

## Communion in Captivity: Torture, Martyrdom, and Gender in New France and New England

GORDON M. SAYRE

The literature of Indian captivity is replete with graphic scenes of torture. In the genre's sensational heyday, which stretched from the 1760s through the 1860s, gratuitous representations of mutilation ostensibly proved the savagery of American Indians, and thus justified campaigns of genocide against them. In the *Affecting History of the Dreadful Distresses of Frederic Manheim's Family* (1793), the captors of Manheim's twin daughters

stripped the forlorn girls, already convulsed with apprehensions, and tied each to a sapling, with their hands as high extended above their heads as possible; and then pitched them from their knees to their shoulders, with upwards of six hundred of the sharpened splinters above described, which, at every puncture, were attended with screams of distress . . . the splinters, all standing erect on the bleeding victims, were every one set on fire, and exhibited a scene of monstrous misery, beyond the power of speech to describe, or even the imagination to conceive. It was not until near three hours had elapsed from the commencement of their torments, and that they had lost almost every resemblance of the human form, that these helpless virgins sunk down in the arms of their deliverer, Death.<sup>1</sup>

The victims are, suitably, virgins, and the techniques of torture suggest sadistic sexual penetration. Indeed, the passage is worthy of Sade himself. By making "the splinters" the grammatical subject rather than the torturers, the author invites the reader to take the assailants' position. The graphic violence of the scene is then excused with a rhetorical denial of its power to represent what it in fact so forcefully represents. Commenting on this scene and others like it, Leslie Fiedler has written, "[T]his primordial image

has continued to haunt pulp fiction ever since . . . for it panders to that basic White male desire at once to relish and deplore, vicariously share and publicly condemn, the rape of White female innocence."<sup>2</sup> Some readers in the 1790s may have perceived only the outrages of the "savages," yet the salacious function of the text seems unmistakable.

An analysis of such horrific descriptions reveals much about the sources and the values behind the captivity narrative genre in American literature, and exposes its connections to a related genre of martyr narratives. This essay aims to discover why the representations of Indian torture in captivity narratives arrived at the lurid extremes of the above passage (which as part of the so-called *Manheim Anthology* was reprinted at least seven times by 1839),<sup>3</sup> and why the female captive's violent death degraded and effaced her body to the point where it "lost almost every resemblance of the human form," rather than raising it in martyrdom.

The representation of torture in seventeenth-century captivity accounts moved from the ethnographic to the melodramatic, and from sacrificial to sensational, as its victims shifted from Catholic missionaries to Protestant women, and as the genre became central to New England Puritan literature. At the time that Mary Rowlandson's foundational narrative was published 1682, the figures of captive and martyr might have been unified. Instead, Mary Rowlandson's text entrenched a division between English and French treatments of torture that reflected gender and religious ideologies, as well as the two colonies' characteristic attitudes toward Native American cultures.

Beginning with Rowlandson, the captivity archetype did not reflect simply the confrontation of civility and savagery, but also of Puritan Protestantism with French Catholicism. After all, Rowlandson refers to her Indian captors as "Diabolical," "Wolves," "Bears," and "merciless Hea-then," yet remarks of her son, held captive by a different band, that "it might have been worse with him had he been sold to the French."<sup>4</sup> Puritan captives, and the Boston patriarchate that commanded the troops in King Philip's War and then King William's War, were actually more afraid of turning Catholic than of turning savage. Cotton Mather's account of Hannah Swarton's captivity speaks of "my captivity among the papists," and John Williams allots two-thirds of his narrative to an account of battles to defend his faith against the French, whom he describes as "cunning crafty enemies using all their subtlety to insinuate into young ones such principles as would be pernicious."<sup>5</sup> For New Englanders, the idea of a Catholic captive, a figure such as Isaac Jogues, was almost oxymoronic.

