379
N81
No. 6861

THE EVOLUTION OF THE TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY THE INDIANS OF THE NORTHEASTERN WOODLANDS FROM EARLIEST EUROPEAN CONTACT THROUGH THE WAR OF 1812

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Jeffrey Deward Carlisle, B.S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1992

R. S.

Carlisle, Jeffrey Deward. *The Evolution of the Treatment of Captives by the Indians of the Northeastern Woodlands from Earliest European Contact through the War of 1812*. Master of Arts (History), May, 1992. 236 pp., 1 Table, bibliography, 96 titles.

When the first Europeans set foot on the North American continent, they clashed, both physically and culturally, with the native inhabitants. The Indian practice of taking, adopting, and sometimes torturing captives offended the Europeans more than any other practice. The treatment afforded to captives varied from tribe to tribe and tended to change as the Indians adapted to the new environment and adjusted to the increased pressure thrust upon them by the advancing whites.

The primary sources used were Indian captivity narratives. The 111-volume *Garland Library of North American Indian Captivities* has made many of the better known narratives more readily available.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

II. TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS TO 1675 14

III. TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1675-1701. 53

IV. TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1701-1754. 86

V. TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1754-1766. 108

VI. TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1766-1783. 145

VII. TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS AFTER 1783. 188

VIII. CONCLUSION. 219

BIBLIOGRAPHY 226

LIST OF TABLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS

Page

I. Indian tribes of the Northeastern Woodlands 4

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

From the moment the first European set foot upon the North American continent until the North American Indian was finally banished to reservations carved from their once majestic land holdings, the two races were frequently in conflict, both culturally and physically. Neither race readily adjusted to or accepted the customs or lifestyles of the other and, as a result, they often clashed. To many Europeans the Indian way of life appeared barbaric and uncivilized. The native custom of taking captives and torturing them to death or adopting them into their tribes, thus turning them into "savages" like themselves, appalled many white men.

Most people today generally think of the American Indian in one of two ways. According to the first view, the Indian was a bloodthirsty savage whose only desire was to massacre helpless settlers. Settlers who were unfortunate enough to fall prey to the marauding red men could only look forward to a fiery, torturous death or a life of slavery. The Indians often adopted children into their tribe and forced them to accept their customs. Women captives suffered a "fate worse than death" as they became slaves of cruel Indian masters and mistresses and were reduced to a life of drudgery. The Native Americans spared male captives only to provide amusement for the tribe when they tortured, burned, mutilated, and scalped the victims during their pagan celebrations.

The second view of the American Indian is that of a noble red man. According to this view, the Indian lived at peace with all of nature until the white man moved in and began to steal his land and corrupt his civilization with liquor and bad morals. The Indian only fought to defend his rights or resist when pushed beyond the limits of endurance by aggressive settlers. The native inhabitants treated captives with as much or usually more kindness than they could expect to receive if they fell into the hands of their white counterparts.

Neither of these simplistic views gives the complete view of the Indian. In reality, elements of both views existed in Indian culture. Individual natives within a tribe varied from each other as much as the various tribes differed from each other. Their treatment of captives usually reflected the Indians' attitude and policy toward the white man. But, like the rest of Indian culture, their treatment of captives was not a constant and it changed as their relations with the white man changed. The Indians' behavior toward their captives mirrored the constantly changing policy they pursued against the new arrivals.

Indian treatment of captives varied from tribe to tribe and from individual to individual within the various tribes. Still, general trends within each tribe can be recognized. Using the Indians of the northeastern woodlands as subjects, their dealings with and treatment of captives can be traced from their first contact with the Europeans until their subjugation.

Two major tribal groups, the Algonkin and the Iroquois, inhabited the northeastern woodlands. The Algonkin covered an extensive area of the northeastern quarter of the North American continent, as well as smaller regions dispersed over the rest of the continent. Centered within the Algonkin groups were a powerful group of Iroquoian speaking Indians. The dominant group of these Indians was the Iroquois Confederacy or League of Five Nations, consisting of five allied tribes, the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Seneca, and Cayuga. Other Iroquoian tribes, such as the Huron, Erie, Tobacco, and Neutral nations, lived on the perimeter of the Five Nations but were never allied with them. The Confederacy did, however, allow a sixth Iroquoian tribe into their league in 1715. This tribe, the Tuscarora, migrated northward to join their linguistic relatives after the settlers of Carolina drove them from their former homelands. For the purposes of this paper, the term Iroquois will refer to, and be used interchangeably with, the Five Nations, the League of

Table I

Indian Tribes of the Northeastern Woodlands

Iroquoian:

- Iroquois or League of Five (Six) Nations:
  - Seneca
  - Cayuga
  - Oneida
  - Onondaga
  - Mohawk
  - Tuscarora (after 1722)

- Huron (Wyandot)
- Tobacco
- Neutral
- Susquehanna or Conestoga
- Erie
- Mingo

Eastern Algonkin:

- New England Tribes:
  - Abnaki
  - Passamaquoddy
  - Penobscot
  - Pennacook
  - Massachusetts
  - Pokumtuk
  - Wampanoag
  - Pequot
  - Narraganset
  - Mahican
  - Shinnecock

- Alogonkin
- Montagnais

Western Algonkin:

- Delaware
- Shawnee
- Miami
- Kickapoo

Iroquois, and the Iroquois Confederacy. Other Iroquoian-speaking tribes such as the Huron or Erie will be referred to by their tribal names.

The Algonkin tribes can be conveniently divided into two groups for the purposes of this paper. The Eastern Algonkin will refer to those tribes inhabiting the New England coast, eastern Canada, and the area north of the Great Lakes. These tribes had early and extensive contact with the first European settlers of North America. The Western Algonkin will refer to the Algonkin tribes living to the south of the Iroquois and inhabiting the Ohio River Valley. The Western Algonkin had less contact with the white man than their eastern kin until the French and Indian War.

Each of these three groups treated their captives differently. Likewise, each group varied its treatment of captives as time passed in an effort to deal more effectively with their European enemies. For the purposes of this paper, time has been divided into several chronological periods. Within each period, the Indians from each group followed a relatively clear policy in their treatment of captives. When a noticeable change occurred, either within an Indian society or because of outside influences, a new period began. For example, when the Iroquois first contacted Europeans, primarily French, they at first treated Frenchmen taken captive mildly in comparison to captives taken from neighboring Indian tribes. This lenient treatment by the Iroquois probably resulted from their efforts to make peace with the new arrivals, for the mutual benefit of both societies. Unfortunately, the French had already allied themselves with several tribes who were traditional enemies of the Iroquois and peace negotiations soon failed.

During the next period, the Iroquois treated their European captives, again primarily French, with as much if not more cruelty and sadism as they treated captives taken from their neighboring Indian enemies. The Iroquois had successfully cowed most of their Indian neighbors with their legendary torture methods and now, having failed to negotiate a successful peace, attempted to use these same methods to subjugate the French. Unfortunately for the Iroquois, the French view of warfare differed from that of the Indians. Indian warfare was based on hit and run tactics, with stalking and ambush as primary elements. If an Indian lost his life, even if he gained a great military victory, he received little honor from his associates because life was more precious than glory in the Indians' eyes. Thus, Indians rarely carried out extended campaigns against an enemy who anticipated attack or held fortified positions as the French and other Europeans did. The Europeans, on the other hand, carried out extensive campaigns against the Indians and, unlike their native opponents, sought to destroy the Indian food stores, which caused many indirect deaths through starvation and broke the Indians' morale.

Once the Iroquois discerned that their torturous treatment of captives did not have the desired effect on their new enemies, they began to alter their treatment to adjust to their new opponent. Their new policy also reflected their declining power within the North American power structure. By 1700 the Iroquois had suffered a series of disastrous defeats at the hands of the French. They quickly realized that if they did not soon end their conflict with the French, they would lose what little influence and power they still retained over their Indian neighbors.

Thus, after 1700, the Indians shifted to a policy of neutrality, disassociating themselves from matters that arose between their European neighbors. This strategy resulted in a severe decline in white captivities as the Iroquois struggled to regain their former status while not provoking their increasingly powerful white neighbors. This conduct continued until the Iroquois were dragged into the French and Indian War.

Once the Iroquois adopted a new policy of participation in the great struggle for the American continent, they began also to take more captives. Their treatment of captives during this period included torture but lacked the ferocity and sadism of the pre-neutrality periods. Captives taken during this time might be tormented but they were more apt to survive the process to be ransomed to the French or sometimes the English. The Indians generally reserved death by torture for captives who attempted to escape or when the captors became intoxicated.

After the French and Indian War, the Iroquois, even though most had fought with the British and thus were on the winning side, suffered severely during the war, further reducing their once significant power. Thus, between the French and Indian War and the American Revolution the Iroquois again tried to remain neutral. Unfortunately for them, however, their geographically strategic position prevented a neutral course and they became embroiled in another war in which they had little to gain and much to lose. The Confederacy itself divided during this struggle, as some tribes fought with the Americans and others fought for the British. In this, their last gasp, the Iroquois fought with a vengeance and treated their captives with more cruelty than the previous period, but they never reached the sadism of their ancestors. Following the conclusion of the American Revolutionary War, the Iroquois League no longer existed as a power. Most of the tribes were reduced to living on reservations carved from their former homelands or fled to their British allies in Canada. In addition, by the end of the Revolution, the frontier had moved beyond the area once dominated by the League. The Iroquois no longer participated in taking captives after that war.

The Algonkin Indians followed a different strategy from the Iroquois. During the period of earliest contact, both eastern and western Algonkin followed a policy of relative peacefulness. They took few captives and rarely resorted to torture. Because the eastern Algonkin lived in close proximity to the Europeans, they were subject to quick and deadly retaliation if they took captives. Only during times of open warfare between the two races were captives taken. Most of those persons were invaders, taken as prisoners of war, and they were often tortured to death. The western Algonkin, on the other hand, had little contact with the white man during this period and hence had no opportunity to take white captives.

After 1675 the eastern Algonkin were driven from their New England homelands, following their defeat in King Philip's War. Most of them fled northward into Canada where they soon allied themselves with the French. Many of the western Algonkin began their migration westward during this same period, remaining ahead of the frontier line and having only limited contact with the white men. The eastern Algonkin became more aggressive as they distanced themselves from the English along the Atlantic coast. With the help of their new ally, they began to raid their former neighbors, carrying many into captivity. The Algonkin rarely tortured their captives to death, although they often beat them and threatened them with torture if they faltered during the march to Indian villages. Many captives were eventually ransomed to the French where the Protestant English often underwent what they considered an even more horrible captivity among the Catholic French.

When the Iroquois began their policy of neutrality, the eastern Algonkin continued their raids upon English settlements to the south. The Algonkin became more aggressive, aiding their new French allies in the colonial wars of this period and continuing their raids after the Europeans had concluded a peace. Perhaps perceiving their invulnerability to reprisal from the English, the Algonkin increased their aggressiveness. Still, they treated their captives mildly compared to the sadistic torture methods previously performed by the Iroquois. Except in cases of attempted escape, most instances of torture occurred at the hands of a single sadistic individual rather than as a tribal ritual. The western Algonkin, for the most part, kept ahead of the advancing whites or remained subject tribes to the now weakening Iroquois Confederacy.

During the period of the French and Indian War, the eastern Algonkin reached their peak activity and then, within a few years, declined rapidly. During the early years of the war, when it appeared that the French might win, the eastern Algonkin actively raided English settlements and took captives. Their primary goal during this time, however, was to capture whites and carry them to Canada as prisoners in exchange for a French ransom. As the French influence weakened, however, their interest and ability to pay ransoms declined, and the Indians quickly succumbed to the advancing white civilization.

This same period saw the rise of a new Indian power, however. The western Algonkin, having thrown off the yoke of the faltering Iroquois, rose to their own preeminence. Settling in the Ohio River Valley that had been formerly controlled by the Iroquois, the western Algonkin determined to protect their adopted homeland from all intruders. Thus, when the British began marching into the valley, the western Indians attacked them with a vengeance. They treated captives harshly, adopting a few into the tribe while torturing to death those they deemed undesirable. Their torture methods resembled those used by the Iroquois in previous periods, although they never carried them out to such a large degree. The similarity probably resulted from the western Algonkin having witnessed and perhaps participated in Iroquois torture rituals during their subjugation by those tribes.

During the time span including the American Revolution, the eastern Algonkin treated their captives with more benevolence than during any other period. They rarely took women or children captive and left disabled males unmolested. They carried most of the captives to the British in Canada who, during the Revolution, apparently instructed their Indian allies to capture only adult males capable of bearing arms. Torture and adoption played only minor roles during this time. Perhaps the eastern Algonkin realized that their civilization was nearing its end and did not wish to antagonize their conquerors.

On the other hand, the western Algonkin treated their captives harshly. Having never been defeated by the white man, they hoped to use terror and torture, much as the Iroquois had in previous times, to intimidate the white men and prevent them from settling on their lands. Also influencing the western Algonkin methods were several independent Iroquois known as the Mingo. These Indians had refused to accept the reservations granted them and instead of fleeing to Canada had chosen to move west. Obviously these Iroquois would remember the torture methods and past glory of their confederacy and would influence their new Algonkin comrades in their use. The western Algonkin were the last northeastern Indians to actively take captives; the Iroquois and the eastern Algonkin had both been subjugated.

After the Revolution, only the western Algonkin actively participated in captive taking. They continued to follow the method of torture and intimidation learned from their former Iroquois masters. Only when it was too late did they learn that such methods did not work well to repel the white man. During the War of 1812, they joined the British against the Americans, but their subsequent abandonment by the British forced them to accept reservations from the Americans, flee to Canada, or move constantly westward ahead of the advancing tide of white settlements.

