happier with her Chief than

she would be if restored to her home" (qtd. in Axtell 328-9). The fluidity and instability of the English character and the social construction of identity became clear possibilities in the face of mounting evidence that perhaps European civilization was not inherently superior to those it tried to conquer or absorb. This tension is felt in captivity narratives from the mid-eighteenth century, which is why the authors continually try to show the lack of allure Indian society has for the British. And yet they cannot prevent their own bodies from becoming entangled and marked by Indian practices.

After American independence, there are a number of captivity narratives, as well as novels and other writings, where the captive goes completely native. Philip J. Deloria accounts for this phenomenon in part in *Playing Indian*; he maintains that the Boston Tea Party, which took place in late 1773, is a "defining story [. . .] of American character" (2). Deloria describes it as "a catalytic moment, the first drumbeat in the long cadence of rebellion through which Americans redefined themselves as something other than British colonists" (2). In order to define themselves differently, they used the figure of the Indian-- the rebels of the Tea Party dressed as Mohawks to carry out their protest and make "a unique and privileged claim to liberty and nationhood" (Deloria 32). And thus the figure of the Indian came to shape the emergent American identity; Terry Goldie observes a similar process in other British colonies such as Canada and Australia, where the emerging national identities must participate in the process of "indigenization." Goldie argues that "the first felt need for indigenization came when a person moved to a new place and recognized an Other as having greater roots in that place," and that "it is only by going native that the European arrivant can become native" (14, 16). I would argue, however, that in the case of pre-revolutionary colonial America, British subjects tried to preserve a connection to the metropolitan centre of the Empire in London. The colonists held on to their British identities, even if some in England did not always see them as fellow subjects, and the significance of going native for an emergent American character did not really begin until shortly before the American Revolution. The case of Colonel James Smith's narrative points to this; Smith was captured in the mid-1750s and was adopted into a Delaware tribe until his "escape" after five years, but he did not write his account until the end of the century, long after he had served as an officer in the Revolutionary War and become a proud American (Sewell 51). Some American historians fetishize Smith as "the first rebel," given his early role as an agitator to the British. He performed his resistance as a member of the "Black Boys" in the mid- to late 1760s while in Indian costume, and has been appropriately immortalized by American icon John Wayne in the film *Allegheny Uprising*. The Black Boys were a group of settlers opposed to the renewal of trade relations with the same troublesome Native people involved in Pontiac's Rebellion, and so they dressed as Indians and intercepted British supply carriers. Smith's captivity lent

credibility to his performance as an Indian, and his performance as an Indian hijacking English caravans which were carrying supplies and trade items to forts painted him as a new kind of colonial American, who, like the newly independent government, loved his land and liberty with an ingrained sense of entitlement. In his narrative he validates this connection, claiming years later that a member of the tribe who captured him told him that he was “now flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone” since “[b]y the ceremony that was performed this day, every drop of white blood was washed out of your veins” (qtd. in Axtell 335).

Part of the myth of American exceptionalism is that captives forged a unique voice that identified themselves as something other than British (in other words, as a new, American subject). However, of the texts I have selected, the only captive who later claims to have willfully lived and identified as an Indian (or non-Briton) is Peter Williamson, who spent his life from the mid-1750s until his death at the end of the century in Scotland-- hardly the harbinger of an emergent American consciousness. None of the colonists who remain in North America write of a full transculturation; recalling Sewell's observation noted in the first chapter, this is an impossibility. He writes that “[t]here can be no written accounts by transculturated captives [...] that make visible that imperceptible moment when the Other becomes I, myself, or when the boundaries that have previously separated self and Other are erased” (53). Sewell's claim is that the very form and language of captivity cannot allow this to happen. This is why the site of transcultural exchange cannot be read within the narrative structure, but rather in a different text that is present within the narratives themselves and is inscribed with and by the cultural practices of savage Others.

The Site/Sight of Transculturation: Clothed and Unclothed Bodies

Since Williamson is the only captive who fully and consciously identifies with Indians on an intellectual and spiritual level, and even then only many years after the initial appearance of his narrative(s), transculturation is clearly a very different process in the other narratives than the adoption of specific cultural practices or modes of thought (though this does occur in some ways). The depictions of utter savagery and brutal violence in these narratives, which I began to deconstruct in the previous chapter, has led to them being viewed as little more than either anti-French and Indian propaganda, or near-pornographic titillation for their reading audience; there is little possibility seen for anything other than a coincidental appropriation of Indian culture, given the fierce hatred and paranoia they are so often laced with. Because of this anti-Indian agenda within the narratives, transculturation cannot be read as a common, straightforward phenomenon, but rather as a dangerous undercurrent that is especially covert in these particular narratives. Unsurprisingly, the captive body is again the site of this exchange. Like the depictions of torture that fill many captivity narratives,

Indians inscribe their presence on the body and threaten the integrity of British identity. In this case, however, the site of the body is meant by the author to disavow the extent to which the captive has become a convert. By focusing on external changes to his appearance, the captive is ostensibly denying the possibility of more fundamental shifts in his subjectivity. However, because of the heightened focus on the body and its connection to a fundamental nationalist and racial identity, the site/sight of a British body written with Indian signs is a troubling spectacle.