But there were Catholic captives, and their stories constitute a French colonial alternative to the Anglo-American captivity narrative. There are several seventeenth-century texts by or about Jesuit missionaries whose

residence among the Indians was transformed by warfare into captivity, torture, and martyrdom.<sup>6</sup> Jogues's narrative is the most notable of several missionary martyrs whose accounts make a fascinating comparison with the New England texts, for they employ many of the same tropes—the constant fear and graphic descriptions of torture, the captive's musings on the religious significance of his or her suffering, the kind treatment received from an adopted family—all to sharply different religious and ideological purposes. Representations of torture were not always employed as propaganda against the Indians. Even better than Jogues's, the remarkable martyrdom of Jean Brébeuf reveals how Native American torture customs could be seen as a potential model of syncretic exchange. After all, in Native traditions, these sufferings were not designed for White captives, and they created opportunities for the heroism, not simply the degradation of the victim. Furthermore, this torture carried no sexual innuendo. Northeastern Indians are well-known to have never raped their captives, and of course the same could not be said for European soldiers.<sup>7</sup> The antithesis between communion and defilement, martyrdom and rape, explains much about Anglo-America's resistance to any symbolic exchange or communion with Native cultures.

If the Anglo-American captivity narrative genre initiated by Rowlandson follows a plot that climaxes in restoration and redemption, Jogues's narrative aims toward a glorious martyrdom, only to be frustrated by the necessity of his surviving to write of his experience. Jogues was captured by Mohawks in August 1642 along the St. Lawrence River, while returning from Québec to his mission among the Hurons. Taken along with him were two French *domnés* (lay servants to the mission) and several Hurons. Unlike Rowlandson, John Williams, or Hannah Swarton, Jogues shared his captivity with Indian prisoners of war, and he knew that his fate would be determined by local customs, not by his race. One such custom was running the gauntlet, which he and fellow captives endured on the occasion of their arrival at each of three Mohawk villages. In place of Rowlandson's son and daughter, Jogues's "family" consisted of the two *domnés*—René Goupl and Guillaume Couture—and the Hurons whom he had converted to his faith. It was unthinkable for Jogues to slander these converts, as Rowlandson does the "praying Indians," and it was as routine for him to continue baptizing new converts during his captivity as it was for Rowlandson to continue her labor of sewing.

Another key difference between the two approaches toward captivity is the typological use of Christ's crucifixion. Rowlandson's providential pattern of suffering, and its meaning for New England as a whole, is interpreted primarily through Old Testament figures, and is ordained by God, not Christ. To equate her persecution with Christ's would either be an out-

right heresy or might invite a horrifying analogy with her bodily sacrifice. In Jogues's account and in the two earliest published narratives by captives of the American Indians, however, such an *imitatio Christi* was obvious. In the previous century, Hans Staden in Brazil and Cabeza de Vaca in Texas had both imagined their pain by reference to that of Jesus. Staden wrote, "I was dragged from the huts by the rope that was still around my neck to the dancing place. . . . I could only think of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of his innocent sufferings at the hands of the Jews, whereat I was comforted and grew more patient."<sup>8</sup> Cabeza de Vaca, not a victim of any ritual punishment, wrote of gathering firewood in thorny forests where, since "gathering it had cost me much blood, I could neither carry nor drag it. When I was in these difficulties, my only solace was to think of passion of our redeemer Jesus Christ, and the blood he shed for me, and to consider how much greater was the torment he suffered from the thorns than that I was then experiencing."<sup>9</sup> Yet these comparisons of firewood to the cross and the Brazilian Tupinamba to the Jews pale next to Isaac Jogues's description of his torture at the stake:

They next hung me up between two poles in the hut, tied by the arms above the elbow with coarse rope woven of the bark of trees. Then I thought I was to be burnt, as this is one of their usual preliminaries. And that I might know that, if I had thus far borne anything with fortitude or even with patience, these came not from myself, but from Him who gives strength to the weary. . . . I render thee thanks, O Lord Jesus, that I have been allowed to learn, by some slight experience, how much thou didst design to suffer on the cross for me.<sup>10</sup>

Jogues thanks Jesus both for orchestrating a torture after the pattern of His own, and for delivering him from it. When it later appears that he might finally be tortured to death on Good Friday, Jogues rejoices that "The morrow, which had closed the Savior's life, was now to close mine also!" (35).