Therefore, from their first encounter with the white man until their final subjugation and removal to reservations, the Indians followed a series of policies toward their captives in efforts to deal effectively with the invaders. The Iroquois attempted peace, intimidation, and accommodation before eventually succumbing to the wave of white settlers. Likewise, the Algonkin used several policies in their treatment of captives in an effort to prevent their subjugation. In the end, all efforts proved futile as the white man spread westward, sweeping the red man before him or limiting him to small reservations.

CHAPTER II

TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY INDIANS OF THE NORTHEAST TO 1675

When the French first began to settle in the St. Lawrence River Valley, they made allies of the Algonkin and the Huron, aiding them against the League of Five Nations to the south. Many of the earliest descriptions of the treatment of captives involved the torture of Iroquois captives by the French allies. Appalled at the cruelty of their allies toward the captives, the French sometimes tried to prevent it. The Huron usually responded to such interference by replying that their tortures were not nearly as cruel as that applied to captives of the Iroquois. Generally, the French could not prevent the torture, but they could often lessen its cruelty. In later years, when many of the Huron became Christianized, the French effectively limited the tortures and sometimes could comfort and baptize the victims.

The Huron and Algonkin used methods similar to the Iroquois but with less cruelty. Additionally, the French religious influence tempered Huron and Algonkin actions as time went by. The French had more limited success in their attempts to Christianize the Iroquois, but their religious teachings did have some effect, though not as the French desired.

When the Huron took a captive, they usually removed his fingernails by gnawing the tips of the digits with their teeth. This action made an escape attempt by untying oneself more difficult.[1] To effect the same result, the Iroquois sometimes took this precaution a step further and cut off the captive's thumbs.[2]

Depending on the mood of the captors, the circumstances of capture, and how far they had to travel, the captive might be subjected to better or worse treatment. In one case, after tearing out the captive's fingernails, his captors bit him severely on the arm. Another had a finger torn off,[3] while others had their back and shoulders slashed with a knife. Finally, the captors bound their victims and led them in the direction of the village. During the journey the captors forced their captives to sing and mocked them contemptuously.[4]

Upon their arrival in the village of their captors, the captives suffered a beating, usually in the form of the gauntlet. Almost all the tribes of the northeast used the gauntlet, although it took various forms. The usual form was for the inhabitants of the village to make two parallel lines where members armed themselves with clubs, thorny branches, knives, firebrands, or other objects with which to strike the captives as they passed. Each captive went through the lines followed by his captor who held the end of the cord that bound the victim's hands. This restraint kept the captive from moving too fast and avoiding the blows. In some cases, the instigators hobbled the sufferer's legs to limit his speed. The captors stripped off the prisoner's clothing, but gave him a porcelain necklace to designate him as a captive.[5] The clubs and knives must have been used sparingly since few captives, constricted in this manner, would have survived the gauntlet to reach the scaffold at the end of the lines otherwise.

At other times the beatings were less organized. In one particular case, as soon as the captive entered the village the women and children of the village fell upon him, beating him severely. A crippled Indian used a heavy, doubled rope to lash the captive's back, chest, and stomach with such fury that the victim staggered and nearly fell. Meanwhile, other tormenters put fire in his mouth and thrust firebrands at him from all directions. After completing the beatings, the victim received a brief respite, though his hosts still forced him to sing and dance.[6]

In another case, the Huron brought a particular captive to a village to be put to death. Since he had apparently been through several villages, he had probably been subjected to the more traditional gauntlet at one or more of the previous settlements. In this case, as soon as the victim reached the village, the women seized him and took him into their cabins where they forced him to dance.

One of the women beat him with a whip of knotted cords. Another struck his chest and stomach with a great stone, while a third gashed his shoulders with a knife. An emaciated Indian, who had been ill for several months, apparently recovered his strength at the sight of the captive and leaped upon him, biting off his ear. He then placed the severed appendage in the captive's mouth, who chewed it without apparent concern. Unable to swallow it, he finally spit it into the fire. Afterward, the tormentors halted and fed him with the best food available. After the meal they bound him with ropes and led him from cabin to cabin while a woman followed, whipping him to the tune of a song.[7]

In almost all of its forms, the warriors, especially the returning captors, took no part in the beatings except in some cases to lead the captives through the lines. The women, children, and the sick or disabled were the main participants. Thus, they used this opportunity to vent their rage over lost friends and relatives.

The Huron, more than the Algonkin but less than the Iroquois, had some religious ceremony attached to their torture, as seen in the following extensive description of the torture of a Seneca captive by Huron in 1637. In that case, a party of Huron captured eight Iroquois. They killed one of the Iroquois instantly and took only his head. Once the party had retreated beyond the reach of their enemies, they paused to divide the captives, and then continued to their separate villages.

At the first village, one party of Huron held a council to determine the fate of their captive. They decided that he should be given to a prominent member of the village to replace a nephew who had been captured by the Iroquois. An escort of thirty to forty warriors then led the captive from village to village. They dressed him in a beaver robe and placed the symbolic necklace of porcelain beads around his neck.

At each village he received a feast and generally favorable treatment, although at sometime before he reached one of the villages he suffered considerable abuse. Some person or persons had badly bruised one of his hands with a stone, wrenched one of his fingers away, almost severed the thumb and forefinger from his other hand with a hatchet blow, and severely burned the joints of his arms, cutting one deeply. At this village where the French first saw him, he suffered no further abuse except being forced to sing.

The Huron hosts allowed the French priest to instruct and comfort the captive. Upon this occasion, the Indians held a feast and cooked a dog. They assured their captive that he was among friends and relatives, and then hand-fed him the cooked dog since he could not feed himself with his mangled hands. The pain from his hands caused him to request to be allowed to step outside to get some air. The

Indians immediately granted the request, gathered around him to wash his hands, and attempted to remove the worms that infested them. This latter task proved impossible, as the worms continually crawled in and out of the flesh. The French withdrew during the feast, but when the captive asked to be allowed to visit them his captors took him to their cabin where his instruction continued.

The next morning his captors escorted him to another village, where the Indian to whom he had been given soon arrived. This Indian, upon seeing the wretched condition of the captive's hands, explained that he had originally been prepared to adopt him and spare his life, but now he felt that it would be better for both of them to have him put to death.[8] At the conclusion of this talk, a woman, the sister of the deceased whom the captive was to replace, arrived and expressed remorse over the captive's fate and condition. She brought him some food while his master cooled him affectionately with a feather fan.

At noon the victim received a farewell feast. He danced and sang and invited those present to join him. That evening, he went to a long cabin in which eleven fires had been kindled five to six feet apart. In the cabin the old men took positions on a platform that extended the length of the structure on both sides while the young men remained below. Scarcely a passage remained along the fires where each of the occupants waited with a firebrand to burn the captive.

Before the captive entered, an Indian captain instructed the occupants to do their job well since their actions would be witnessed by the sun and the god of war. He instructed them to limit themselves to burning the captive's legs so that he might live to see the dawn. Several Huron then led the captive in and bound his hands. His guards gave him a tour of the cabin, probably with the dual purpose of showing him the route he should follow and to allow his torturers to see him before the torture began. Once they had completed the tour, the Huron compelled the captive to run around the cabin while his tormentors gleefully burned him with firebrands as he passed.

At one end of the cabin the Huron stopped him and broke some of the bones in his hands. They thrust sharp sticks through his ears and rebound his wrists more tightly. Then they released him to continue his run. If he paused to catch his breath, his tormentors forced him to repose on the hot ashes and burning coals.

On his seventh trip around the cabin, his strength failed and he fell down among the ash and embers. After a short time the Huron tried to get him to continue, but they failed to stir him. One of the tormentors applied a firebrand to his loins that caused him to faint. Thereupon, the young men began to stir up the fire around him, apparently with the intent to burn him where he lay, but the captain stopped them so that the captive might live until dawn.

At this point the Huron lifted the poor soul from the coals and placed him on a mat, while others extinguished most of the fires. Many of the occupants of the cabin began to drift away but others stayed and gave the captive water in an effort to revive him. After an hour, he opened his eyes and those caring for him commanded him to sing. At first his voice was weak and cracked, but gradually it grew in strength and volume. When he could be heard outside, the young men began to return to the cabin.

The tormentors each took a turn at burning him again. They continued to concentrate on his legs that now lay in shreds. Some applied a flame to his leg, pulled it away only when he cried out in pain, then reapplied the fire to repeat the process when the victim ceased shrieking. Others bound cords around his body and then set them on fire, to burn his body slowly. Some heated hatchets red hot and then forced him to press his foot against them. Still others struck his head with a club, punctured his ears with sticks, or broke his fingers. Oddly, all during these actions, the men praised and complimented the captive, asked him where he preferred to be burned, or pretended that he was cold so they could use the fire to warm him.

They gave him sufficient water and corn to assure that he survived until sunrise. When dawn arrived, the

Huron lit fires outside the village and carried the captive to them. They forced him up a six-foot scaffold and three or four accompanied him. They tied him to a tree limb which passed overhead, but allowed enough slack in the rope to give him limited movement.

Now the burning began again. This time, however, they spared no part of his body. They used new firebrands from time to time as the old ones ceased to burn. The torturers thrust flaming sticks down his throat or up his rectum. They burned his eyes and applied red hot hatchets to his shoulders or hung them around his neck. If he attempted to crouch or sit, his tormentors would position their flaming brands beneath the scaffold to force him to rise. Eventually the captain ordered a break to give the captive water. When he failed to move, the Huron feared that he might die from a means other than by the knife, which they considered a bad omen. Therefore, they quickly severed a foot, a hand, and finally his head. The Huron then held a feast and consumed the body.[9]

This lengthy description contains most of the elements used by the Huron in their torture of captives. They appear, however, to be more uncertain and unprofessional in their actions than the Five Nations, as will be seen. For example, at least once, the captain had to intervene in order to prevent the premature death of the captive. His instructions to concentrate on the captives legs, while possibly part of the ceremony, seems to indicate that the Huron were not fully versed in this procedure. It seems probable therefore, that the Huron had only recently acquired from the Iroquois the ceremony to the sun god and the god of war and that their torture methods resulted only from a desire to revenge themselves on their enemies for outrages committed on their friends and relatives.

In many other cases, both before and after the above described incident, no mention exists of the sun or god of war. Of course this omission could merely be an oversight on the part of the chronicler. But in many cases, having the captive die by fire seems to be of no concern to the Huron. In one case, they tortured two captives simultaneously by fastening them to stakes and burning them with firebrands and hot irons. When one of the captives died unexpectedly, the Huron turned their fury on the remaining victim. They almost immediately scalped the survivor, an action usually performed near the end of the torture. Surprisingly, instead of expiring, the captive recovered and grasped a firebrand to defend himself. This act of defiance enraged the Huron and they redoubled their efforts, throwing hot ash and embers at him. Others crawled beneath the scaffold to thrust their firebrands at him from below. While defending himself, the captive fell from the platform where the Huron immediately seized him, burned him anew, and tossed his body upon a fire.

The captive remarkably emerged from the flames wielding two firebrands and began to struggle toward the village as if intending to incinerate it. After struggling almost one hundred yards, he ceased his efforts when one of his enemies knocked him to the ground with a club. Before he could rise, they fell upon him and cut off his hands and feet. They then roasted his body over nine separate fires, moving to a new one each time his blood extinguished the flames. They then thrust him beneath a blazing, overturned tree trunk where they cruelly burned his entire body.

Again, the recalcitrant victim rolled himself from the flames and struggled on his elbows and knees toward his enemies. Finally one of the Huron cut off the captive's head with a knife, thus ending the incredible episode.[10] Even though the Huron put this captive to death by the knife, as required by the ceremony of the sun and god of war, it appears to have been done more out of exasperation than for any other reason. Most likely the Huron would have been satisfied for the victim to have died in the flames as he most surely would have done had he not struggled free each time. Thus it is probable that their torture of captives was more strongly motivated by revenge than for religious beliefs or ceremony.

Cannibalism, on the other hand, was apparently related to ceremony or served as a means of torturing the victim. Many times the captors forced their captives to eat parts of their own bodies, especially ears, as seen earlier, or fingers. In an example of the latter, a woman tried to bite off a captive's finger. When she failed, she resorted to using a knife. She then placed the severed digit in the victim's mouth in an attempt to force him to eat it. When he could not or would not swallow the morsel, the woman removed it, roasted it, and gave it to some children to suck on.[11]

After a captive expired, the hosts often cut the body into pieces for distribution among tribal members or cut it up and boiled it in a pot to serve at a feast.[12] At other times the Huron simply burned the body, or roasted it for the dogs to consume.[13]

In several instances the French lessened or cut short the tortures by appealing to those who had been Christianized, or by hinting that the French would not be pleased if the tortures continued. The French always acted with caution to avoid threatening their allies. Sometimes the French saved or ransomed a captive but usually the Indians simply removed the captive from the Frenchmen's sight to be disposed of without interference.[14]

A final note of interest regarding French influence on the Huron relates to religious symbolism. In some cases the Huron pierced the captive's feet and hands with hot rods or sharp spikes. This action left wounds that one French priest compared to those Christ suffered on the cross.[15]

Whether the Huron made this connection is unknown, but perhaps the Jesuits' teachings left some lingering influence.