As discussed in the chapter on forced contact, the captive body enters the Indian society with European clothing, and is stripped of it so that the Indians can encode it with a new meaning. Captives frequently write of the specific scene where their clothes and other possessions are taken from them, recalling the traumatic moment when they are literally laid bare in front of their captors. Colley writes that "[t]he desire of many, though not all, captives to guard jealously their customary sense of themselves helps to explain why some narratives are obsessed with clothing" and "[b]eing stripped of western dress could seem a metaphor for the danger that one might indeed go native" ("Going Native," 178). The possibility that the Indians can now write whatever they wish onto the body of their captive underlies these scenes, and it brings a greater attention to his naked, vulnerable body. Grace writes that "[a]s soon as we came to the Chief Man's Wiggwam they took away my Hat, and began stripping me of every thing I had in the World, and then put me on my Knees close to a great Fire" (13). Charles Saunders also describes the scene where "[t]hey having strip'd us of our Shoes and Coats we stood almost naked" (6), and Robert Eastburn notes that immediately after his capture, he "was surrounded by a great Number, who stripped me of my Cloathing, Hat, and Neckcloth (so that I had nothing left but a Flannel Vest, without Sleeves)" (6-7). Later, an Indian and a Frenchman "strip me of my *Flannel Vest*, before mentioned, which was my All" (17). In Rutherford's account, he is not stripped upon capture, but a short while later in the narrative by his master's father, who "stripped me of my clothes and told me I should wear them no more, but dress like an Indian" (232). Ann Little notes that clothing in British society during the Restoration and eighteenth century signified "gender, rank, age, and status," and, furthermore, "on the Anglo-Indian frontier, where Native peoples did not produce woven cloth, it marked ethnicity as well" (240). The British frequently made note of the supposed superiority of their clothing; Cotton Mather's opinion is typical, observing in 1721 that the Indians "saw a People Arrive among them, who were Clothed in *Habits* of much more Comfort and Splendour, than what there was to be seen in the *Rough Skins* with which they covered themselves" (qtd. in Axtell 325). Little writes that clothing was both expressive of the identity of the wearer and potentially transformative, and so it could perhaps "turn Indians into the English, and the English into Indians, at least temporarily" (240). She suggests

that a key concept for signifying Indian difference is that of “nakedness,” which was used even to describe clothed Indians (246). It is therefore apparent that the language that describes the captive becomes entangled with the signification of Indian difference, and captives bear that signification upon entry into the tribe.

Nakedness was clearly associated with “savage” people in the eighteenth century and long before then, and the absence of clothing was akin to an absence of culture. There are, of course, other European connotations to nakedness, such as innocence, Biblical creation, and the state of nature, and these are also applicable in some cases to the discursive construction of the Indian. What makes the supposed lack of clothing a problematic assertion, however, is that, as Gordon M. Sayre points out, in fact “[v]irtually all Native North American peoples [. . .] did wear clothes, and in the cold forests of Canada, no one could survive for long without them” (145). Indeed, many captives discover this soon enough, and they must repeatedly plead with their captors for articles of clothing to keep them from freezing to death. Sayre argues that Native clothing in North America “was inextricably tied up with exchange and profit,” since much of it consisted of pelts and hides, important items in the fur trade (148). In order to obtain these commodities, Europeans, in addition to trade and killing the animals themselves, engaged in “stripping the natives of their clothes” (148). That is, they obtained from Native people the pelts that had already been worn, as they were already treated and suitable for making hats. William Wood, describing the relations between English planters and the local Aboriginal populations in 1634, writes that English profiteers “to uncloathe them of their beaver coates, clad them with the infection of swearing and drinking, which was never in fashion with them before” (qtd. in Sayre 151). Recalling Charles Thomson’s words quoted in the previous chapter, he ascribes to some Native people the complaint that European traders, “when they have got the *Indians* in Liquor, make them sell the very Cloaths from their backs” (76). Thus the Indians in numerous travel and exploration accounts are, like captives in the narratives, stripped of their clothing and made naked before the gaze of the Other. That their nakedness is caused by exchange is indicative of the ambivalent role of trade in colonial discourse, and naked Indians are thus inscribed with the practice of European commodity exchange. Furthermore, nakedness in both “first” and “forced” contact represents the unmediated power of one group of people over another. To make or describe the Other as naked shows the dominance of one cultural formation, at least in a European consciousness (and all these encounters are documented by European pens).⁹ By “stripping” the Other, one is paradoxically marking them with the self.

⁹ For Aboriginal populations around the world, the naked body can have various connotations, and to make oneself naked for another can be an expression of hospitality and openness, among other things.

External Forms and Isolation

The nakedness of captives' bodies is but one way in which they are externally made more Indian. Snader notes that "many narratives contrast the outward imposition of alien cultural forms with the captives' inward adherence to Christianity, liberty, and Britain" (103). At the same time, he writes that "such outward forms also sometimes effect powerful changes in cultural identity, and these changes sometimes endure" (103). Significantly, Snader claims that "[i]n one motif that surfaces in captivity narratives set across the globe, the physical appearance of the returned captive, as a result of sartorial transformation or bodily abjection, leads his fellow Europeans to mistake the European identity he wishes to assert" (103). This is certainly the case with Williamson's narrative, where he finds his way to a neighbour's farm, only to have them react to his appearance with utter horror and threaten him with a gun for they "took me to be an *Indian*" (30). Rutherford ends his narrative with the observation that "if I had more time, I don't think I should have put [my narrative] into much better language, for having so long been confounded with hearing and speaking different languages, French, Dutch, Chippewa, Ottawa, &c &c that it is no wonder I should be at a loss to write or speak that of my native country" (274). Snader notes that these external cultural forms confuse the captive's identity shortly after his or her escape, which "transform[s] a long-hoped-for moment of cultural reunion into a moment of isolation, dislocation, and cultural confusion" (103). Captives often realize that they are not as comfortable in their old lives or bodies as they once were, and often find it difficult to simply become a stable European subject again; it turns out in many cases that they never were.