So whereas the Anglo-American Calvinist Rowlandson remains passive, as if an attempt to escape would be an Arminian heresy, Jogues's position is characterized by a paradoxical combination of active and passive, evangelist and martyr, aggressor and victim. He can see two outcomes to his captivity: life brings continued suffering, but also the opportunity for additional baptisms, while death means martyrdom. Since martyrdom is redemption, he has a different motive for surrender than Rowlandson: "Although I could, in all probability, escape either through the Europeans or the savage nations around us, did I wish to fly, yet on this cross, to which our Lord has nailed me beside himself, am I resolved by his grace to live and die. For who in my absence would console the French captives? who absolve the penitent? who remind the christened Huron of his duties?" (38).

Jogues nonetheless did escape to the Dutch colony at Rensselaerwyck, where he wrote the story of his captivity and torture. From there he sailed to France, where he was received as a hero. Still intent on his mission, he returned to New France and to the Iroquois, who finally made a martyr of him in October 1646.

For Rowlandson, Indian captivity is a Protestant form of purgatory from which God saw fit to redeem her. For Jogues, torture by the Iroquois can lead to martyrdom and thus to heaven. If Rowlandson had been tortured or raped, then even if killed her status as Puritan visible saint would have become untenable. Aware that her readers might blame the victim, she carefully reported that while among the Indians "not one of them ever offered the least abuse or unchastity to me in word or action. Though some are ready to say I speak it for my own credit; but I speak it in the presence of God."<sup>11</sup> As a woman, Rowlandson knew that any suggestion of her suffering at the hands of savages would be contaminated by sexuality. Speaking "in the presence of God" lifts her above base corporeality and seduction, but at the same time removes any possibility for a martyrdom such as Jogues had anticipated.<sup>12</sup> Such a torture would have led her not to heroic memorial but to the dissolution of her human form, as happened to the poor Manheim girls.

Rowlandson's predicament seems overdetermined, yet I propose that her story, and the captivity genre in general, could have evolved differently. There were many female torture victims in Protestant martyrologies such as John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* that might have provided a model for the captive/martyr. And since Northeastern Indians did not rape captives, Puritan readers might have cleansed their minds of such innuendo. A deeper reason for the divergence of French and English, Catholic and Protestant, versions of the captivity/martyrdom narrative lies not only in gender but in the English writers' refusal to represent the Indians as conscious creators of meaning rather than as bestial villains. To demonstrate this we need to turn to another text that, even better than Jogues's, achieves the hagiographic potential of missionary martyrdom in New France.

Father Jean de Brébeuf was among the founders of the Jesuit mission to the Huron Indians in Southern Ontario in the 1630s, and the author of some of the most interesting parts of the *Jesuit Relations*, the annual reports of the mission that were published yearly in Paris. The mission's success suffered, however, as its objects died from unfamiliar diseases and from attacks by the enemy Iroquois. In March 1649, in an attack on the village of St. Ignace (named for Loyola himself), Brébeuf and Gabriel Lallemant were captured along with many "new Christians." The ensuing events were recorded by Christophe Regnaut, a lay servant of the mission, based on the eyewitness accounts of Hurons who fled the attack. Just five

pages in length, it appeared in the *Relation of 1649*. Shortly after capture, Brébeuf, like Jogues, urged his Huron converts "to suffer well, that they might die well, in order to go in company with him to Paradise."<sup>13</sup> For Brébeuf if not for Rowlandson, the figural palisade separating the pious from the heathen included many Indian converts within its walls. And, no Calvinist predestinarian he, Brébeuf was confident of his redemption after death. Like other missionaries who shared their dreams in the pages of the *Relations*, he must have contemplated—perhaps even looked forward to—martyrdom.