The Algonkin followed a process similar to that of the Huron, but without the religious connotation. Like the Huron, the Algonkin tore off their captive's fingernails soon after capture. During the torture, they cut off fingers and bound the captive's wrists together so tightly as to cut the flesh and sometimes break the bones. Next, they tied the captive to a stake and the women and girls brought presents to the captors in exchange for the privilege of torturing the victim. They then applied fire to the most sensitive and private parts of the sufferer, pricked them with awls, bit them, and cut them with knives. They threw fire, burning coal, and hot sand upon them, drowning out their cries with yells of their own. They would cut the victim's forehead and peel back the scalp, thrusting hot sand onto the exposed skull. Sometimes they pierced the captive's arms or wrists with sharp sticks and drew the nerves through the holes. Once a captive had died from the burning, his heart might be cut out and given to the children of the village to eat, or his entire body might be consumed in its half-roasted condition.[16]

The torture practices of the Algonkin resemble those of the Huron, but without the ceremony or preparation. The Huron seem to be more similar to the Iroquois than the

Algonkin. The Algonkin also did not care if the captive died by burning, which the Huron sometimes tried to avoid and the Iroquois almost always tried to avoid. The other major difference was the giving of gifts by the females for the privilege of torturing the captives. While not limited to the Algonkin tribes, the practice seems to be absent from the Iroquoian tribes.

The French sometimes ransomed or rescued captives from the Algonkin. Even when wood had been gathered and stakes prepared for the captive to be burned, the French often prevented the death of a captive. They carried out this negotiation by using the Christianized Indians to argue their case for them.[17] The Algonkin, like the Huron, maintained that they would receive this treatment if captured by their enemies.[18]

As the French influence increased, captives began to receive more humane treatment. For example, a group of Christianized Algonkin captured or killed a group of Iroquois. After scalping the dead, the party embarked in their canoes to return to their villages. One young captive complained about his tight bonds, whereupon his captor retorted that he apparently did not know the rules of war. Another captive immediately commented on how he had seen Algonkin weep and cry when captured by his people and burned, adding that the Iroquois had no such fear of death. The Algonkin struck the captive for his insolence, but offered no further violence. At the village, the dancing inhabitants met the captives but did not abuse them.[19]

In another instance, a captive arrived at a missionized village after having been cruelly treated at an earlier village. The local Indians ran out to meet him with charity and good will, took him into each of their cabins to have him dance, and offered more kindness and gentleness than usual. After he had finished dancing, they led him to the hospital where the nuns received him joyfully. A surgeon attended his wounds, while the curious and concerned Indians gathered around him.[20]

In the 1660s, the Huron did not beat or maim three Iroquois captives, even after the prisoners arrived in the village. Instead, they took the trio to the chapel and left them in charge of the French who instructed them in the Christian faith. All of the Iroquois did not escape death, however. After the instruction, the Huron shot two of them but spared one, a Huron by birth, who had been captured and raised as an Iroquois.[21]

Thus, as time went on, the French exerted more influence on their allies. As more of the Algonkin became Christians, the French used them to argue against the use of torture. Unfortunately for the French, they failed to convert the Iroquois to the same degree.

The Algonkin of the New England area seem to have been much less aggressive than their relatives to the west.

Most of the cases involving captivity occurred during warfare with the English, such as the Pequot War and King Philip's War. Prior to King Philip's War, extended captivities appear to have been rare. Captives suffered death by torture soon after their capture if no one came to ransom or rescue them. Possibly the proximity in which the Indians and whites lived in New England resulted in the lack of captives since the nearness of the white settlements made it much easier for a captive to escape or be rescued by his comrades. After King Philip's War and the dispersal of the New England Indians, the Algonkin raids probably increased as the raiders returned to the area to pillage and take captives and then retreated to their more distant homeland with less fear of retaliatory strikes.

The general method of torture by these Indians appears to have been burning, but little evidence exists to indicate the method or duration of torture. The Pequots captured John Tilly, tied him to a stake, flayed him alive, thrust burning coals into cuts on his body, and cut off his hands and feet. Tilly apparently survived for three days in this wretched condition. Whether his torturers continued this cruelty throughout this period is unknown, but it appears possible since Tilly's courage and endurance apparently impressed his tormentors.[22] Probably his tormentors only cut off his fingers and toes instead of his entire hands and feet, although those extremities might have been removed later.[23]

From this and other meager descriptions, the New England Algonkin during this period apparently tortured their captives in methods similar to but perhaps not as cruelly as their northwestern relatives. They seem to have been the least influenced by the Iroquois. This reduced activity possibly resulted from their dangerous proximity to two aggressive neighbors, the Iroquois to the west and the English to the east. Their major concern during this period was probably survival, and they were therefore probably cautious not to incur the wrath of their more powerful neighbors.

When the Five Nations obtained firearms from the Dutch and later the English, they quickly dominated less aggressive tribes in the northeast. Their neighbors knew of their excruciating torture of captives and consequently feared them.[24] These tribes, as we have seen, retaliated by torturing Iroquois who were taken captive.

In many of the early contacts with the Iroquois, French captives received better treatment than their Indian counterparts. For example, when a surrounded Frenchman's arquebus misfired, the failure to harm his attackers probably saved his life, although he received a javelin wound in the leg. His European companion also surrendered without harming an attacker. The Iroquois bound both captives but they did not tear out their fingernails or mutilate them in any way.

More than two weeks later, the captives reached the village of their captors, where Indians from neighboring villages and even other nations gathered to see the strangers. The Europeans stood for long periods of time while curious Indians examined them thoroughly. Some of the examiners insulted the captives and others threatened to burn them, but a few, who had received good treatment at the hands of the French, treated them well and made speeches on their behalf. When these latter Indians offered presents in exchange for the captives, the council decided to spare them and use them the following spring to negotiate a peace with the French. As a result, Indian families adopted the captives and treated them as their own children.[25]

In comparison to this gentle treatment, a group of Algonkin captured during the same period (c.1640) received a harsher treatment. The Iroquois surprised an entire village, slaughtered or captured it inhabitants, and bound the captive men, women, and children with strong cords. The victors then sliced the dead bodies into pieces, threw them into pots, boiled them, and ate them in front of the distressed survivors.

When the party finished their meal, they set off to their village. The Iroquois tomahawked one woman when she proved unable to keep pace. They seized the infants of three other women, placed them on spits, and roasted them over slow fires before their helpless mothers' eyes. After they had been roasted to death, the Iroquois tossed the bodies into kettles, boiled them, and then ate them in front of their horrified mothers.

On the journey, one woman cast herself into a frozen river, preferring death by drowning to that by burning which awaited her in the village. Her captors tried to rescue her but failed. Instead, they clubbed her to death and took her scalp. Two young Indians went ahead to announce the group's arrival and brought a large number of Iroquois to meet the party a full day's journey from the village. The women brought corn and other food for the warriors. Thereupon the group called a halt and forced the captives to dance.

Upon entering the village, the Iroquois took the captives to a large cabin that had been prepared for their arrival. Inside the cabin, men, women, and children beat the still bound prisoners and tied cords more tightly around their wrists. The occupants gashed the backs and shoulders of the sufferers and cut off a number of their fingers, varying the torment with each captive. They used fish scales instead of a knife for this operation in order to make it more lasting and painful. One woman had both her thumbs cut off and her tormentor tried to force her to eat them.

After this stage of the torture, the captives received food in order to revitalize them. The captors then ordered the men to sing; they also stripped the women and ordered them to dance. One Christianized captive refused to sing except in French fashion and so irritated his captors that they cut his fingers lengthwise in order to make him suffer more. Eventually, the Iroquois killed the men and older women. They spared almost thirty of the younger women to live and marry among the victorious Iroquois. The hosts tortured the women, but told them that their new masters would not need to kill them but would be satisfied with burning them with torches and gashing them with knives.[26]

When the Iroquois appeared unsure of their position as friends or enemies of the French, they tended to treat them less harshly. Within a year, however, the attitude of the Iroquois changed. According to the French, this change resulted from the French refusal to accept peace on the Indians' terms.[27] During this period, a party of Iroquois captured Jesuit Father Isaac Jogues, along with several Frenchmen and their Huron allies.[28] One of the Frenchmen killed an Iroquois and the remaining attackers immediately pounced upon him. They stripped him, beat him with clubs, tore out his fingernails, and crushed the ends of his fingers. They pierced his hand with a javelin and then bound him tightly and brought him to where they confined the others.

Jogues ran to comfort and encourage his fellow countryman, but the Iroquois, perhaps believing that the

Jesuit sought to congratulate the Frenchman for having killed an Indian, fell upon Jogues and beat him insensible. When he recovered, those who had not beat him tore off his fingernails and bit the ends of his fingers so violently that splinters of bone protruded from their ends. The other French captives received like treatment, but oddly the Huron did not.

On the journey to the Iroquois villages, the group met a war party returning from a raid on the French and their Indian allies. The new arrivals gave thanks to the sun for the captives and then melted into the woods to gather sticks and thorns with which to beat the captives. Upon their return, they beat the captives severely. During the flogging, Jogues fell to the ground, but instead of allowing him to get up the Indians only intensified their blows. When they finally realized that he had not fallen by accident and made no effort to rise, they gave him a brief respite to recover his senses. Once he recovered they again hurled blows and insults at him. They then burned one of his fingers and crushed another in their teeth. They scratched his wounds with their nails, and when his strength failed they applied fire to his arms and thighs. One of the Indians approached Jogues on two separate occasions with the apparent intent of cutting off his nose, but each time left before carrying out the action. One of the Huron captives had both of his thumbs cut off and a pointed stick thrust into the incisions up to his elbow.[29]

Once the war party departed, the journey continued. A quarter of a league from the village several men and youths met them and fell upon the captives. They tore out Jogues's remaining fingernails and dug out the flesh beneath them to the bone. Once this heinous act had been accomplished, the journey resumed.

At the entrance to the village, the youths, armed with sticks and iron rods, formed a gauntlet. They spaced the three Frenchmen among the more numerous Huron captives. Some of their captors placed themselves among the captives to keep them from passing too quickly through the gauntlet. After passing through the ranks, the prisoners went to the center of the village and climbed a scaffold where they received another brief respite as their tormentors limited themselves to verbal abuse. One Frenchmen who received a severe beating while passing through the gauntlet had to be carried to the scaffold.[30]

For the next three days the Iroquois heaped more abuse upon their victims. Jogues received special attention because of the respect shown him by the other captives. The Iroquois therefore treated him like a chief, that is, he received more severe treatment. During these three days, several captives had their thumbs cut off. To prevent them from fainting from loss of blood, the Iroquois bound their wounds with strips of cloth torn from the captives' shirts.

Each evening the Iroquois took their captives from the scaffold into cabins, where they served as sport for the children. After feeding them a meal of boiled Indian corn to help them maintain their strength, the torturers tied their victims spread-eagled to four stakes driven into the ground within the cabin. The children then tossed coals and burning cinders onto the prone bodies of the sufferers and took pleasure in the resulting shrieks.

On the fourth day the captives marched to a second village, where they received similar treatment. At this village, the Iroquois aimed their blows at their captives' bones, such as shins, in order to cause more pain. One of the captives had not yet lost a finger, but this detail did not long escape the Iroquois. Quickly one of the Indians grabbed his hand and began to saw at a finger with a dull knife. Failing to sever it with the knife, the man twisted it and tore it loose, pulling out a sinew almost a span in length with it. The unfortunate captive's arm began to swell almost immediately.

At the third village the captives again met with severe treatment. In addition to a repetition of former tortures, the Iroquois drove sharp sticks into the sores of their victims and scratched the ends of their nailless fingers down to the quick. They tied Father Jogues to two pieces of wood in such a manner to suspend him in the air, causing him intense suffering. After fifteen minutes of misery, he felt himself about to faint and called to his tormentors to slacken the bonds so that his feet might touch the ground and thus afford him some relief. One of the Indians ran up to him immediately after his call, but instead of loosening the bonds he drew them still tighter to increase the Jesuit's suffering. An Indian from a more distant nation then pushed his way through the crowd and cut Jogues loose.

When additional Huron prisoners arrived at this village, the Iroquois held a council to determine the fate of the captives. They at first agreed to put them all to death, but they later decided to spare the Frenchmen in order to use them in negotiating with the French. Once this decision had been reached, the French captives received no further torture.

Jogues lived with an Iroquois captain who never formally adopted him, thus leaving Jogues in constant danger of losing his life. The Jesuit did, however, receive the freedom to travel between the three villages to console and teach the Huron captives held in them.[31] During his captivity, Jogues did the drudge work usually reserved for Indian women.

While on a hunt, his captors gave him the task of gathering wood for the camp fire. In his free time Jogues would pray, but the Indians, thinking perhaps that he was working some magic against them, would constantly harass him. They broke his cross, threatened him with bows and arrows or hatchets, and cut down trees so that they fell near him in order to frighten him. When part of the group decided to return to the village, they allowed Jogues to accompany them. Along the way he saved a pregnant Indian woman and her baby from drowning, but received little gratitude. In fact, as soon as the group reached the village they loaded him with corn and ordered him to return to the hunters. His strength failed and he returned to the village where his hosts heaped insults upon him for failing to perform the assigned task. As punishment his captors forced him to serve in the cabin of a diseased man. He served this man for two weeks until those of his own cabin returned and called him back.

Other Frenchmen suffered similar tortures when captured. Father Francois Bressani, captured by the Iroquois in 1644, ran the gauntlet or suffered beatings at each village he passed through. However, before doing so, he received the additional torment of having a gash cut between his fingers with a knife. When the party stopped at a fishing encampment, the inhabitants burned his fingers in sections. One day they burned his nail, the next day they burned his first joint, and then continued the process on other finger and joints so that the torture could be extended for several days.