This isolation is even more pronounced in the later pre-Revolutionary narratives, whose authors frequently find themselves as outcasts from their own homes and families. The experience of captivity does not simply end after their escape, and they suffer various hardships of body and mind. Charles Saunders writes that after his captivity, his "[c]onstitution being quite broke, and being wounded in the Arm, I was advised to come to *England* my native place, in hopes of recovery" (19). Though his body recovers eventually, he writes that "'tis humbly hoped the indulgent Publick will commiserate the unhappy fate of the Author, and contribute their endeavours to enable him to go to Sea again: He having lost upwards of Three hundred Pounds sterling by his captivity, is now reduced to the lowest degree of indigence" (16). Henry Grace is also able to quantify his losses, and laments his miserable state brought on by the experience of captivity. He writes near the end of his narrative

I procured my Discharge the 10th of *February*, 1763, and the Loss of the Year's Pay and Cloathing, and could obtain no Pension, though it has been granted to many who had not gone through any thing like the Miseries I suffered. When I came home, I was in

Hopes to get some comfortable Settlement, but found it quite contrary, those who ought to have been my best Friends proved my worst Enemies, and my own Relations used their utmost Endeavours to ruin me. (55)

Eastburn is also disappointed by the lack of concern over his family's welfare, noting that "as soon as the *News* were sent Home, that I was *killed*, or *taken*, [my wife] was not allowed any more *Support* from my *Wages*, which grieved me much, and added to my other *Afflictions*" (31). He returns home "*sick and weak in Body, and empty handed*, not having any Thing for my Family's and my own Support" (42). There is no support or compensation for the redeemed captives, and they are left to fend for themselves or depend on their friends and relatives. Grace, like Saunders, pleads for the charity of his readers, writing, "I submit my Case [. . .] to the Consideration of the Humane and Benevolent, hoping for some Relief; and any Favours received, will be acknowledged with the utmost Gratitude" (56). His tattooed arm that the Indians forcibly gave him prevents him from working, and he is left to bear this mark in "Indian paint" on his body as a wound of Empire. Williamson claims he is sent home from his military service "on account of the wound I had received on my hand" as a result of a gunshot injury received during a battle with French and Indian forces, which rendered him "*incapable of further service*" and left his hand partially paralyzed (93). Like Grace, he claims he "received very barbarous usage and ill treatment" upon his arrival to his home country. There is little redemption after all, as the captive finds himself isolated and persecuted in his home. Captives are alienated from their own countrymen after being held by the Other, and the physical transformation brought about by their captor's society is more than simply external. The body can no longer be relied upon as a marker for Otherness, and therefore the stability of the Self is compromised. Furthermore, the wounds brought about by captivity continue to haunt the former captives—even the act of writing, the process which supposedly reclaims the 'appropriate' power relations, is presumably hindered by wounded arms and hands.

It was a common practice in the mid-eighteenth century to negotiate the release of British captives held in Canada and sail them to England en route to a return trip to the colonies. For many, this was a profound and moving experience, a reaffirmation of their essential Englishness following a threat to its integrity. These voyages also served as a means to transport information on captivities and Native peoples back to England, and show the metropolitan population the stakes involved in the colonial struggle. Colley records that "[i]n just two months, October and November 1758, over sixty American colonists captured [. . .] were shipped from New France to England, where they were fed and clothed for several months before finally being transported home" (*Captives* 173). Jean Lowry was one captive who found hospitality in "old England," and was brought into many homes as a welcome guest. She notes that the English "discovered

surprising regard unto a poor disconsolate Stranger" (17). This same trip in Robert Eastburn's narrative of 1758 fails to produce a comfortable merging of colonial and metropolitan British cultures. After Eastburn procures freedom for himself and his son, they sail from Montreal to England before being returned to Philadelphia. Since both father and son were born in the colonies, neither had ever set foot in the country that defined them culturally and spiritually. There are 300 other former captives on the ship, and they arrive with "great Joy, for we were *ragged, lowly, sick*, and in a Manner, *starved*" (39). However, there is an outbreak of smallpox on the ship, which, laments Eastburn, means "we were not allowed to go on *Shore*, but removed to a *King's Ship*, and sent to *Portsmouth*, where we [were] confined on *board*, near two Weeks" (40). Having surrendered their coats to some of the sick since they were "expecting Relief" for themselves, Eastburn and his son return to winter in New England "almost naked," and "all Application to the Captain for any Kind of Covering being in vain" (40). Throughout his narrative Eastburn pleads for clothes from various people, including some of his captors, a French merchant, and finally the English ship captain on the voyage back to North America, and one of the few who give him relief is "the old *Squaw*" earlier in the narrative who gives him a shirt (24). He is denied clothing in England, and he and his son are left to suffer from their "near View of our *Mother Country*, the Soil and Comforts of which, we were not suffered to touch or taste" (40). They return to the colonies almost naked and shivering, Eastburn perhaps still in possession of his shirt "with ruffled Sleeves" given to him by the old Indian woman.