The drama of this martyrdom is culturally syncretic. Brébeuf understood the Natives' customs of torture, and sought to fulfill their ideal of a victim who earned the respect of his torturers. This ethic is perhaps best known to scholars from Montaigne's "Of Cannibals" in the portrait of the noble primitive "who yields no jot to his steadfastness for any threat of imminent death, who, as he yields up his soul, still gazes on his enemy with a firm and disdainful eye . . . he is killed but he is not vanquished."<sup>14</sup> Iroquoian customs of cannibalism differed somewhat from the Tupinamba Montaigne had read of (in Staden's text among others), but the ethic was the same. The victim was expected to sing a *chanson de mort*, a litany of his valorous achievements in warfare, preferably of victories over the tribe now torturing him. Brébeuf mimics this custom: "His zeal was so great that he preached continually to these infidels, to try to convert them. His executioners were enraged against him for constantly speaking to them of God . . . they cut off his tongue, and both his upper and lower lips."<sup>15</sup> The contest of valor is at once a contest of mockery, and could function on both levels only because missionaries and Indians, victims and torturers, knew each other so well.

Rowlandson saw her captors, even the praying Indians, as ignorant of her faith. When an Indian returned from an attack on Medfield, Massachusetts with a Bible for her, she observed "the wonderful mercy of God to me" in the event, and asked "whether he thought the Indians would let me read."<sup>16</sup> as if only through ignorance of the power of this book would they permit her to read it. By contrast, Brébeuf's torturers are portrayed as conscious foes of his faith, as enemies more like the Protestants' image of Catholics than of Indians:

[A] wretched huron renegade,—who had remained a captive with the Iroquois, and whom Father de Brébeuf had formerly instructed and baptized,—hearing him speak of Paradise and Holy Baptism, was irritated, and said to him 'Echon, (that is Father de Brébeuf's name in Huron) 'thou sayest that Baptism and the sufferings of life lead straight to Paradise; thou wilt go soon, for I am going to baptize thee, and to make thee suffer well, in order to go the sooner to thy paradise.' The barbarian, having said that,

took a kettle full of boiling water, which he poured over his body three different times, in derision of holy baptism.<sup>17</sup>

The torturer is a *renégat*, one who had consciously renounced the true faith. By providing an heroic martyrdom for Brébeuf and his brother Gabriel Lalemant, he and the Iroquois act out a script of the Catholic faith's struggle with the apostate wilderness. The customs of torture and anthropophagy translate easily from Iroquois to European frames of meaning.

Several scholars have written of how cannibalism in the early modern period was regarded through the lens of the Holy Eucharist, and turned to propaganda advantage by both Protestants and Catholics.<sup>18</sup> In the martyrdom of Brébeuf, the metaphor of transubstantiation becomes fully literalized, and Brébeuf's sacrificial blood becomes that of the lamb himself. At his final moment,

Another one of those barbarians . . . made an opening in the upper part of his chest, and tore out his heart, which he roasted and ate. Others came and drank his blood, still warm, which they drank with both hands,—saying that Father de Brébeuf has been very courageous to endure so much pain as they had given him, and that, by drinking his blood, they would become courageous like him.<sup>19</sup>

This image of blood streaming out of the chest was familiar in European art of the Crucifixion, yet its details are faithful to Iroquois custom also.

The martyrdom of Father Brébeuf is therefore a sacrifice to redeem the sins not of his own colonial community, as Rowlandson sought to do, but of his torturers. As the Iroquois drink his blood, Brébeuf believes that they affirm their common kinship with him and with the children of Adam, in spite of their own intentions. As Frank Lestringant analyzes the scene, "The real anthropophagy of the Iroquois and the symbolic theophagy of the Catholic missionaries have met to overcome the sacrificial curse and to consecrate, in a oneness that is in no way a simulation, the unity of the Revelation."<sup>20</sup> Yet readers of Brébeuf's martyrdom are also invited to the feast, for the corporeal details of his mutilation contribute to the fetish of relics, and thus to the ultimate goal of canonization. The denouement of Christophe Regnaud's account is a catalog of a future saint's relics:

I saw and touched a large number of great blisters, which he had on several places on his body, from the boiling water which these barbarians had poured over him in mockery of Holy Baptism. . . . I saw and touched his two lips, which they had cut off because he constantly spoke of God while they made him suffer. I saw and touched all parts of his body, which had received more than two hundred blows from a stick.<sup>21</sup>

There are several more such sentences, enumerating the parts of the corpse that Regnaud brought to Québec, "where they are held in great veneration." Regnaud seems anxious that because he did not actually witness the martyrdom, but only listened to reports from the Hurons, his account might be doubted. So he cleverly employs the graphic examination of Brébeuf's corpse as part of an allusion to the story of doubting Thomas, which inverts empiricist authority to insist that "blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (John 20:29).