In the second village the Indians suspended Bressani with ropes and chains so that he hung upside down. At another time, after tying Bressani on the ground, the Iroquois poured sagamite on his stomach and called the dogs to eat it. The dogs bit him in the process. The tortures reduced Bressani to such an offensive and smelly state that the Indians would not approach him except to torture him. His swollen hands hampered him in preparing his own food and he received little help from others. Eventually hunger forced him to eat raw Indian corn and chew on clay for sustenance.

When the Indians held a council to determine his fate, Bressani begged them to give him death other than by burning. To the priest's surprise, his captors spared him and gave him to a kind woman to replace her grandfather who had been killed. She treated him well but her daughters did not. Whether because of her daughters' cruelty, out of compassion, or to avoid having the burden of caring for the mutilated man, the woman eventually sold Bressani to the Dutch.[32]

In 1649, when the Iroquois captured Fathers Jean de Brebeuf and Gabriel Lalemant, the Iroquois added new methods of tortures. After beating de Brebeuf, the Iroquois torturers poured boiling water over him in a derision of Holy Baptism. They made a collar from red hot hatchets and hung it around the priest's neck, then placed a belt of bark filled with pitch and resin on him and set it on fire to roast his flesh.

Throughout his tortures de Brebeuf continued to pray and to preach to his tormentors. They became so infuriated that they cut off his tongue and lips in an effort to silence him. They then began to strip the flesh off his arms and legs, which they roasted before his eyes. Finally, they scalped him, cut out his heart, and threw his body on a fire. Lalemant suffered similarly.[33]

In contrast to this treatment, Pierre Esprit Radisson fared better.[34] After capturing him in 1652, one of the Indians adopted him as a brother. His "brother" protected him from beatings several times. When a young Indian at one village struck him, his brother urged him to strike back. The two were soon punching and kicking each other. Radisson appeared to have won, much to the joy of his brother. Likewise, his captors spared Radisson from the gauntlet when an old woman took him from among the captives, covered his head, and led him to her cabin. This woman became his "mother" and her family adopted him. His new family treated him very well.

When Radisson agreed to join a hunting party his adopted mother supplied him with a sack of meal, three pairs of shoes, and a gun. His sisters carried his baggage until he reached his hunting companions. During the trip, Radisson and an Algonkin captive murdered the Iroquois and attempted to escape, but other Iroquois tribesmen intercepted them and killed the Algonkin. Upon recapture Radisson claimed that the dead Algonkin had murdered the party and then taken him captive. Although his captors beat him and removed one of his fingernails, Radisson, after relating this account, escaped further abuse.

When they reached the village, however, Radisson and the other captives in the party received the traditional beatings, tearing of nails, and burning or removing of fingers. When the villagers began to form the gauntlet, Radisson's adopted mother pushed her way through the crowd, grabbed him by the hair, and conducted him to their cabin. There his father chastised him for his treasonous behavior. His sisters brought him food, but after he finished eating a large number of armed Indians entered the cabin and took Radisson back to the other captives. The Indians took him and the other captives, both male and female, to a scaffold to be tortured in a method similar to that already described.

Radisson related numerous acts of torture he witnessed during his captivity. He told of the various mutilations performed on the captives' hands, the tying of the wrists, the use of sticks to twist the ropes tighter in order to cut the victims' sinews, and the pouring of gunpowder and molten lead into the captives' wounds. When the Iroquois scalped a captive, they piled burning sand on the exposed skull. They placed layers of bark on their victims and set the wood on fire. Sometimes the Iroquois castrated their prisoners and the Indian women tossed their testicles about like balls.

The influence of Radisson's Indian parents probably spared him from the more brutal acts performed on some of his companions. One woman induced a child to cut off one of his fingers, but the child lacked the strength to break the joint and managed only to cut his finger.[35]

Radisson's mother often remained nearby to offer comfort and support to her adopted son. Once, an old man placed Radisson's thumb into his pewter pipe and calmly smoked while the digit burned. As soon as the man completed his smoke, Radisson's mother tied his damaged thumb, now swollen and as black as coal, with a cloth and then lovingly combed and greased the captive's hair.

After a few days of torture, though not as severe as that undergone by his companions, a council met to decide his and the other captives' fates. The captives consisted of seven women, two men, and more than ten children. The council spared all of them except for two of the children and a fifty-year-old woman whom they immediately tomahawked. Radisson's fate required further debate.

Both his father and his brother spoke in his behalf and finally the council decided to spare him. Radisson regained his status as a part of his host family, but he never realized the full trust and freedom he had enjoyed before his escape attempt.

From accounts of these captivities it can be seen that the Iroquois carried their torture to a much more violent extreme than any of their neighbors. They usually drew out their tortures to last for extended periods of time. Whenever large groups of Iroquois gathered, whether it be at a village, a fishing camp, or a passing war party, they tortured available captives. At each stop the torments increased as the victims' bodies became more abused. When a council finally decided their fate, either for life or death, the torture generally ended. The adopter, of course, also had the right to decide on the fate of a captive presented to him. Generally, if the hosts did not quickly decide on death, the captive could be reasonably sure that he would not be killed later, except in rare cases where the captive refused to make an attempt to blend into the Indian lifestyle.

An Iroquois family who adopted a young Frenchman felt such good will toward him that they desired that he marry in the Indian fashion. The captive refused, though urged and eventually threatened. Finally, faced with the choice of marriage or death, he chose the latter. While one Indian offered him bread, another came up behind him and tomahawked him.[36] Another captive could not conceal his grief at the loss of a companion and his adopted family eventually abandoned the sad fellow to be burned to death.[37] In some cases when the Indians did not complete a formal adoption, as with Father Jogues, the captives lived in limbo with no one to defend or protect him.

The French generally failed to influence the Iroquois torture of captives before 1675. The sight of praying or other religious actions sometimes drove the Iroquois to fury. In fact, Indians killed one of Jogues's companions because he made the sign of the cross on a child's body.[38] Another French captive who prayed fervently while being beaten, so outraged the Iroquois that they cut off his lips in an effort to silence him. When he continued to pray they tore out his heart and threw it, still beating, in his face.[39]

At other times, the Iroquois perverted French ideas and incorporated them in their torture. For example, they crucified a four-year-old captive on a piece of bark and pierced his hands and feet with sharp sticks.[40] When captive Father de Brebeuf encouraged his fellow captives to remain strong in the faith, one of the Iroquois (actually a renegade Huron who had remained with his Iroquois captors) poured boiling water over the priest's body in a derision of Holy Baptism.[41]

In the 1660s, the Iroquois captured a Huron and bound him upon the scaffold in a manner "entirely new" to the French. The usual method of securing a prisoner consisted of tying the hands and placing a rope around the neck with the other end loosely attached to a tree limb. Thus the length of this rope gave the captive varying degrees of freedom. This time, however, the Iroquois bound the Huron's extended arms tightly to a pair of beams formed in a cross.[42] This form of tying to a cross might very well have resulted from the Jesuits' descriptions of Christ's crucifixion.

Sometimes religious factionalism created unforeseen problems for a captive. By 1662, the Jesuits appeared to have made some progress in their attempts to Christianize the Iroquois. One day an Iroquois with a cocked pistol approached a Frenchman who had been adopted into a family and demanded to know, in effect, which of two Jesuit priests he supported. Fortunately for the captive, his sister indicated the correct response, thereby saving his life.[43]

Indians generally killed wounded captives or those unable to make the strenuous journey back to the captors' villages. The Iroquois, unlike most of their neighbors, tortured these captives by burning them.[44] Sometimes the Iroquois tied prisoners to stakes within their own cabins, which the attackers set on fire when they left. The departing Iroquois seemed to take perverse pleasure in the sound of screams and cries an entire family made as they roasted together.[45]

In one case, one of the French captives dispatched his wounded comrades with a hatchet in order to prevent them from suffering the more cruel fate of burning. He failed to discover two others, however, and the Iroquois tortured them with lighted firebrands, thrust red hot awls into their wounds, and forced them to lie on ember beds.[46] One woman tried to spare a wounded relative by placing him on a sledge and pulling him after their captors. Before they had gone far, the Iroquois stopped and burned the man, fearing he might die before they reached their destination.[47]

A noticeable exception to this treatment occurred in 1663 when the Iroquois probed a French captive's wounds to remove a musket ball. They then carefully cleansed and bandaged the wound. During the journey his hosts prepared his meals for him and supported him both physically and emotionally. Once in the village, however, he and a captive companion met with the traditional beatings until they fell faint at the village entrance. Originally sentenced to death, the wounded captive obtained a reprieve when a council reversed this decision.[48] Perhaps the Indians treated him well because they had captured only two. Had there been an abundance of captives, he probably would have been burned on the spot.

The Iroquois seemingly made little distinction between the sexes in their treatment of captives, except they invariably spared young, prime females from death in order to marry them into the tribe. They did not make this distinction, however, until the council met to determine the fate of the captives. At this point, torturing them along with the men, the captors usually spared the women. One captive woman, uncertain about her safety, attempted to drown herself in the icy river rather than continue to the village.[49] In some cases the Iroquois tortured male and female captives on separate scaffolds. After the torture, the Iroquois spared the women, girls, and boys too small to throw a javelin.[50]

The Iroquois kept women, like men, bound day and night, possibly with good reason. One woman, bound at night in the usual Iroquois fashion, that is, spread-eagled with arms and legs tied to four stakes driven into the ground, managed to free herself one night. She killed one of her captors before escaping.[51]

Often women were tortured for revenge, if no other captives were available. This happened to a French woman taken outside Montreal in 1650. The Iroquois tore off her breasts, cut off her nose and ears, and then burned her in retaliation for the deaths of eight of their warriors who had fallen in an earlier battle.[52] A French woman captured with Radisson died while being tortured on the scaffold. Just before she expired, the Iroquois cut off her breasts and took her unborn infant from her abdomen, broiled the fetus, and forced her to eat parts of it.[53]

Although little is recorded concerning Huron treatment of female captives, quite probably the French would have made mention of extreme brutality had they known about it.[54] Little evidence exists about the western Algonkin's treatment of female prisoners. The New England Algonkin apparently treated their female captives very well. When they captured over thirty women and children in 1675, they did not abuse or kill the women but released them for ransom payments, except in one case. When a pregnant woman unable to travel became very discontented, the Indians stripped her, knocked her on the head, and threw her body on a fire. With this exception, females captured by New England Indians seem to have been treated as well as could be expected under such circumstances.[55]

From a review of existing stories of atrocities in frontier America, one learns that the Iroquois prior to 1675 tortured their captives in a most brutal manner. They used torture mainly to intimidate their neighbors and for religious purposes. Their neighbors, on the other hand, used torture primarily to avenge Iroquois torture and raids or European encroachment and aggression. They apparently copied the practices of the Iroquois but applied them less aggressively. The more contact a tribe had with the Iroquois the closer their torture methods resembled those of the dominant Iroquois. Apparently, most of the tribes, except the Iroquois, treated Indian and European captives in a similar manner, making little distinction between the races. The Iroquois treatment of the French varied with the mood of the captors. When the Indians sought peace, they treated the French more gently, but during times of open warfare, the Iroquois responded against their French captives in such a fiendish manner that the treatment accorded oftentimes defied understanding of its rationale.

NOTES

[1] Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed. The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, 73 Vols. (New York: Pageant Book Company, 1959), 5:29, 51; 8:23.

[2] Ibid., 50:39.

[3] Ibid., 5:29.

[4] Ibid., 18:31.

[5] Ibid., 15:185-87.

[6] Ibid., 9:257.

[7] Ibid., 9:297.

[8] Accounts exist of Iroquois and Huron Indians killing their captives because of the extent of their mutilation. See also Ibid., 47:51. Father Isaac Jogues was relieved when his nose was not cut off because those who were noticeably mutilated were usually not allowed to live long. Ibid., 31:35.

[9] Ibid., 13:37-79.

[10] Ibid., 17:65-71.

[11] Ibid., 9:257.

[12] Ibid., 18:31-3; 15:173; 13:79.

[13] Ibid., 9:297-99.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Examples may be found in Ibid., 18:31 ;17:75.

[16] Ibid., 5:27-31, 51-55; 24:193.

[17] Ibid., 26:59-61.

[18] Ibid., 24:193. See also Samuel de Champlain, Voyages of Samuel de Champlain, 1604-1618 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), 166, 290.

[19] Ibid., 27:231-37.

[20] Ibid., 24:183.

[21] Ibid., 48:107-11.

[22] Herbert Milton Sylvester, Indian Wars of New England, 3 Vols. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1910), 1:242-44. See also James Kendell Hosmer, ed., Winthrop's Journal, 1630-1649, 2 Vols. (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1908), 1:194.

[23] John Underhill, Newes From America (London: Printed by J.D. for Peter Cole, 1638; Reprint Amsterdam, New York: DaCapo Press, 1971), 22-23. See also William Hubbard, The History of the Indian Wars in New England, 2 Vols. (Roxbury, Mass.: Printed for W. Elliot Woodward, 1865; Reprint New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969) 2:62-64.

[24] For an example see Baron de Lahontan, New Voyages to North America, 2 Vols. (Reprinted from the original edition in the Ohio State University Library; New York: Burt Franklin, 1970) 1:498.

[25] Thwaites, 21:23-29.

[26] Ibid., 22:253-67.

[27] Ibid., 31:27-29.

[28] The following account of Jogues captivity comes mainly from Ibid., 31:23-53; 24:281-3. For a more extensive account of his life before and after his captivity, see Felix Martin, The Life of Father Isaac Jogues (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1885).

[29] This war party had apparently lost some of its members in the raid and had not taken any captives of their own. See also 24:281; 26:191.