While it is true that captives, by definition of the captivity genre, are always released in the end, this release turns out to be almost as alienating as life among the Indians. Though the authors have located the enduring effects of Indian life on their bodies as a means of discounting them, clearly this external presence is lasting and can exclude a former captive from their native culture. It is arguable that this isolation from British society after captivity is indicative of the rise of American Revolutionary consciousness, yet many of these narratives, such as those of Grace, Williamson, and Saunders, were only printed in Great Britain. As such, they depict the permanent inscription of colonial violence on the European body and the inability of the English character to accept it or erase it.

Feigning Indian

Captives must be able to adapt their behaviours so they can "accommodate" themselves to the Indian societies they enter. As Rutherford writes in his narrative,

I found it was absolutely necessary for my safety to affect a relish for their savage manners, and to put on an air of perfect

contentment, which I had often heard was the way to gain the affections of the Indians; whereas a gloomy, discontented air irritates them, and always excites worse treatment, and sometimes occasions the death of the captive who is so unfortunate as not to be able to accommodate himself to his situation. (232)

Williamson also claims that the Indians who capture him resort to “threatening me with the worst of deaths, if I would not willingly go with them, and be contented with their way of living” (11). Thomas Brown writes that “[I]ove of Life obliged me to comply” with Indian demands, and he admits, “I feigned myself merry” (15). This justification for acting content amongst the community they are supposedly forced to join is by no means an uncommon argument put forth in captivity narratives. Ebersole notes that captives often claim their efforts in going native are merely tools of survival, adopting what he terms a “rational ruse” which, in addition to ostensibly guaranteeing survival, also “served the social needs of the returned captive, and [. . .] confirmed the cultural prejudice of readers that life with the Indians could have no attraction for civilized persons” (195). Ebersole argues that “social needs” were served by the “rational ruse” of acting Indian in the sense that the returned captives could silence any criticism of their actions while living with the Indians, but also that it “made it easier for the readers to indulge both their own cultural prejudices and fantasies through such narratives without having to admit that personal and cultural identities were fragile constructions and relatively easily shed” (196). Of course, the extent to which the actions of the captive were totally excused is difficult to know, and even if the necessity of collaborating with the captor’s culture was wholly accepted as a legitimate reason there is clearly an understanding of the performativity of identity implicit in the moments of feigned Indianness.

The captive must mimic the Indians, he maintains, in order to survive. Henry Grace describes how “they made me stand up and practise dancing along with them till Morning, and I took a great deal of Pains to do as they did, though I performed very awkwardly, for which they beat me” (15-16). Mimicry is, as Homi Bhabha suggests, “profound and disturbing” to the authority of colonial discourse (86). Though Bhabha is speaking of the mimicry of colonized peoples in reaction to the “civilizing mission,” it produces a similarly ambivalent note in captivity narratives. On the one hand, the more convincingly the captive mimics the captor, the better chance of survival and even reward amongst the Indians. On the other hand, the more the captive resembles an Indian, the less uniquely British he is, and the more he becomes what Bhabha calls a “partial presence.” There is certainly a difference between a British subject and a colonized subject engaging in mimicry; Anne McClintock argues that “the staging of symbolic disorder by the privileged can merely preempt challenges by those who do not possess the power to stage ambiguity with comparable license or authority” (69). She suggests that “mimicry and cross-dressing” can be “a technique not of colonial

subversion, but of surveillance" (69). The colonial agent knows that "passing 'down' the cultural hierarchy is permissible; passing 'up' is not," and there is therefore an "other side of mimicry: the colonial who passes as Other the better to govern" (70). This kind of "passing" is one of the "privilege[s] of whiteness" in colonial discourse, and the threat of hybridity becomes a tool in deflating colonial resistance. This is an important notion that can and should be further explored in the context of captivity narratives as a means of reining in their subversive potential and giving a balanced assessment. I would suggest, however, that this is more at play in later narratives, such as Smith's and subsequent accounts from the nineteenth century, as opposed to the mid-century narratives of abjection.¹⁰ Indeed, Smith wrote his narrative in order to encourage American forces to appropriate Indian methods of warfare, since "we are not above borrowing language from them, such as homony, pone, tomahawk, &c. which is little or no use to us" (qtd. in Sewell 52).

Eastburn, perhaps more than any other captive amongst the writers of these narratives, resists the demands of the Indians to participate in certain rites. He continually refuses the command that he "*dance round the Fire Bare-foot, and sing the Prisoners Song*," even though a fellow captive warns him that he will be killed for his refusal and pleads with him to do as they say. Eastburn writes "[t]he *Indian* also continued urging, saying you shall dance and sing; but apprehending my Compliance sinful, I determined to persist in declining it at all Adventures, and to leave the Issue to the divine Disposal!" (15). The Indian, whom Eastburn had wounded in a skirmish when he was captured, bears a grudge against the captive and tries to push him into the fire for disobeying him, but his wounds make him weak and he "was obliged to desist" (15). Eastburn attributes the "gracious Interposure of *Providence*" for "preserving me both from *Sin* and *Danger*" (15). The image of an angry, wounded Indian trying to push a white Christian into a fire is clearly wrought with a moral and religious significance in mind, and Eastburn is able to leap over the fire to prove his fortitude and devotion. His whole narrative is ostensibly framed in this religious context, as it begins with a preface from well-known Presbyterian minister Gilbert Tennent. Tennent praises Eastburn's religious character, noting that "the Design of [his narrative] is evidently Pious," though he wishes it to be both "entertaining and improving" for the reader (3). Eastburn also includes his own preface, in which he writes that he did not intend to write a narrative since he "had no Opportunity to keep a Journal, and my memory being broken and Capacity small" (3). However, at the urging of friends, he decided to write it "from a sincere Regard to God, my King, and Country," though he notes that "the Way of representing some things [. . .] is not so regular, clear, and strong, as I could wish" (3-4). He writes that "it will be some Apology, that I am not so much acquainted with

¹⁰ McClintock, in fact, is specifically addressing the time period from the Victorian era to the later twentieth century in her *Imperial Leather*.