In another instance of syncretism, Jogues rejoices in the understanding that to the Iroquois his torture and death "might compensate for the death of the chief"<sup>22</sup> killed earlier by the Huron. According to Iroquois belief, grief for a dead clan member festered dangerously until he was either replaced through the "requickening" of his identity in an adoptee, or compensated for by the torture of a victim.<sup>23</sup> The fate of a captive was balanced between these two alternative methods of "incorporation" into the tribe. Missionary ethnographers were astonished that captives of the Huron and Iroquois generally complied with this practice, abandoning their old identities and embracing new ones among their captors, even to the point of going to war against their former tribesmen. Jogues was aware of these customs, and welcomes the prospect that he might be identified with a respected chief among his captors, as well as the coincidence that Good Friday might be the date of his torture. His sacrifice, like the Savior's, might lead to the redemption of his captors.

It is difficult to read Rowlandson's narrative through this hermeneutics of sacrifice, because by the definition of the genre the captive is "redeemed" (ransomed), or occasionally escapes, while the martyr finds redemption in death. Yet Protestant martyrologies included female martyrs even if the captivity narrative tradition resisted it, and there is a repressed figure of a martyred captive in the Rowlandson narrative.<sup>24</sup> The Goodwife Joslin appears at first to be the vehicle for a lesson about the passivity of the proper Puritan captive. Rowlandson reports that "Good wife Joslin, told me she should never see me again, and that she could find in her heart to run away. I wished her not to run away by any means."<sup>25</sup> Rowlandson cautions Joslin of her weakness (she is "very big with Child") and the long distance to "any English Town," and drives home the message with the memorable line from Psalm 27, "wait, I say, on the Lord" (42). A page later, Rowlandson writes that she heard afterward of the torture and death of Joslin. She had not attempted an escape; Joslin's mistake was simply

asking the Indians to let her go home; they, not being willing to that and yet vexed with her importunity, gathered a great company together about her and stripped her naked and set her in the midst of them. And when they had

sung and danced about her (in their hellish manner) as long as they pleased; they knocked her on the head, and the child in her arms with her. When they had done that, they made a fire, and put them both into it. . . . (42)

The few details that Rowlandson provides, at second hand, of Joslin's "martyrdom" resemble that of Brébeuf, Lalemant, and Jogues.<sup>26</sup> But unlike Regnant's, her report, passed on from information "some of the company told me in my travel"<sup>27</sup> is merely incidental, and does not heroicize Joslin at all. This notwithstanding that Rowlandson was probably aware of Protestant martyrs like those in Fox's *Acts and Monuments*. Because the Indians are not granted any self-conscious agency as Christians or as anti-Christians, their torture of Joslin has no potential for martyrology, and as a woman, her suffering connotes sexual violation, not potential sainthood.

Surprisingly, one critic who has examined the Joslin scene, Teresa Toulouse, has concluded that Rowlandson employs it to "demonstrate the extent of her superiority as a female martyr" because "In dying with her infants, Joslin suffers no more bodily or mental pain. Rowlandson, as mother, must continue to suffer both."<sup>28</sup> For the Protestant woman, true martyrdom apparently meant being forced to live, not to die. Perhaps without meaning to, Toulouse invokes the melodramatic cliché of "a fate worse than death," which is how female bodily sacrifice is often read. In the legend of the rape of Lucretia, for instance, a woman's voice and agency are erased when the she suffers the antimartyrdom of rape. Her subject position is emptied out or made invisible, as with the Mannheim twins. This is what Rowlandson must avoid, for insofar as she represents the Puritan polity in her narrative, her death would foretell the defeat of the English in King Philip's War. But the Goodwife Joslin, a woman of lower status and apparently less pious than Rowlandson, lacks this typological weight and can be quickly forgotten.