[30] Ibid., 28:123-25.

[31] Ibid., 24:283.

[32] This account of Father Bressani's torture comes from Ibid., 39:59-73; 26:33-51.

[33] Ibid., 34:27-33.

[34] This account of Radisson's captivity comes from Arthur T. Adams, ed. The Explorations of Pierre Esprit

Radisson (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Ross and Haines, Inc., 1961), 3-25.

[35] Another example of children being induced to commit acts of torture can be found in Thwaites, 40:133-35.

[36] Thwaites, 47:201-3.

[37] Ibid., 54:29-35.

[38] Ibid., 28:127-35.

[39] Ibid., 47:89-91.

[40] Ibid., 30:241.

[41] Ibid., 34:27-29.

[42] Ibid., 46:45.

[43] Ibid., 50:63.

[44] Ibid., 47:49.

[45] Ibid., 34:135-37.

[46] Ibid., 45:255-57.

[47] Ibid., 30:239-41.

[48] Ibid., 49:119-25.

[49] Ibid., 22:257.

[50] Ibid., 30:243.

[51] Ibid., 30:289-91.

[52] Ibid., 36:165.

[53] Adams, 22. See also Thwaites, 39:219-21, 51:231, 52:173, 53:253, and 55:41-3.

[54] Bruce Trigger contends that the Huron usually tortured and killed women and children immediately after their capture. Trigger, 1:70.

[55] Hubbard, 2:47-48.

CHAPTER III

TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1675-1701

Between 1675 and 1701 several wars occurred between the Indians of the northeast and the Europeans. These wars resulted in a change in the power structure of the region and reduced the Indians from a position of general military superiority to an inferior status. King Philip's War, 1675-76, broke the power of the eastern Algonkin and dispersed northward those tribes living in southern New England. These tribes continued to harass English settlements from Canada but generally conducted hit and run raids rather than extended campaigns, especially after 1701. Their French allies often accompanied them on raids.

The Iroquois, by the beginning of this period had conquered or dispersed most of their Indian neighbors. They had scattered or absorbed the Huron, Erie, and Neutral nations to the west. The Susquehanna to the south had suffered a death blow at the hands of the English and the Iroquois dealt with the survivors of this once powerful tribe. To the east, the Iroquois decisively defeated King Philip's allies. Only the French and their northern Algonkin allies remained to be reckoned with. Thus, by 1676, the Iroquois seemed to be in a position to consolidate their supremacy. During this time, however, the Iroquois suffered heavy losses from disease and French raids on their villages.[1] Losses were especially heavy from 1689-1700. During this period the number of Iroquois warriors declined from 2,570 to 1,230, a decrease of more than 50 percent.[2] The great number of casualties suffered by the Iroquois caused them to seek peace with the French, which they accomplished in 1701.

For the Algonkin, King Philip's War opened this transitional period. Prior to this war, with the exception of the Pequot War, the Indians of New England had been at relative peace with the English settlers. In 1675, tensions that had been building for years broke into open warfare and soon escalated into the largest Indian conflict that the New England colonies ever fought. With help from the Mohawk, who actually administered the most important defeat to Philip's Indians, the English defeated the Algonkin. Most of the survivors fled the area but for years continued to raid New England from their new northern homes. Northern New England continued to suffer sporadic attacks and during King Williams War, 1689-97, the French, to whom many of the Algonkin had fled, aided their new allies and often accompanied them on their raids.

The Algonkin treatment of captives continued to have less emphasis on torture than their Iroquois counterparts, even during the war of near extermination waged upon them by the English. During the initial moments of the attack, when the Indians had achieved surprise, for they seldom attacked otherwise, the killing or capture of victims appears to be the most arbitrary and haphazard. After all, the Indians' primary goal was to do as much damage to their enemy as possible with no loss to themselves. It was imperative, therefore, to kill or disable quickly those most likely to cause problems for the Indians, especially men who were apt to arm and defend themselves more aggressively than women. In the heat of the battle, however, women and children often fell victim, sometimes by accident, sometimes as they tried to defend themselves, and sometimes for no apparent reason other than for the attackers to sate their lust for blood. Indian raiders in the heat of battle often struck down those who might otherwise have been spared. Indians usually considered babies a nuisance and a burden and often snatched them from their cribs or from their mothers' arms, dashing their brains out against walls or trees.

After the struggle subsided, the victors became more selective. Still, they often threatened captives, especially adult males, with death. An Indian almost tomahawked Quentin Stockwell, a captive taken in 1677 during a raid on Deerfield, Massachusetts, when the raider thought his victim was too wounded to travel. Stockwell had been shot at three times and had fallen down in a bog, but as the Indian approached, Stockwell pointed an empty pistol at him.

The Indian halted and promised that no harm would come to Stockwell if he surrendered. Having little other choice, he agreed. As the Indian led Stockwell back toward the other captives, another Indian ran up with a raised rifle to strike Stockwell on the head. His captor, fortunately, kept his word and warded off the blow.[3] Other captives did not fare as well, and many met their doom when their captors proved unable or unwilling to protect them from others who had not quenched their thirst for blood.

Unlike the Iroquois, who made little distinction between male and female captives until the final council decided their fate, the Algonkin treated their male and female captives differently from the moment of their capture. For this reason, their treatment of male captives will be considered first, followed by a discussion of their treatment of female captives.

Once the captives had surrendered or been overpowered, the victors gathered them together and bound them. Some of the Indians guarded the prisoners while the others plundered and burned their dwellings. Depending on the number of Indians in the area and how secure they felt, the captive might receive varying degrees of freedom. Stockwell's captors ordered him to catch a nearby horse. He did so but made no attempt to escape because the Indians stayed nearby and he could not outrun them on the slow, dull animal. They then sent him to catch some of his own horses, as he had hoped, but he could not get close enough to the frightened animals.[4]

During evenings on the way back to the Indian villages, the Algonkin bound their male captives in a method similar to that used by the Iroquois. Flat on their backs with their limbs secured to stakes in spread-eagle fashion, the Indians further immobilized the captives by placing a cord around their neck. Such restraint continued for nine nights, after which the Indians believed that they would have traveled beyond the area known to the captives and thus they would be less likely to attempt escape.[5]

The Algonkin apparently did not use the gauntlet to any extent during this period. One possible reason is that often the Indians went to a French settlement rather than an Indian village and so had no opportunity for the gauntlet. Instead of the gauntlet, the Indians tortured their captives in other ways. One captive expected to be well received at his entrance into the Indian village, but instead a ring of dancing and yelling Indian women met him. One of the women took his hand and led him into the ring where the others quickly grasped him. Before he suffered any harm, however, his master laid out a ransom and the women released the captive unharmed.[6]

At the next village, this man and his fellow captives met rougher treatment. Led into a cabin, four Indians seized one of the unfortunate men, each taking an arm or a leg. They then swung the captive into the air allowing him to crash on his back on the hard ground. The Indians continued this procedure until they had "danced" the length of the cabin, approximately thirty-five feet. If the captive was a boy, then only two Indians would do the tossing. Sometimes the Algonkin seized their victims by the waist, held them upside down, and shook them violently. A captive might be grabbed by the hair and bent over while his captors beat him on the back and shoulders until blood gushed from his mouth and nose. Old Indian women would take part in the tortures by tossing shovelfuls of hot coals on their victims, and if the aggrieved cried out the other Indians would compliment the tormentors for their brave action.[7]

The Algonkin seem to have rarely carried out their tortures to the point of death except for recaptured captives or in cases of extreme anger such as having suffered heavy losses in an attack. Captives might be killed for another reason, such as not being able to keep up during a march, but their deaths generally came quickly and involved no torture other than its psychological effect on the other prisoners. The major exception, as stated above, involved recaptured captives who were punished in the presence of other captives.

The Algonkin used a method of punishment similar to that used by the Iroquois, but without as much ritual. For example, Robert Rogers, a heavyset captive could not keep pace with his companions. Falling behind, he shed his burden and attempted to escape. The Indians quickly missed him and pursued him. Finding him hidden in a hollow tree, they pulled him from his sanctuary, stripped him, beat him, and then drove him at sword point back to the rest of the group. Once back at camp, they tied him to a tree while they danced, sang, and then ate their supper. After supper they gathered wood and prepared a stake from a small red oak tree. Having built a fire near the stake, the Indians led their victim to it, first allowing him to bid farewell to his friends and to pray. They then bound him to the stake and seated the other captives in a circle around it to watch. They then pushed the fire toward the victim. When the heat almost stifled him they withdrew it to give him a brief respite. Meanwhile the Indians danced around him and gashed out chunks of his flesh that they threw in his face. After he died they placed his body, still tied to the stake, on the embers and left.[8]

Another captive, after three years of captivity, tried to escape with a companion. Their hosts recaptured both and tortured them at the stake. The Algonkin cut off the prisoners' noses and ears, then forced the victims to eat those parts of their own body before burning them to death. Throughout the torture the Indians continuously declared that all "deserters" would receive similar punishment.[9]

Thus, the Indians used torture as a deterrent to keep captives from attempting escape. Quentin Stockwell twice refused to escape because he and his fellow captives had vowed not to attempt an escape alone, since it would endanger those left behind. Apparently, after the ninth day of travel the Indians relaxed their vigil. Even on the eve of the day that they planned to burn three of the captives, as Stockwell found out later, the Indians did not bind their captives at night. Stockwell roamed the camp on this particular night, tending the fire noisily for the dual purpose of testing the soundness of the Indians' sleep and in the vain attempt to wake his fellow captives. Unable to wake his compatriots, he nonetheless managed to remove the Indians weapons, but then lost his nerve and returned them before they awoke.[10]

When one of Stockwell's companions did eventually escape, the Indians gathered the remaining captives into camp and bound them while the angry Indians debated their fate. The deliberations ranged from death by burning to simply burning and biting of fingers. During the discussion, a captain of the Indians who had always shown favor toward the captives argued that they should not be blamed, rather that the Indians who had been with the escaped captive should be faulted for letting him escape. As a result of his speech, the captives received no punishment.[11]

Besides using torture to quell captives into submission and prevent their escape, the Indians sometimes, in fits of rage after unsuccessful campaigns, tortured their prisoners to death. For example, after failing to reduce a garrison of only fifteen settlers because they did not want to take the losses associated with a frontal assault, the Indians vented their rage on an English captive taken earlier. In sight of the garrison, they stripped their victim, scalped him alive, castrated him, and then cut slits between his fingers and toes. They gashed the fleshy parts of his body and thrust firebrands into the wounds.[12] Besides venting their frustration, the torture of this captive might also have been used in an attempt to goad the men in the garrison to attempt a rescue of the unfortunate victim, since the Indians had previously tried to get the garrison to fight in the open.

Sometimes the victors abused their captives to avenge wrongs that other whites had perpetrated on the Indians. As already noted, the successful escape of a captive often brought the wrath of the Indians upon those who remained behind. Likewise, Indians who suffered a defeat or lost friends at the hands of whites often took vengeance on captives. A family of Indians who had lost some of their friends to English fishermen beat John Gyles and a fellow captive. These Indians apparently traveled a hundred miles to the village for the purpose of revenging themselves upon the captives. After beating and throwing the men about until the victims could barely walk, the Indians finally released them. Later, the perpetrators planned to repeat the beatings, but fortunately for Gyles his master helped to hide him.[13] This type of torture rarely resulted in death, especially if the perpetrators were not members of the host tribe.

Besides these forms of group torture, the captives had to deal with assaults by individual Indians. In many cases a benevolent master prevented much mistreatment from befalling his captives, but in the master's absence the captives often suffered considerable abuse. Some Indians seemed to enjoy tormenting captives. Gyles tells of an old Indian woman who tormented any captive she caught near a fire. If the captives were adults, she would toss hot coals and embers on them, if the captives were children, she would grab an arm or leg and drag them through the fire.[14]

At the same time, the Algonkin treated their female captives with as much tenderness as could be expected given the circumstances. Few of the chroniclers of the time argue to the contrary.[15] Only in unusual circumstances did the Algonkin kill or torture women. They rarely bound female captives and usually allowed them to ride horses when they were available. At the time of Quentin Stockwell's capture, the Indians used the eleven horses available to carry plunder and the female captives.[16] Mary Rowlandson, author of one of the earliest Puritan captivity narratives, does not mention being bound, but she was forced to accompany a large band of Indians who probably considered her chances of escape rather slim. Hannah Dustan, another Puritan captive, and her nurse's captors apparently also deemed it unnecessary to bind the captives. After traveling halfway to their destination, approximately one hundred and fifty miles, with an Indian family of twelve, two men, three women and seven children, the two female captives with a boy who had been taken earlier slew their captors with their own tomahawks. Only an Indian woman and a boy survived as Dustan and her companions scalped the dead and returned to their homes.[17]

If a woman's condition made it unlikely that she would be able to keep up with the party, the Indians would usually kill her but not torture her. In one instance, a pregnant woman, being very close to delivery, went into the woods to bear her child, but the Indians followed her, jeering that they would serve as her midwives. Instead, they ripped open her abdomen, tore out the fetus, burned it, and then tomahawked the mother.[18]

Mary Rowlandson, captured in the same raid, offered additional insight on the above murder. She talked with the woman, identified as Ann Joslin,[19] shortly before the tragic incident. Joslin considered escaping, but Rowlandson discouraged her because of her condition, especially since Joslin also had a two-year-old child in her care. Rowlandson accompanied another band at the time of Joslin's murder, but others in the company informed her of the poor woman's fate. Apparently, because of her condition, Joslin constantly badgered her captors to let her return home. They refused to grant her request and soon wearied of her complaints. They stripped her, danced around her, and then killed both her and the two-year-old child, tossing their bodies on a fire. The Indians then turned to the remaining captives and threatened them with similar treatment if they attempted to return home.[20] Obviously Joslin's attitude displeased the Indians so much that they decided to use her as an example to intimidate the other captives to better behavior. Her distressed condition might have demoralized the other captives had the Indians allowed her ranting to continue.