Performances of this Kind, as many others; who may be hereby excited to give better Representations of Things, far beyond my Knowledge" (4). Despite the religious introduction by Tennent, this does not read as comparable to the moralizing and fanaticism of the introductions to Puritan narratives written by Cotton and Increase Mather. Where those called for a mobilization of Christians against the dangerous heathen masses of Indians that menaced the Puritans, and for the sympathetic tears of all readers at the suffering of the captives, Tennent simply vouches for the character and honesty of Eastburn. The stakes are not explicitly laid out in religious terms as in the introductions by both the Mathers, but are played out in the course of the narrative on Eastburn's body.

Though there is a religious frame to his narrative, it is the piety of his Catholic Indian captors, not Europeans, that Eastburn often marvels at, and he admires their sheer determination to defeat the English; he writes that upon their return from a successful battle "they fell on their Knees, and returned *Thanks* for their *Victory*; an Example this, worthy of Imitation!" (8). He claims this devoutness "may make prophane pretended *Protestants* blush" who "instead of acknowledging a God, or Providence, in their military Undertakings, are continually reproaching him with Oaths and Curses" (8). Eastburn later remarks that "our *Enemies* leave no Stone unturned to compass our ruin; they pray, work, and travel to bring it about, and are unwearied in the Pursuit" (12-13). The English, on the other hand, "*sleep* in a *Storm*, that has laid a good Part of our Country desolate, and threatens the Whole with Destruction: O may the Almighty awake us, cause us to see our Danger, before it be too late, and grant us Salvation" (13). He concludes that

our *Enemies* seem to make a better Use of a bad *Religion*, than we of a *good One*; they rise up long before Day in Winter, and go through the Snow in the coldest Seasons, to perform their Devotions in the Churches; [. . .] The *Indians* are as *zealous* in *Religion*, as the *French*, they oblige their Children to pray Morning and Evening, [. . .] are punctual in performing their stated Acts of *Devotion* themselves, are still and peaceable in their own Families, and among each other as Neighbours! (44)

He adds that when he "compared our Manner of Living with theirs, it made me fear that the righteous and jealous God [. . .] was about to deliver us into their Hands, to be severely punished for our Departure from him" (44). Thus, in spite of his resistance to Indian demands of cultural performance, Eastburn valorizes aspects of their culture, even elevating them above his own. Williamson similarly writes in *French and Indian Cruelty* that though the Indians are "inhumanly cruel," it is also the case that "some *other* nations might be more happy, if, in some instances, they copied them, and made *wise conduct, courage, and personal strength*, the *chief* recommendations for war captains" (22). Despite their descriptions of unbelievably brutal torture practices and other instances of

inhumanity, the captives cannot create a stable boundary from the Indians and cannot help but realize that alterity and essence are never absolute. Their own bodies bear witness to that fact. Ironically, it is the captives who are most resistant to Indian culture who ultimately conclude that Europeans *need* to imitate the Indians in several important ways.

All captives must in some way accommodate themselves to the Indians; even Eastburn agrees to shave his long beard at the insistence of the Indian he wounded (17). What I have termed “feigning Indian” is the self-conscious performance of Indianness intended to ensure the survival of the British body at the expense of British identity. This reveals the understanding that the two are not mutually exclusive, and that the captive body can in fact perform an alien subjectivity. The action of feigning Indian therefore destabilizes the authority of British identity and momentarily collapses the distinction between self and Other. It even threatens to become a simulation; Baudrillard distinguishes between “feigning” and “simulation,” suggesting that “[s]omeone who feigns an illness can simply go to bed and make believe he is ill. Someone who simulates an illness produces in himself some of the symptoms” (qtd. in Vizenor 13). It is therefore the case that “feigning or dissimulating leaves the reality principle intact: the difference is always clear, it is only masked; whereas simulation threatens the difference between ‘true’ and ‘false,’ between ‘real’ and ‘imaginary.’ Since the simulator produces ‘true’ symptoms, is he ill or not?” (qtd. in Vizenor 13). There are moments that suggest the captive’s feigning becomes a simulation—Gamaliel Smethurst writes in his narrative, “[a]fter we had walked a league further, we pitched our tent for all night- Lay upon our mother’s lap (the earth)- I was under some apprehensions at first, as I had never travelled with Indians before; however, I behaved as if I was not the least afraid” (12-13). His use of “we” and “our,” as well as the casual, unmentioned appropriation of a recognizably Native maternalization of the earth, threatens his claim of merely behaving “as if” he were content. As I have mentioned at various points, the captive author often cannot separate “we” from “I,” which implicates him in the actions of the Indians. William Fleming admits to raiding the house of a fellow settler with an Indian; at first, he writes of the Indian that “he rumaged up such Things as pleased him best, [. . .] then he set Fire to the House” while Fleming “seem’d heartily to comply with [the Indian],” but he later slips in that “[w]e then made the best of our Way with the Plunder to the Place” (13-14). To paraphrase Baudrillard, since Fleming is in fact participating in an Indian raid, is he feigning or not? Rutherford recalls that “[s]ometimes our Mother roasted a large piece [of meat] for the whole family,” and he admits, “I soon came to eat as heartily as Peewash himself” (246). Even Eastburn, who piously refuses to participate in Indian cultural and religious practices, writes that when the French bring a “large Supply of Provision,” there is “great Joy [among the tribe], for we were in great Want” (13).