Just as Joslin's violent end did not attract sympathy from readers of Rowlandson's narrative, the captive's victimization never achieved the status of martyrdom in Anglo-America. However, it did later converge toward the victimhood of sentimental heroines in seduction novels. Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse have argued that the melodrama of captivity prefigures that of the sentimental novel, and that Mary Rowlandson is a proto-Pamela, "a kind of epistolary heroine, whose ability to read and write, more than anything else, distinguished her from her Indian captors."<sup>29</sup> Like Pamela, the Protestant female captive's body is "hermetically sealed" (202) and "infinitely valuable" (207) as a repository of Englishness under assault from the Other. In effect, Armstrong and Tennenhouse claim that novel and captivity narrative become mature only when the protagonists are women (and that both are essentially Protestant). Other scholars of captivity narrative—Christopher Castiglia, Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola,

and Michelle Burnham—have recently published books that examine female captives exclusively, and demonstrate both the links between captivity and seduction as modes of sentimentality, and the subversive potential of captivity as an escape from patriarchy. Yet in confining the genre to female captives, in ignoring Spanish and French versions of colonial Indian captivity, and in reading the texts as anticipating sentimentality rather than revising baroque martyrdom, these critics address only half of a fascinating process of literary evolution. Rowlandson and the Anglo-American captivity genre do initiate a shift toward the modern novel of Protestant womanhood and away from a premodern morality where violation of the woman's body forced that body into silence and invisibility, the fate of the Goodwife Joslin. When Joslin is "stript naked" in the midst of the gazes of many Indians, when the Mannheim sisters are pierced with wooden spikes, the scene does not sacralize the body as relic; it implies the rape that could not be represented, and in fact never occurred. Readers of these scenes, whether male or female, communed in their moral outrage toward Native Americans, but did not arrive at the sense of sacrificial communion between torturers and victims, a symbolic exchange that is achieved in the narratives by Jogues and Regnaut.

Another scene in Rowlandson's narrative further demonstrates this resistance to symbolic exchange. Rowlandson writes of being taken to see King Philip, or Metacomet, the leader of the Indian resistance, and the namesake for the entire war. That she was granted this audience, as well as the fact that she traveled with Weetamoo, a female Pocasset sachem, suggests that her captors were aware of the status she held as the wife of the minister of Lancaster. The first gesture Philip makes toward her is to offer tobacco:

He bade me come in and sit down and asked me whether I would smoke it? (a usual compliment nowadays amongst Saints and Sinners), but this no way suited me. For though I had formerly used Tobacco, yet I had left it ever since I was first taken. It seems to be a bait the devil lays to make men lose their precious time. I remember with shame how formerly when I had taken two or three Pipes I was presently ready for another, such a bewitching thing it is. But I thank God He has now given me power over it. . . .<sup>30</sup>

This passage seems out of place in what might be a suspenseful scene of her confrontation with the enemy chief. But recall that for Native Americans smoking was a civil beginning for any council or negotiation. The pipe itself, the calumet, was a symbol of peace and ensured the safety of the one who carried it. Whereas Brébeuf engaged in a mimicry of the Indian custom of torture, and offered his own blood as syncretic eucharist for the salvation of his torturers, Rowlandson refuses to engage in an exchange

of pipe and tobacco. Although elsewhere she makes much of her adaptation to "savage" foods such as bear and horse's hoof, those were for practical sustenance, not ritual eucharist. Her transubstantial breath, like her bodily fluids, must not be shared with the Other. Furthermore, tobacco's addictive power is for Rowlandson emblematic of a fall into savagery. It is, like the Indian war as a whole, a field of battle between God and the devil, not, she insists in spite of all evidence, a communal sacrament inhaled by sinner and saint alike. Quitting is part of her spiritual conversion in captivity. Toward the end of her narrative she admits that her husband sent her some tobacco while she was a captive, but claims she sold it to her captors for nine shillings, and rebuts rumors about this gift: "It was a great mistake in any who thought I sent for tobacco, for through the favour of God, that desire was overcome" (66). A plant native to the continent, and the profitable basis for the rival colony of Virginia, tobacco is less a commodity for Rowlandson than a symbol of her renunciation of bodily desire and rejection of any communion with Native American peoples.