During the first two months of her captivity, the Algonkin treated Mary Rowlandson fairly gently because of her wounds. She had been shot in the side during her capture. After two months, however, her torment became more severe. Tired of hearing her complain about carrying a heavy burden, her mistress slapped Rowlandson's face and ordered her to continue.[23] It should be noted that by this time Rowlandson had probably recovered from her wound, and additionally, the Indians' malice had increased because of the recent death of a leading chief.

Other captives received harsher treatment than Rowlandson. Hannah Swarton, captured in May, 1690, traveled for nine months through the wilderness. In spite of the heavy burden she carried, Swarton had to keep pace or be killed. Both she and a fellow captive, John York, suffered from lack of provisions, as did the Indians themselves. When York fell behind, the Indians killed him and threatened Swarton with a similar fate if she failed to keep pace.[22]

Rowlandson also received the unusual treatment of being paid for parcels of clothing that she knitted for her captors. They paid her with food, such as pieces of bear's meat, ground nuts, peas, or corn. In one case, an Indian gave her a shilling, which she offered to her master but he allowed her to keep it. She later used it to purchase some horse meat. Sometimes, in exchange for her handicraft, the Indians would invite her to dine with them. Once an Indian gave her a knife in exchange for a shirt she made, but when she returned to her cabin with it, her master demanded it and she gladly gave it up, happy that she could please him.[23] Apparently the Indians had no fear that Rowlandson would make ill use of the knife, although her master might have been uncomfortable knowing that she had it and that might be why he requested she give it to him.[24]

While rarely abused physically, female captives suffered severe mental torture. Before Mary Rowlandson's child died, several Indians at different times threatened to knock it in the head. They, however, never carried out their threat. Nevertheless, the child expired soon afterward from wounds it had received when captured.[25] Upon another occasion, when Rowlandson inquired about her son, also a captive, an Indian told her that the boy had been roasted and that he himself had eaten part of him and that the boy was very good meat.[26] They also repeatedly told her lies about her husband. Some said they had killed him, others claimed that he had been assured of her death and had remarried.[27] In time, Rowlandson learned to disregard the Indians' lies and horrible stories. The Indians used these falsehoods to discourage escape attempts, believing Rowlandson would accept her captivity more willingly if she believed that her husband were dead or remarried. It should also be noted that her master rarely took part in these lies and this treatment occurred during his absence.

The Algonkin gave their captives varying degrees of freedom. Women generally received greater freedom than their male counterparts. The further the company moved from the colonial settlements and into the wilderness, the more freedom the captives received. When Mary Rowlandson asked for and received permission to visit her son, who was camped about a mile away, she became lost. Even though she met several Indians unknown to her during her wandering, none of them disturbed her in any way. She eventually returned to her master, who gave her directions to her son's camp.[28]

The Indians generally granted this liberty so long as they knew of their captive's whereabouts. For example, once when Rowlandson became hungry, she went to a neighboring tent in search of food and the woman within gave her a bit of bear meat. The next day, Rowlandson returned to the same tent and received permission to cook the meat and some ground nuts in the woman's kettle. Later, finding no room by the fire in her own tent, Rowlandson entered another where an Indian woman laid out a skin for her to sit upon and gave her some food. After moving with her part of the group three-quarters of a mile away, with the intent to move still further the next day, Rowlandson became hungry and returned to the kind Indian woman's wigwam. An Indian from her own tent, apparently upset by her action, came to fetch her and kicked her all the way back. As punishment, her hosts did not allow her to partake of the venison that they were cooking.[29] From these actions it becomes apparent that the captives had considerable liberty to visit from tent to tent within their own camp. To visit neighboring camps, however, required permission, which Rowlandson apparently had not received.

The Indians discouraged captives from visiting each other at unauthorized times. When Mary Rowlandson called on a fellow captive, John Gilbert, she found him ill, sitting in the cold with an abandoned Indian baby. She persuaded him to seek out a fire and eventually helped him to find one. Rowlandson returned to her own tent where the daughter of Gilbert's master confronted her about the boy's whereabouts. Rowlandson explained her actions and eventually led the girl to the place she had left him. By the time she got back to her tent, the rumor that she and Gilbert planned to escape had spread through the camp and she received threats that she would be killed if she ventured out again. Her confinement ended the next day when another Indian asked her to knit him some stockings and took her with him.[30]

Threats of death discouraged families from conversing during their captivity. Such was the fate of Hannah Swarton. The Indians had scattered her children among several groups of Indians and although she might sometimes see them, she feared endangering them or herself by talking to them.[31] John Gyles's Indian captors immediately seized and questioned him when they learned that he had been meeting with a fellow captive. The Indians interrogated both captives separately but released them without punishment when their explanations of their innocent activities agreed.[32]

Babies and small children, especially if they cried, seldom survived captivity. If its mother did not quickly silence a crying baby the nearest Indian would often seize it and dash its head against a tree or upon a rock.

Sometimes the mother would be warned first, allowing her the chance to calm the child. One woman, after being warned by her master took her child away from the camp and sat alone in the snow until her baby fell asleep. When it came time to move, her master killed the child so that the now unencumbered mother might travel more easily and quickly.[33]

In some cases the Algonkin tolerated babies more readily, so long as their presence would in no way hinder or endanger their position. If the Indians had no concern of pursuit or fear of being detected, a crying baby might be endured. If sufficient horses existed to carry the added burdens, or a benevolent master took it upon himself to carry the child, babies might survive the ordeal of captivity.

Wounded captives often shared the same fate as babies, especially if they had mortal wounds or would hinder the group's travel. Exceptions occurred occasionally, however. Mary Rowlandson received a gunshot wound in the side, and apparently the same bullet struck her daughter. The Indians spared them both. On the other hand, her nephew suffered a broken leg, and after the Indians examined his wound they killed him.[34] During their marches, one of the Indians carried the wounded daughter while Rowlandson followed on foot. At one point she took her daughter from the horse and carried her until she fell exhausted, whereupon the Indian placed both of them upon the horse.

The severely wounded child survived only nine days after its capture.[35]

In Mary Rowlandson's case, she bore only a partial load because of her wounded condition. She carried only her knitting work and two quarts of parched meal. The Indians at the time were fleeing a pursuing English army but did not travel as fast as they might otherwise have, since many carried their old mothers and wounded comrades with them.[36] This unusual circumstance possibly saved Rowlandson's life, because under normal traveling conditions she would have been unable to keep pace with the march.

Sometimes, especially during a frigid winter, Indians might leave behind captives who became weak and unable to keep pace. This abandonment usually occurred when captives would not likely be rescued or effect a successful escape. Quentin Stockwell received death threats several times during the last leg of his journey to Canada. Weak from cold and hunger, he began to fall behind. After promising death to Stockwell if he did not keep pace, his tormentor apparently sensed the serious nature of the captive's condition, because he relieved Stockwell of the burden of pulling his sled and let him travel at his own speed. For a time, Stockwell kept up but he quickly tired and again fell behind. He struggled through the ice and snow to a fallen log where he lay down to await his fate. Another Indian came back to find him and again threatened to kill him if he did not continue. Stockwell, too fatigued to resist or continue, resigned himself to death. The Indian saw the signs of his struggle in the snow and apparently took pity on the freezing captive. He wrapped Stockwell in a coat and then went for assistance. Two Indians with a sled soon returned and hauled him to the camp. There his captors pampered him, gave him dry clothes, made him a good bed, and fed him broth. After a night's sleep and feeling able to travel again, he set out ahead of the much delighted Indians. They soon overtook him when he once again became exhausted and put him on a sled. When they could no longer use the sled, one of the Indians who had been left behind with him carried him on his back for part of the remaining journey.[37] The proximity of the French villages undoubtedly prompted the Indians to save Stockwell, because they hoped to obtain a ransom for him. In addition, his fortitude even when exhausted probably gained the Indians' respect.

Other captives did not fare as well. John Evans, an acquaintance of John Gyles, fell through a patch of ice from the weight of his burden and cut his leg. He continued to struggle on as best he could, but his Indian companions soon left him behind. By the time the Indians returned to retrieve him, he had frozen to death.[38]

Gyles himself almost met the same fate when he and an Indian set out to fetch a moose that some hunters had killed several miles from camp. When they reached the moose at dusk, they gathered wood for a small fire but could not keep warm or dry. The next day they set off for the camp with the moose meat. Gyles's coat froze stiff around his knees and the Indian left him behind. He eventually struggled to the camp with frostbitten feet. The skin on his feet fell off in large pieces and the Indians thought his feet would rot and he would die, but the feet eventually healed and Gyles survived.[39]

Captives among the Algonkin suffered the most abuse from their closest Indian counterparts. For example, female captives received the most adverse treatment from Indian women and young captives experienced personal violations mostly from Indian children. Much of this oppressive behavior arose from a desire to annoy or bully the captive rather than to maim or kill them. If captive women provoked the Indian women with perceived insolence, then a captive might be killed in a fit of rage. Indian children, through carelessness or ignorance, might also cause a young captive's death. The Indian women, motivated by jealousy of a new female rival, whether realistic or not, did all in their power to keep the captive in a subservient position.

One night, for example, Mary Rowlandson arose and moved a stick of wood that blocked the fire's heat. Her mistress then moved the stick back to its original position, apparently just to spite the captive. When Rowlandson looked up at her, the woman temporarily blinded her by throwing ashes in her face and eyes.[40]

In another case, Rowlandson refused to give a piece of her apron to an Indian woman who asked for it. When her mistress pressed the demand by threatening to tear off a piece herself, Rowlandson boldly promised to retaliate by tearing the woman's coat. At this point in the confrontation, Rowlandson's mistress picked up a large stick and swung it at the insolent captive's head. Fortunately the missile missed its mark and Rowlandson quickly gave the entire apron to the Indian woman.[41]

From these two examples it appears that Indian women often did things with no other apparent motive than to annoy female captives. If the captive resisted too strenuously, she endangered her life. Children, on the other hand, often unaware of potentially dangerous circumstances that could arise, played pranks on their captive peers and in some instances death resulted.

When directed by her master to run along the river bank with a group of Indian girls, seven-year-old Sarah Gerish fell off a precipice into the river when her companions pushed her. Sarah grabbed some branches that overhung the river and saved herself, but dared not tell her master how she became wet lest she incur even more wrath from her peers.[42]

During this period, French influence, from the captive's perspective, had both good and bad effects on their Algonkin allies. The French often goaded their allies into the very attacks that resulted in captives being taken. English captives often remarked on the apparent French failure to stop massacres and sometimes accused them of condoning the Indians' actions. Realistically, however, the Frenchmen in the war party could do little to stop the killing without threatening their important and delicate alliance with the Indians.

To their credit, once the captives arrived in the French settlements, the French treated their captives kindly. They generally did all in their power to redeem the captives, although Puritan captives sometimes feared a new form of captivity among the Catholic French. Although the French sought to convert the captives to Catholicism, they seemed to have a greater interest in rescuing the captives from the Indians. In fact, the Indians often complained that the French seemed to love their English enemies more than their Indian allies.[43]

At the beginning of this period, the Iroquois maintained a relative peace with the French in order to concentrate on their war with the Susquehanna to the south. Once they had defeated that southern tribe, the Iroquois turned their attention once more to the west, and their attacks on those Indians, with whom the French attempted to establish an alliance, brought these two forces into conflict again. The Iroquois scored some astonishing victories during the 1670s and 1680s. In one campaign against the Illinois Indians, they brought back 700 captives and killed another 600 on the spot.[44] In 1689 they raided the area around Montreal and virtually besieged that settlement.

At this time, however, Canada's new governor, Count Frontenac, returned to assume control of New France's war effort and soon turned the tide of the war. The fighting expanded into a full scale war when England entered King William's War. The Iroquois suffered a series of defeats at the hands of the French, and their English allies seemed content to let the Iroquois bear the brunt of the fighting. By 1695 some of the Iroquois sought peace, but they suffered several more costly defeats before the French granted peace in 1701.

The Iroquois treated their captives differently, depending on their intentions. For example, if they desired war, they killed the captives; if they sought peace, they spared the captives.[45] In the case of Illinois and Miami Indians captured in the west, the Iroquois tortured those western Indians to death, despite attempts by the French to spare them in order to negotiate a peace. Before the outbreak of war between the French and Iroquois, several missionaries who lived among them tried to prevent the deaths of the captives.