Adoptions

As I noted above, both the ranks of the British military and many colonists saw the possibility of becoming a “white Indian” as a very distinct and disturbing reality. Some of the captives only experience cruel treatment among their captors, and do not find a stable place in an Indian family, which enforces the notion that white people do not belong among the Indians. Henry Grace suffers countless humiliations and beatings before he is sold to a Frenchman, and is seemingly never accepted among the people of his tribe. Williamson too, despite later claims, is never accepted as a family member. Eastburn and Rutherford, however, both experience the process of formal adoption into a family, even though they attempt to minimize the significance of the event and claim that they resist going native. Their formal acceptance into families suggests that they have been particularly convincing in their performances and have in some sense earned a place among the Indians.

Rutherford admits he is dressed “*en sauvage*” before he is adopted into his Master’s family, and he “feigned a satisfaction with their way of living and a particular fondness for my new dress” (234). His Master would occasionally “dress me out in the richest manner, putting all the ornaments belonging to the family upon me, [. . .] and making me strut about to show myself, [. . .] calling out to the people to look at the little white man” (237). Rutherford understands his role as spectacle, noting that “[a]t this time I was only made a show of, and not suffered to join in the game” (237). Shortly afterwards, however, he goes on a voyage with his “family” and participates in various rituals whose meanings are unclear to him, including sacrificing and eating dogs and planting corn in a burial ground; one night, his Master promises to Rutherford that “in the morning I should have the mystery revealed” (242). The next day they go to a grave, while his Master “arose and made a long speech, during which he often pointed to the grave and to me alternatively, and at every pause we joined in a sort of chorus by way of approving of what he said” (243). Shortly after this Rutherford is told that he

was as much their son as if I had sucked these breasts (showing me those of his wife), telling me at the same time to look upon the boys as brothers, and that my name should be no more Saganash, or Englishman, but Addick, which signified a white elk. Notwithstanding this, I was generally called by my Master’s name, which was Peewash. I had three brothers, Mayance, Quido, and Quidabin. (243)

Rutherford becomes a member of a family and, despite his eventual escape and continued colonial activity, he refers to his adoptive parents by their new roles: Mother and Father. He occasionally refers to his father as “Peewash,” which does in this instance blur the line between self and Other, since Rutherford is, after all,

a lesser version of that name among the Indians. But despite his total adoption and re-naming, he is subsequently sold by his "family" to a Frenchman, though he claims, "[m]y mother and brothers took a very affectionate leave of me and went home loaded with the goods they had got for me" (252). Becoming an adoptive member of a family does not exempt the captive's status as commodity, and Rutherford circulates between several hands throughout his narrative. He eventually finds himself adopted for a short while by "King Wasson," an Ojibway chief, who promises him a leisurely life and wants Rutherford to marry one of his daughters. Rutherford's "family" soon want him back, however, because "it grieved their hearts to see me in the possession of another," and Wasson is obliged to return him since "he had no power to keep what was another's property" (257).

Eastburn is similarly brought into a family; like Rutherford, he goes on a journey to a place where he "was to be adopted" (22). He writes, "my *Father* and *Mother* that I had never seen before ordered me into an *Indian House*, where we were directed to sit down silent for a considerable Time, the *Indians* appeared very sad, and my Mother began to cry, and continued crying aloud for some Time, and then dried up her tears and received me for her Son" (22). Eastburn has, like Rutherford, evidently taken the place of a lost child in an emotional ceremony. This practice was well known, and became much more common in later narratives. In Alexander Kellet's fictional narrative of 1778, *A true Relation of the unheard-of Sufferings of David Menzies, Surgeon, among the Cherokees, and of his surprizing Deliverance*, he sardonically writes that an old woman orders the protagonist to be eaten, "instead of courteously inviting her captive to replace by adoption her slain child" (199). In Eastburn's case, his "parents" become "much displeased with their new Son" after he rejects their religion (23). He is sent to work with a kind, old Indian couple as punishment, and scarcely sees his adoptive parents again. He does profess a strong attachment to the old couple, and it is the old woman who gives him his new shirt. After leaving their company and that of his "parents," Eastburn's surprise reunion soon after with his own son, now a captive as well, is an ambivalent moment. He writes that he is "not able to express" his feeling at the reunion, "and therefore must cover it with a Vail of Silence" (31).