The preservation of the (feminine) body is perhaps the central, archetypal trope of the Anglo-American captivity narrative genre. Rowlandson's female, maternal body must be preserved uncontaminated for her redemption and figural resurrection. The transfigurations that the Jesuit martyrs' bodies undergo, from earth to heaven, flesh to spirit, sinner to saint, and mutilation to veneration, are not possible for the body of the Anglo-Protestant captive. Where the captive's body represents the colony or young nation, it must defend its borders against savage incursions. Where it is the virgin daughter's body, it must be preserved for the prerogative of the white male. Thus while not every captivity narrator is female, the genre treats male and female captives' bodies very differently.<sup>31</sup> The torture and effacement of the female captive's body is a symbolic rape, and an antitype to the martyr's beatification. The Jesuit missionaries who tried so hard to mortify their flesh, reminding readers of the horrific stench of their gangrenous wounds, succeeded instead in fetishizing their bodies as relics.

Further comparative study might explore this Anglo-American conception in counterpoint to Catholic colonial figures of femininity and syncretism. The Mexican descendants of Cortés and his Native guide Malinche regard the latter as sexually compromised yet essential to a hybrid identity. The Virgin of Guadalupe enshrines the penetration of Christianity into Native beliefs. In those vehicles the violation of one race by another gives rise to a new sacred culture, much like Jogues and Brébeuf can celebrate the heroism of suffering simultaneously in both a Catholic and an Iroquois context. Yet the Anglo-American captive only reinforces and circumscribes her ethnocentric self; the citadel that Leslie Fiedler termed the "Protestant Virgin." Although Fiedler's approach was flavored with an antisentimental

misogyny, it will be useful for us to revisit these episodes, and to build a more comparative colonial American literary history.

#### NOTES

1. Richard VanDerBeets, ed., *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives, 1642-1836* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1973), 205.
2. Leslie Fiedler, *The Return of the Vanishing American* (New York: Stein and Day, 1968), 93.
3. See VanDerBeets, *Held Captive by Indians*, 202.
4. Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1981), 54. Although it was still in press as I was completing this article, the Rowlandson, Jogues, Brébeuf, Swarton, and Staden texts discussed here are all included in my anthology, *American Captivity Narratives*, ed. Gordon M. Sayre (Boston: Riverside/Houghton Mifflin, 2000).
5. Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians*, 156, 208.
6. These include Jean de Brébeuf and Gabriel Lallement, discussed below; the Italian Jesuit Bressani (in James Leverier and Hennig Cohen, *The Indians and their Captives* [Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977], 23-30); and Pierre Millet (in *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, ed. Reuben Gold Thwaites [Cleveland, 1896-1901], 64:67-107). A different version of Jogues' narrative, with some interesting additions, is found in the *Jesuit Relations*, vol. 31. Both Jogues's and Bressani's texts were also translated and published by John Gilmary Shea in *Perils of the Ocean and Wilderness* (Boston: n.p., 1857).
7. See James Axell, *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 182.
8. Hans Staden, *The True History of his Captivity*. (London: George Routledge, 1928), 71.
9. Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, *Castaways*, trans. Frances M. Lopez-Morillas (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 75-76.
10. VanDerBeets, *Held Captive by Indians*, 18.
11. Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians*, 70. Much recent scholarship on Rowlandson has emphasized the representations of her suffering and the sympathetic response that these elicit from readers. See Lisa Logan, "Mary Rowlandson's Captivity and the 'Place' of the Woman Subject," *Early American Literature* 28, no. 3 (1993): 255-77; and Teresa Toulouse, "'My Own Credit': Strategies of (E)valuation in Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative," *American Literature* 64, no. 4 (December 1994): 655-76. Neil Salisbury's introduction to the Rowlandson narrative, on the other hand, suggests that she wrote with an aim of clearing her name of accusations of complicity or contamination; see *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1997), 46-48. I do not contend that Rowlandson suppressed any reference to her body so as to spiritualize her suffering; only that she limits the representation of her bodily suffering so as to avoid any suggestion of sexual violation, as occurs in the torture of Goodwife Joslin discussed below. The general issue of female captives' possible sexual relations with their captors is analyzed in June Namias, *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
12. Jenny Franchot, in one of the few literary analyses of Jogues's text in English, suggests that his martyrdom is transgendered; she says he "compares his torture to the pains of childbirth" and "conceives of his torture as a masculine asceticism necessary to a feminine