For example, a Christianized Indian woman received a

Miami Indian captive to replace her son who had been killed in the war against the Illinois. Her relatives urged her to give up the captive to be tortured, because their poverty prevented them from clothing him properly. They contended that she would bring shame to herself personally and to her son's memory to have the adopted son live in such a condition. The French in the village appealed to her Christian instincts and mercy and managed to conduct the captive safely to her cabin. During the Frenchmen's absence to procure some clothing, however, the other Indians entered the dwelling, tore off the captive's fingernails, crushed his fingers with their teeth, cut off half of one of his hands, and bit off his ears. The French objected to this brutality when they returned but could not keep the Iroquois from taking this captive to join the others, although they did manage to instruct and baptize him. He and the other captives suffered the usual tortures of cut bodies and burned sides and eyes before they died. A woman captured a few days later underwent the same torture.[46]

Once open warfare broke out again with the French, Frenchmen who had been living among the Iroquois fled. Christianized Iroquois who moved to live among the French in Canada received the same treatment as enemies or traitors, even by their own families, when their pagan brethren captured them. In one case, the Iroquois captured a Christian woman outside a mission and took her back to

Iroquois country to be tortured. At the villages, her captors cut off several of her fingers and slashed her body with knives. They led her to a cabin where they continued the torture. Finally the Iroquois bound her to a stake and applied hot irons to various parts of her body. After burning her whole body, they removed her scalp and released her from the stake. When she knelt to pray, the Iroquois angrily beat her on the head with rods and stones. One of them tried to stab her with a bayonet, but it broke. After repeated blows to the head failed to kill her, they piled wood upon her and burned her.[47]

The Iroquois usually treated these Christianized Iroquois, who chose to leave their villages and live among the missions of the French, with more severity and with less mercy than they did members of enemy tribes. The Christians often aided their French allies in their war with the Iroquois by acting as scouts and fighting in their armies. Not all Christianized Iroquois chose to leave their homes. Those who stayed did not seem to suffer any persecution by their pagan neighbors, but they often helped negotiate the release of captives from torture and death.

In one case, several Christianized Indians convinced their pagan brethren to spare the life of Father Pierre Milet after a war party captured him. Milet had Christianized many of them personally when working among them earlier.[48] The priest became a center of controversy among the Iroquois. To the pagans he was a criminal and deceiver who had infected their fellow countrymen with his religious beliefs, but to his Christianized followers, who were among the most influential in the country, he was a savior and must be protected. Milet received relatively mild treatment during his captivity, owing to the watchfulness of the Christian Iroquois who guarded him against injury. Immediately following his capture, the pagans stripped him to his breeches, tossed him in the water, and trampled him before his protectors could recover him. Even though they gave him adequate provisions and a light workload, his captors never failed to bind him at night to prevent his escape.

Milet received only a single blow instead of the usual beating upon his arrival at the village. The tribe eventually adopted him because of the influence of his Christian supporters so he could replace a deceased chief. The Indians gave him a new name and a position as a member of the council since he had replaced a former council member.

The English allies of the Iroquois tried to have him turned over to them, but the tribe refused to give up its new full-fledged member. Iroquois of other villages also attempted to entice him from his protectors in order to murder him, but they too failed. Thus Milet wielded some influence over the Iroquois and used his new power to benefit captives taken after his arrival.

During this twenty-six-year period, two trends emerged which became more prominent in the next period. The Algonkin and the Iroquois changed their strategies in dealing with the Europeans. The Algonkin generally tried to maintain a neutral position until goaded into war by the English. They suffered their second major defeat, in King Philip's War, which drove them from southern New England to join the French who had already made allies with most of their Canadian relatives. From their new bases in the north, the Algonkin increased their raids against the English settlers throughout this period and into the next. With less likelihood of retaliation and an alliance with the French, they actually become more secure.

The Iroquois, on the other hand, moved in the opposite direction. At the beginning of the period, they dominated the region and through aggressive action almost conquered the French. When the fortunes of war turned and their English allies failed to support them, however, they suffered a series of devastating defeats that, along with disease and other problems, left them weak and desperately seeking peace at the end of this period. Both tribes, having failed in their initial method of dealing with the Europeans, changed their tactics: the Algonkin from neutrality to war and the Iroquois from war to neutrality.

The influence on their treatment of captives developed more slowly. Throughout this period, the Algonkin remained the more humane of the two, even though they suffered massacres and mistreatment at the hands of their enemies. Perhaps one of the most noticeable differences between Algonkin and Iroquois treatment of captives was their attitude toward the sexes. The Iroquois treated male and female captives equally, binding both at night and subjecting both to torture. The Algonkin, on the other hand, rarely bound female captives and almost never tortured them.

Adoption of European captives did not appear to have been a high priority among the Algonkin in this period. They generally took their captives to the French to be ransomed or held the prisoners in the hope that family or friends might pay for their safe return. Those who spent any length of time among the Indians did not appear to have been adopted formally into Indian families, but assumed more the status of a slave to their captor. The Indians appeared more interested in ransom than having new tribe members. In one case the English redeemed ten captives in a negotiation, one of whom had been consigned to be burned. In fact, the Indians had already tied him to the stake, cut off one of his ears, and forced him to eat it but the Indians released him along with the other nine who had been ransomed.[49]

The Iroquois continued to treat their captives more severely, with torture continuing to play a significant role. Adoption became an acceptable and more prevalent alternative as their numbers decreased and the Christian Iroquois began to wield greater influence in the tribes as their numbers increased. For example, the Iroquois spared Father Milet and adopted him into the tribe even though they customarily killed the first captives taken from an enemy upon whom they desired to declare war.[50] The Christian Iroquois did not always attempt to spare captives, as seen in the case of the Miami Indians who were put to death despite efforts of the French to rally support to save them. Father Milet was a special case because he was brought among his own flock. He had instructed and baptized his protectors and they were determined to save him at all costs. Fortunately for him, they were among the most influential members of the tribe.

NOTES

[1] For a good brief overview of this period and its resulting impact on the Iroquois, see Richard Aquila, The Iroquois Restoration (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), chapters 2 and 3.

[2] Francis Jennings, The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984), 206. W. J. Eccles, Canada Under Louis XIV, 1663-1701 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964) estimates that the number of Iroquois warriors declined from a peak of 2,800 to 1,320 by 1698, while the white population of New France increased during this same period despite heavy losses from disease and war. Besides their losses from disease and war, the Iroquois also lost numerous members to alcoholism and religious conversion. Alcoholism resulted in deaths from declined health and an increase in murders. Conversion to Catholicism also drained the Iroquois population as many of the converts chose to leave their homes and resettle in Canada near the missions. This behavioral change was especially true of the Mohawk. A faction of that tribe, which became known as the Caughnawagas, moved as a body to Canada and became staunch allies of the French, often aiding them in the wars against their own relatives. Jennings, 176.

[3] Increase Mather, An Essay for the Recording of Illustrious Provinces (Boston: Printed by Samuel Green, 1684; reprint Delmar, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1977), 40.

[4] Ibid., 40-1.

[5] Ibid., 43.

[6] John Gyles, Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, Etc. (Boston: Printed by S. Kneeland and T. Green, 1736), 5.

[7] Ibid., 7-8.

[8] Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum: An History of Remarkable Occurrences in the Long War Which New England hath had with the Indian Salvages, from the Year 1688 to the

Year 1698 (Boston: Printed by B. Green and F. Allen, 1699; reprint New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 47-9.

[9] Gyles, 11-2.

[10] Increase Mather, Essay, 44-5.

[11] Ibid., 45-6.

[12] Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 96-7.

[13] Gyles, 12-4.

[14] Ibid., 20.

[15] Nathaniel Saltonstall says "any woman they take alive, they defile, afterwards putting her to death." Charles Lincoln, ed. Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), 30. See also page 98 for a similar, but more graphic accusation. He offers no proof or witnesses and his accusations are probably based more on prejudice than on fact. Mary Rowlandson makes a point of saying that during her captivity, not one of the Indians offered "the least abuse of unchastity to me, in word or action." Lincoln, 161. For possible reasons for Indian sexual disinterest in white female captives see James Axtell, "The White Indian of Colonial America," The William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 32 (January 1975), 67-8.

[16] Increase Mather, Essay, 43.

[17] Cotton Mather, Humiliations Follow'd with Deliverances (Boston: Printed by B. Green and F. Allen, 1697; reprint New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 41-7.

[18] Lincoln, 83.

[19] See Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, eds., Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), 41.

[20] Lincoln, 128-9. See also William Hubbard, The History of the Indian Wars in New England, from the First Settlement to the Termination of the War with King Philip, in 1677, 2 Vols. (Roxbury, Massachusetts: Printed for W. Elliot Woodward, 1865; reprint New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), 2: 47-8, who also mentions this incident but says it was a singular incident and other accounts of abuse of female captives should be discounted.

[21] Lincoln, 139.

[22] Cotton Mather, Humiliations, 52-4. See also Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 56-7.

[23] Lincoln, 135-6, 140, 151.

[24] John Gyles was given a tomahawk when forced to perform an Indian dance and considered using it to dispatch some of his captors, but could never work up the courage while it was in his possession. Gyles, 12-3.

[25] Lincoln, 125.

[26] Ibid., 140-1.

[27] Ibid., 142.

[28] Ibid., 136-7.

[29] Ibid., 137-8.

[30] Ibid., 143-4.

[31] Cotton Mather, Humiliations, 51-2.

[32] Gyles, 15.

[33] Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 52-3, 56. A five-year-old boy was tortured to death by his master because of his constant crying. Ibid., 51-2.

[34] Lincoln, 119-20.

[35] Ibid., 123-6.

[36] Ibid, 130.

[37] Increase Mather, Essay, 50-2.

[38] Gyles, 15.

[39] Ibid., 16-7.

[40] Lincoln, 141.

[41] Ibid., 142.

[42] Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 37-8.

[43] Increase Mather, Essay, 53. See also Vaughan and

Clark, 87.

[44] Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, 73 Vols. (New York: Pageant Book Company, 1959), 62: 71.

[45] As seen in an earlier chapter, when the Iroquois first took French captives, they spared them as they debated whether to seek peace or war against the French.

[46] Thwaites, 62:73-9.

[47] Ibid., 65:33-7. See also 64:127-9, 145.

[48] Milet's captivity comes mainly from Ibid., 64:67-107.

[49] Cotton Mather, Decennium Luctuosum, 79-80.

[50] Milet's defenders claimed that he should not be considered a captive because he came among them voluntarily. Actually, the Iroquois had tricked him into accompanying them on the pretense of visiting their sick and wounded and had asked a French surgeon to join them to lend validity to their trip. Thwaites, 64:67-9, 79-81.

CHAPTER IV

TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1701-1754

During the period from 1701 to 1754, the Iroquois followed a policy of neutrality. Suffering heavy losses from two decades of continuous war with the French, the Iroquois realized that a continuation of such a policy would hasten their destruction. They negotiated a peace with the French in 1701 and continued their peaceful relations with the English. Although the Iroquois could no longer defeat either of the two European powers in a war, their participation in a war between the two could make the vital difference. Accordingly, neither the French nor the English willingly risked upsetting their alliances with the Iroquois.

This circumstance permitted the Iroquois to maintain a neutral stance in both Queen Anne's War (1701-1713) and King George's War (1744-1748). In both conflicts, individual Iroquois joined the English on raids into Canada, but the League as a whole remained neutral.[1] Neutrality served the Iroquois reasonably well, but it broke down when the English defeated the French during the French and Indian War (1754-1763). The Iroquois also maintained peaceful relations with their northern and western Indian neighbors, concentrating their war efforts on the tribes to the south.

As a result of this policy, the Iroquois took few captives. Those taken from the southern tribes appear to have been spared the usual tortures. Christian Iroquois adopted Chickasaw tribesmen captured in the southern wars. The Iroquois and French missionaries instructed the captives in the faith rather than sentencing them to the usual burning at the stake, despite their belief that the Chickasaw and their English allies burned captured Frenchmen.[2] Non-Christian Iroquois also apparently adopted captives with much more frequency than in previous years, possibly in an attempt to rebuild their strength.

Christianized Iroquois, mostly Mohawk, living at the French mission of Sault St. Louis, or Caughnawaga, did not follow the neutral policy of their pagan brothers. These Indians, generally referred to as Caughnawaga or Praying Indians, began moving from their homeland to the French missions in 1669. Converts continued to drift to the missions in the following years and by 1680 over four hundred Indians, all staunch French allies, resided at the mission.[3] The League tried to induce them to return but failed and in 1684 renounced them.[4]

As French allies, the Caughnawaga fought beside their white friends in both wars of this period. Their treatment of captives appears to be a curious blending of traditional

Iroquois torture and Algonkin moderation. Father Joseph Francois Lafitau, who lived at the mission from 1712-1717, described this treatment in his two-volume work on the Indians.[5]

When a raiding party returned to an Indian village, the warriors left the captives in the care of a selected group of individuals and went into the village alone. Those remaining in charge of the captives prepared them for the upcoming ceremony by painting the captive's faces, adorning their heads with feathers, and giving each of them a white baton covered in swan skin. Captives also received a turtle shell rattle. The symbolism of the baton had evidently been forgotten, because when Lafitau questioned several people about its significance he received conflicting replies.

The hosts then stripped the captives and tied their arms behind their backs at the elbows, so that they still had the use of their hands. The captives then approached the village following their guards, singing their death songs, and shaking their rattles. Before they reached the village, the inhabitants who had been foretold the time of their arrival marched out to meet them. When the two groups met, the captives halted but continued to sing as the villagers danced around them.

After completing the dance, the captives ran toward the village while the inhabitants rained blows on them with sticks, stones, or fists. This action continued, with several stops, until the captives reached the village entrance. There, an old man stopped them and tore off one or more fingernails or cut off a finger as a council or individual demanded. Because the warriors retained official ownership of the captives, it was in their best interest to prevent large scale mutilation of the prisoners. Most of the captives were destined to serve as replacements for dead relatives and if mutilated they might be perceived as an insult to the dead. Therefore, individuals who desired to torture a captive customarily supplied a gift proportional to the extent of the mutilation.