Williamson writes in *The trial of divorce, at the instance of Peter Williamson*,

[t]he reader will be here asking, what school I was brought up in? I shall only tell them, that the extent of it was upwards of four thousand miles, and the height thereof as high as the heavens, governed by Indians of many nations; and regular education is no where taught among them, but handed down from one generation to another, and their records are kept, marked with tomahawks on the outside of trees, and can be distinguished by themselves for

centuries back. I shall only leave it to the public to judge, if they can expect a learned discourse from a person, who, from his infancy, was brought up with those Savages, and taught nothing else but the use of the tomahawk and scalping knife; for a printed book was alike to me with that of clean paper; and the only opportunity I had to learn any kind of figures, was in the time of snow, to imitate the Indians by the mark they made on trees, which much resembles the Greek characters. (xxiii-xxiv)

His relatively short period of captivity, which began after he was already a married, established planter, has clearly become a life-altering experience by this time, over thirty years later (the divorce proceedings were published in 1789, while the first edition of his narrative appeared in 1757). His alienation from British society becomes increasingly evident with each edition of his narrative; upon its initial publication, Williamson was sued by Aberdeen merchants who took offence to his depiction of them as kidnappers. He included these court proceedings against him, along with a "Discourse on Kidnapping," in most subsequent editions of the narrative following the first. Though he initially lost the court case and all the editions of the book were ordered to be burnt, Williamson won on appeal and was awarded a settlement (Williamson 105). He thus ends the fifth edition of *French and Indian Cruelty* with the promise to those "groaning under the yoke of tyranny" that "Providence will throw friends in their way, their oppressors shall hide their heads, and the cruelties they have committed be retaliated upon" (147). He is not, however, talking about the "French and Indian cruelty" of the title, but rather that of the merchants and court system that kidnapped and silenced him. After a life of indentured servitude caused by the merchants of his home country, Williamson fashions himself into an Indian as he understands them to be. Known as "Indian Peter" throughout Scotland, he would open a café filled with artifacts from North America, and perform dances and the "war whoop" for anyone who cared to listen (Nolan 28). Williamson was buried in Edinburgh, not quite an Indian but profoundly effected by his short time among them-- the newspaper obituary reported, "by his own wish he was interred in the full panoply of a Delaware Indian Chief similar to those he had observed in Pennsylvania" (qtd. in Nolan 28).

Rutherford, like Williamson, returned to Scotland and lived out the rest of his life. Though he rejects his Indian family and joins the military to fight against the very nations he lived amongst, Colley notes that "something ineradicable had happened to Rutherford on that lost burial island, which he did not wish to acknowledge but could not entirely shake off" (*Captives* 195). He refers to his adoptive family as "my family" throughout, and despite his claim to have "lived in continual terror, expecting that every day would be the last," he admits that during his adoption in Wasson's family "[e]very member of the family [. . .] vied with one another to show me the most countenance and favour, and when any

disturbance or alarm appeared in the camp [. . .] I was always hid till the danger was over" (256). He even hints that he would have stayed with the Indians forever if Wasson had been allowed to keep him, and married one of the "princesses" that formed part of his family. Eastburn's rejection of and by his adoptive family is tempered by his alienation from white society and valorization of Native piety.

The attempted defusing of transculturation through its localization on the body is ultimately not effective, since the body is also the visible marker of distinction between self and Other. An English body in Indian clothes threatens to erase that marker, especially when the performance becomes a simulation. Captives end up displaying the performativity of both British and Indian identities rather than reasserting their own. Indeed, their old lives and selves often prove to be empty and friendless following their experience in captivity, suggesting that Indian life, despite their depiction of it as frequently filled with violence and inhumanity, is a tempting alternative to British society. Though this may be a much more common notion now, given the widespread appropriation of First Nations culture, its appearance in these texts from the height of colonial struggle sheds light on the less assured moments of British empire.

Conclusion
Battle Scars

“For it is in-between the edict of Englishness and the assault of the dark unruly spaces of the earth, through an act of repetition, that the colonial text emerges uncertainly.”

-Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*

Captivity narratives produced from the 1750s until shortly before the American Revolution are often understood to be anti-Indian propaganda meant to justify the continued conquest of Native lands and nations. Though I have in part demonstrated the ways in which British subjects entangle themselves in these constructions, I cannot wholly discount this assessment given both the historical and current reality of colonialism and its effects on First Nations people. It is difficult to claim within this context that these narratives are subversive texts that undermine the colonial project. Colley notes that captivity narratives are “ambivalent documents” because there is an “essential linkage between captivity on the one hand and the business of empire on the other” (“Going Native” 192). This connection draws the captives into what Césaire calls the “antagonistic economies” of imperialism, yet at the same time these men frequently find themselves in a state of abjection at the end of their captivity experience. They are integral to and yet in part alienated from the riches of empire, making their narratives frequently contradictory accounts of both terror and desire. Foucault describes texts such as these as “two-sided discourses”; in discussing the broadsheets and pamphlets that formed the “last words of a condemned man” genre, which also circulated around marked and tortured bodies in the eighteenth century, he suggests

[p]erhaps we should see this literature of crime, which proliferated around a few exemplary figures, neither as a spontaneous form of ‘popular expression’, nor as a concerted programme of propaganda and moralization from above; it was a locus in which two investments of penal practice met— a sort of battleground around the crime, its punishment and its memory. (67)

The different investments of empire within the captivity genre make it a battleground as well, centred around the European body whose suffering threatens to mask the more widespread and genocidal violence directed toward Aboriginal populations. The captive’s body ultimately cannot conceal the process of colonization, however, because it is implicated in it.

Though I have been careful to situate these narratives within the broader Anglophone captivity genre, as in the work of Snader and Colley, it is also important to emphasize their relation to the conquest and settlement of North America. Linda Tuhiwai Smith argues that for indigenous people, “[c]oming to

know the past has been part of the critical pedagogy of decolonization,” and we need to “revisit, site by site, our history under Western eyes” if we are to “transform history into justice” (34). These particular narratives call attention to the intense conflict and brutality surrounding them that has been largely absent from North American national histories, which in turn form an integral part of the subsequent and ongoing oppression of First Nations people. This historical silence continues to resound as unresolved land claims and reparations for cultural genocide are met with disdain and resentment from many who live on the very land gained through forgotten bloodshed. The contemporary disconnection from the violent claims of ownership asserted by various European and Euroamerican powers in North America over the last five hundred years, as well as the pervasive racism toward Aboriginal peoples which is chilling in both its ferocity and casual acceptance, means that these specters of colonial slaughter will continue to haunt the peripheries of North American cultural memory alongside the figure of the captive, whose damaged body cannot forget the colonial trauma inscribed upon it.