- new birth, the sexually transgressive metaphor testifying to his creative powers of endurance and authorship." *Roads to Rome: The Antebellum Protestant Encounter with Catholicism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 92. I would dispute, however, Franchoi's assertion that Jogues regards his torture as directed at his white skin (91).
13. Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, 34:27.
  14. Michel de Montaigne, *Essays*, trans. J. M. Cohen (Harmondsworth, U.K.: Penguin, 1958), 116.
  15. Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, 31.
  16. Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians*, 41.
  17. Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, 27-29.
  18. See Frank Lestringant, *Cannibals: The Discovery and Representation of the Cannibal from Columbus to Jules Verne*, trans. Rosemary Morris (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); and Maggie Kilgour, *From Communion to Cannibalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).
  19. Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, 31.
  20. Lestringant, *Cannibals*, 135.
  21. Thwaites, *Jesuit Relations*, 35.
  22. VanDerBeets, *Held Captive by Indians*, 35.
  23. See Matthew Dennis, *Cultivating a Landscape of Peace: Iroquois-European Encounters in Seventeenth-Century America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 106; and my *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 283-302.
  24. Moreover, Caroline Walker Bynum has shown how pious medieval women sometimes portrayed their bodily suffering as in sympathy with that of Christ. See "The Female Body and Religious Practice in the Later Middle Ages," *Fragments for a History of the Human Body, Part One* (New York: Zone, 1989), 160-219.
  25. Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians*, 41.
  26. The scene also recalls the illustration of John Smith's captivity in *The General History of Virginia . . .* (1624) and the frontispiece to the *Manheim Anthology* (reproduced in Burnham, *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861* [Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1997], 74), both of which appear to be copies of John White's watercolor showing an Indian fertility dance (a connection also noted by Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola and James Leverier, *The Indian Captivity Narrative, 1550-1900* [New York: Twayne, 1993], 59). That White's ethnographic portrayal of a peaceful "religious dance" would be transformed into an icon of captivity, the native virgins in the midst of the ring being replaced first by Smith, then by the virgin captives, parallels the shift in the written narratives that I am outlining. Compare these to the most famous and sensational image of the torture of Catholic missionaries, on the map *Novae Franciae Accurata Delimitatio* of 1657, mostly likely drawn by Bressani, and reproduced in VanDerBeets, *Held Captive by Indians*, 160.
  27. Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians*, 42.
  28. Toulouse, "My Own Credit," 660. I find Mitchell Breitwieser's reading of the Goodwife Joslin episode, which associates her with the Puritan figure of the "Wayward Woman Punished," much more accurate, although Toulouse's is more provocative insofar as it anticipates the later developments I am describing. See Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defence of Mourning* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 111.
  29. Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tenenhouse, *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 204. I find Michelle Burnham's analysis of the links between the captivity

narrative and the sentimental novel to be more solid, but Armstrong and Tenenhouse are notable for the importance they place upon Rowlandson in the history of the novel. See Burnham, *Captivity and Sentiment*, 41-62.

30. Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians*, 47.

31. This is not to say that no narratives of male captives in the Anglo-Protestant tradition included scenes of torture. Peter Williamson's narrative, first published in 1757 with the title *French and Indian Cruelty: Exemplified in the Life and Various Vicissitudes of Fortune of Peter Williams*, and later included in the Manheim anthology, was among the most popular and most sensational. He wrote graphically of being bound and burned, but expressed relief that his wife was not captured, and refrained from eyewitness descriptions of the torture of women even though he included many scenes of men.