Bibliography

- Axtell, James. "The White Indians of Colonial America." In *American Encounters: Natives and Newcomers from European Contact to Indian Removal, 1500-1850*. Eds. Peter C. Mancall & James H. Merrell. New York: Routledge, 2000. 324-350
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Brown, Thomas. *A Plain Narrative*. 1760. v.8. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Burnham, Michelle. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861*. Hanover: UP of New England, 1997.
- Castiglia, Christopher. *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
- Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. 1950. Trans. Joan Pinkham. New York: MR, 1972.
- Colley, Linda. *Captives*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2002.
- - "Going Native, Telling Tales: Captivity, Collaborations, and Empire." In *Past and Present*. Number 168. 170-193
- Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Deloria, Vine Jr. *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. New York: Avon Boons, 1969.
- Denlinger, Elizabeth. "Caught Between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction (Review)." In *Biography*. Vol. 25, no 2 pp.391-394 March 2002
- Eastburn, Robert. *A Faithful Narrative*. 1758. v.8. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Ebersole, Gary L. *Captured by Texts: Puritan to Postmodern Images of Indian Captivity*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin White Masks*. 1952. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove P, 1967.
- Fleming, William. *A Narrative of Suffering and Deliverance*. 1756. v.8. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Gatenby, William. *A Full and Particular Account of the Sufferings of William Gatenby*. 1784. v.9. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Goldie, Terry. *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literatures*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1989.
- Grace, Henry. *History of the Life and Sufferings of Henry Grace*. 1764. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Hammon, Briton. *A Narrative of the Sufferings and Deliverance of Briton Hammon*. 1760. v.8. New York: Garland, 1975.

- Heard, J. Norman. *White into Red: A Study of the Assimilation of White Persons Captured by Indians*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press Inc, 1973.
- Hollister, Isaac. *A Brief Narration of the Captivity of Isaac Hollister*. 1767. v.10. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Kellet, Alexander. *A Pocket of Prose and Verse*. 1778. v.11. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Little, Ann. "'Shoot that Man, for He Hath an Englishman's Coat On!': Cultural Cross-Dressing on the New England Frontier, 1620-1760." In *The New England Quarterly*. Vol. 74, no. 2 (June 2001). 238-273.
- Long, John. *Voyages and Travels of an Indian Interpreter and Trader*. London, 1791.
- Lowry, Jean. *A Journal of the Captivity of Jean Lowry*. v.8. New York: Garland, 1975.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Mitchell, Robert. "The Violence of Sympathy: Adam Smith on Resentment and Executions." *1650-1850 Volume 8* (2003) 321-341
- Morgan, Philip D. "Encounters Between British and 'Indigenous' Peoples, c.1500-1800." In *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600-1850*. Ed. Martin Daunton & Rick Halpern. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1999. Pp. 42-78
- Morris, Thomas. *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse*. 1791. v.20. New York: Garland, 1975.
- Nolan, J. Bennett. "Peter Williamson in America, A Colonial Odyssey." In *Pennsylvania History* 31 (January 1964), 23-29
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967.
- - - "The Significances of the Captivity Narrative." In *American Literature*. Vol. 19, no. 1 (March, 1947), 1-20.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. "Fieldwork in Common Places." In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. J. Clifford and G.E. Marcus, eds. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.
- - - *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- - - "Scratches on the Face of the Country; or, What Mr. Barrow Saw in the Land of the Bushmen." In *"Race," Writing, and Difference*. Ed. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.
- Rutherford, John. *Narrative of a Captivity*. 1763. In *The Siege of Detroit in 1763*. Ed. Milton Quaife. Chicago: R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co., 1958.
- Saunders, Charles. *The Horrid Cruelty of the Indians*. 1763. New York: Garland, 1975.

- Sayre, Gordon M. *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature*. Chapel Hill, NC: The U of North Carolina P, 1997.
- Sewell, David R. "'So Unstable and Like Mad Men They Were': Language and Interpretation in Early American Captivity Narratives." In *A Mixed Race: Ethnicity in Early America*. Ed. Frank Shuffelton. New York: Oxford UP, 1993.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1973.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: St. Martin's P., 1999.
- Snader, Joe. *Caught Between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction*. Lexington, Ky.: UP of Kentucky, 2000.
- Thomas, Charles. *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Alienation of the Delaware and Shawanese from the British Interest*. 1759. St. Clair Shores, MI: 1970.
- Vaughan, Alden T. & Edward W. Clark, eds. *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1981.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan UP, 1994.
- Williamson, Peter. *French and Indian Cruelty; Exemplified in the Life and Various Vicissitudes of Fortune of Peter Williamson*. 5th edition. 1762. Intro. by Michael Fry. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 1996.
- - -*French and Indian Cruelty*. 1st & 3rd ed. 1757, 1758. v.9. New York: Garland, 1975.
- - -*The trial of divorce, at the instance of Peter Williamson*. Edinburgh, 1789.