The Indians repeated this procedure at each village that the captives passed through on their way to their final destination. Once there, a council determined how they would be distributed and announced the result to the tribe. The warriors supplied their captives with belts of wampum but took all other possessions and then led them to their new homes and introduced them to their new families.[6] The householders then decided the fate of the captive. If they decided to spare the captive they gave the warrior a gift in acceptance of the prisoner. The family cleaned, groomed, and dressed the captive, and then held a feast and ceremony to honor the prisoner and to give him his new name. A female captive, adopted into a family with no other women, received special treatment, as the hopes for sustaining the lineage of the family rested on her. If they could sustain it, others assumed the position and authority of those they replaced.[7]

Captives who, because of age, physical condition, or poor attitude, failed to meet the standards required by the family often met death. This condemnation occurred mainly in large families that had little use for the new arrivals, or in poor families who saw the captive as an additional burden to feed and clothe. In these cases, the hosts announced their decision to the village and made preparations for the execution. Members of the adopted family took no part in the tortures, since it would have been inappropriate for them to torment one who represented a loved one.

The torture process was long and drawn out and conformed generally with the traditional Iroquois method. The torturers began at the captive's extremities. One tore out a fingernail while a second bit or cut the flesh from the finger. A third placed the fleshless finger in his pipe and smoked it in the guise of tobacco, or forced the prisoner himself to smoke it. When the nails had all been removed, the torturers broke the victim's fingers between rocks and cut the joints.

Next, they passed torches over his body until the blood or discharge from wounds extinguished them. When they uncovered a nerve, the torturers wrapped it around an iron bar and tore it loose. After five or six hours of torture, they allowed the captive to rest and sometimes to sleep. If the victim did sleep, fire usually had to be used to arouse him.

Next, the torturers applied the fire to the rest of the victim's body. They placed bark shirts on the captive and lit them to create a slow burning fire. When the captive had been burned so that his entire body was charred or blistered, the torturers mutilated his face, scalped him, and heaped burning cinders on or poured boiling water over his naked skull. They then released the captive and forced him to run as they beat him with sticks, finally ending his torment by rolling him in the flames or cutting out his heart.[8]

This description indicates elements of torture used by both Iroquois and Algonkin. During this period, the use of the gauntlet before entering the village was primarily Iroquoian. The exchange of presents for the torture of captives has Algonkin roots. Deliberation by a council before any extensive torture occurred indicated Algonkin or possibly even French influence since the Iroquois generally held their councils after extensive torture had been carried out. Finally, the extensive, drawn out torture process reflected the Caughnawaga's Iroquois heritage. Apparently the Caughnawaga adopted some practices of the French and Algonkin and merged it with their traditional methods to create a new method of treating captives.

The Algonkin tribes continued their policy of active warfare against the English. More secure from English reprisal than the Iroquois and backed by their French allies, the Algonkin staged an almost continuous series of raids on the New England colonies. They aided the French in both Queen Anne's War and King George's War and often continued their raids after the European powers ended their conflict.

From 1701 to 1754 the Algonkin treated their captives in a manner similar to that used in the previous period. Babies and small children continued to suffer the greatest chance of wholesale slaughter, while women received the best treatment that could have been expected under the circumstances. The Algonkin rarely tortured their captives, male or female, without sufficient reason. The main change during this time was the Indians' increased interest in ransom for their captives. By its end, captives were more likely to survive their captivity than during the seventeenth century.

In 1703 the French and Indians raided Deerfield, Massachusetts, capturing one hundred of the residents, including Reverend John Williams. On the return journey to Canada, the Indians killed nineteen of the captives, including Williams's wife. Most of the victims were women, who could not keep the pace set by their captors, or children, whose strength failed and whose masters were unable or unwilling to carry them. Most of the deaths occurred during the first few days of the march, when pursuit was most likely and speed most necessary.[9]

The attitude of the individual Indians often determined the fate of a captive. In one case, an Indian killed his four-year-old captive because the deep snow made it impossible to carry both his baggage and the child.[10] An uncertain ransom was apparently less desirable than the booty carried in the Indian's pack. In other cases, the Indians treated their young captives very kindly. Williams's own children received such care. The Indians carried his youngest son and daughter, either on their backs or upon sleighs, for the entire journey. His older children also rode on sleighs when their strength gave out.[11]

Two Indians claimed John Williams.[12] One of them, his chief master, would not allow Williams to speak to any of the other captives. In the chief's absence, Williams's second master allowed the captive to visit and even comfort and aid his wife in traveling. When the first master returned, he forced Williams to abandon his wife and during his absence she faltered and her master slew her.[13] In all probability, Williams could not have prevented the murder of his wife. Even with his help she grew weaker, so the Indian's apparent cruelty might have saved Williams from wasting his strength and becoming a victim himself.

In another raid, the Indians captured two boys, a ten-year-old girl, and her grandfather. When the little girl tired during the journey to the Indian villages and began to cry, an Indian, apparently her master, raised his tomahawk to slay her. The Indian chief saw the intended action and knocked the Indian violently aside and took the girl in his arms. He carried the girl in his arms for several miles and sang her to sleep.[14] In this case the motive was not hope for a ransom, but apparently genuine affection. It is possible that the child reminded the chief of his own daughter, who had recently died, because he became very protective of the girl and even carved a wooden spoon for her. He also spared her from the gauntlet and eventually adopted her.[15]

It is interesting to compare the treatment of two women, captured twenty years apart, in order to show the progression of Indian treatment during this period. In 1703 a woman, identified only as Mrs. Bradly, surrendered with her baby to Indian attackers, hoping that her sister might remain undiscovered. The Indians immediately murdered the child, knocking it in the head.[16] In 1724 another Algonkin party captured Elizabeth Hanson, spared her two-week-old baby, but killed her four-year-old child because it would not stop crying.[17] Bradly gave birth approximately six weeks after her capture. She contacted a French priest in order to have him persuade her mistress to help her and her infant. In response, the mistress gave her a bit of moose meat to boil for broth to feed her baby. Despite her recent delivery, the Indians forced Bradly to work, much as they would any Indian woman, and as a result she produced insufficient milk for her child. To add to her dilemma, the Indians often placed hot coals in the baby's mouth so that it became burned and sore. The baby starved to death when it could no longer suckle.[18]

Hanson received much kinder treatment from her master. Immediately after her capture, her master often carried her baby even though he already packed a large load. When climbing steep grades, he took her hand or pushed her from behind. When they passed through thickets or swampland, her master lead the way to clear her path.[19]

Despite this kind treatment, the poor diet, hard labor, fatigue, and improper rest caused Hanson, like Bradly, to be unable to produce sufficient milk for her child. The Indian women noted her distress and taught her to make a substance from walnuts, water, and Indian cornmeal to feed the child. The baby thrived on the new food, which the Indians apparently fed to their own infants.[20]

When Hanson's master noted the sudden revival of her child, he often teased Hanson that when it grew fat enough they would eat it. At times he ordered Hanson to fetch a stick to use as a spit for roasting the child and then have her sit beside him and undress the infant. He would then feel the arms and legs of the baby and remark that it was not quite ready and allow her to dress it again.[21] Perhaps the Indian meant this inspection as a cruel joke with no intent to harm the child. Hanson apparently never believed he was sincere, but she could never feel comfortable around him either.[22]

Bradly's captors apparently had little concern for ransom. As already seen, they cruelly tortured her child, causing its death. Her mistress kept her away from French villages for more than a year in fear that the French would treat her more kindly than the Indians. When Bradly fell ill with fever, her mistress continued to force her to carry out her labors even during the worst of her illness and on the coldest days. She eventually recovered, and after her mistress died another Indian family took her and sold her to the French.[23]

A woman captured in the same year as Bradley was almost hanged by her master. The Indian took her aside and tied a rope around her neck, threatening her with a tomahawk when she resisted. He then threw the other end of the rope over a tree branch and climbed the tree to haul her up and secure the rope. Fortunately for her, the branch broke. Before her torturer could repeat the process on a second branch, an Indian chief saw him, rebuked him for his action, took the woman from him, and eventually sent her to Canada.[24]

Hanson's master, as has been seen, treated her with much civility in the early part of her captivity by carrying her child and helping her over rough terrain. Several times during the journey, the Indians suffered from lack of food. When the group had food, Hanson and her children received a fair share, although she described their portion as "the guts and garbage."[25] This partition was probably not a conscious effort on the Indians' part to offend the captives, since many of them relished those parts as much as any others. Captives often objected to the food given them to eat during their captivity, but when their hunger grew intense, they testified that they ate it with as much fondness as they would have a home cooked meal.[26]

After Hanson's captors had traveled a considerable distance, the Indians divided their captives. The group containing one of Hanson's daughters and their servant maid went without food for three days. The maid fainted from hunger, but the Indians treated her kindly and helped her recover, because to lose her then might mean forfeiting a possible ransom.[27]

Twice during her captivity, Hanson's master grew irritated with her and threatened to kill her and her children. Once, during a food shortage, her master, unable to feed his family, planned to kill the captives to make it easier for him to feed his own family. At another time, the Indian became ill and in a fit of sickness threatened to kill the captives. Except for these two instances, the master never threatened his captives' lives again, although he did become less attentive to Hanson's needs. Perhaps her master still suffered from the effects of his illness and did not feel well enough to burden himself with helping her, or, more likely, he might have felt that she had been pampered long enough since her birthing and should now fend for herself. Strangely, Hanson seems to have been well liked by the Indian women and received nothing but kind treatment from them.[28]

When they reached the French villages, Hanson's master left to visit the French and discuss her possible ransom. He returned in ill humor and threw her out of his wigwam. Later, he took her with him to visit the French, and when the latter refused to give him his asking price he threatened to burn her within sight of the French town. A Frenchman casually replied that he was welcome to do so if he felt that would give him more pleasure than the offered price. The Indian left in anger, but returned the following day to accept the offer.[29] Even though threatened with death during her captivity, Hanson admitted that the Indians treated their female captives civilly and offered them no harsh or indecent actions unless drunken.[30]

All captives could not always be redeemed by French offers. One of Hanson's daughters suffered this fate. Her mistress refused to sell the daughter to the French in order that she might marry her son. The French persuaded the girl to marry one of them so that the Indians would lose their claim on her. She agreed, married one of the Frenchmen, and in this manner secured release from captivity.[31]

The Algonkin rarely killed captives unless their inability to keep pace would delay the group dangerously or if the Indians became intoxicated. John Williams's captors killed his slave, apparently without provocation, when they became intoxicated one evening.[32] Most of the time Frenchmen in the party or a few Indians remained sober to protect the captives from harm.

During the journey to their villages, the Algonkin did not bind their captives except at night. Female captives, however, do not appear to have been bound even then. The Indian captors tied their male victims on their backs in a spread eagle position with each arm and leg fastened to a stake or small tree. The Indians then laid a blanket, sticks or a rope across the prone captive's body and reclined on the ends so that any movement would awaken the Indians.[33] In a slight variation to this method, a young boy and his fellow captives laid between two of the Indians who each tied a leg of a captive to their own.[34]

Few of the women captured mention being bound except immediately after their capture while the Indians plundered their homes.[35] In one case, three Indian men and a boy ambushed a woman who had become separated from her husband and son. They left the boy to guard her, apparently unbound, while they plundered her nearby house. At night, the Indian leader made a bed of leaves for her to sleep on a short distance from where the Indians slept, and even gave her his personal blanket to use as a cover.[36]

Sometimes, especially during King George's War, French forces turned over prisoners to their Indian allies. When this occurred, the captives generally feared for their lives and accused the French of treachery, but they often received surprisingly kind treatment from the Indians. Such was the case in 1746 when raiders captured Reverend John Norton during the French siege of Fort Massachusetts. The English surrendered on the condition that none of them would be turned over to the Indians, because they feared that the Indians would murder their wounded comrades. The French commander agreed, but the Indians demanded their share of the captives. The French tried to persuade some of the Englishmen to go voluntarily with the Indians but they adamantly refused. Finally, the French selected some of the prisoners to give to the Indians who surprisingly afforded the same treatment to their captives as the French did. The Indians carried the wounded and exhausted, while the French carried most of the female captives. One captive became ill and either died or was killed during the journey. Norton believed his fellow captive had been killed, but on several previous occasions he expected that captives had been murdered, only to see them alive later. It is likely, therefore, that the captive simply died from his illness since the French and Indians traveled together in a group and the French would not condone murder.[37]

The gauntlet does not appear to have held an important role for the Algonkin as it did for the Iroquois. The Iroquois subjected almost all of their captives to the gauntlet or some form of ritualistic beating. The Algonkin, during this period, used it sparingly and without as much violence as the Iroquois. For example, when captive Daniel Hayes arrived at the Indian villages near the Canadian border, the Indians held a council to decide his fate. They decided he should run the gauntlet. They stripped him and forced him to run between two lines of Indians who beat him as he passed. Before he reached the end of the lines, he bolted, exhausted, faint, and bruised, through the line and sought refuge inside a wigwam. The Indians pursued, but the occupants of the hut offered him sanctuary. The old woman who resided in the wigwam later adopted Hayes.[38]

Daniel Howe and his fellow captives, another boy, a ten-year-old girl, and the girl's grandfather, arrived in an Indian village where the Indians gathered and "demanded that the captives should run the gauntlet for their amusement." The chief of the captors held the girl while the boys and the old man ran the gauntlet. The two boys ran through relatively unscathed, but the old man received such a violent blow to the head that he died.[39]

When another captive reached the Indian villages near a French fort, the Indians forced him to dance and sing. In the next village, two Frenchmen took him by the arms and ran with him to a house while the Indians pelted him with snowballs. Indians gathered around him inside the structure to force him to dance and sing again. Most of the tormentors eventually left, but two remained behind and struck him on the cheeks so severely that he bled freely and then commanded him to sing and dance once more. The Frenchmen ran him to another house so quickly that the Indians could not keep up to harm him.[40] It appears, therefore, that the Algonkin did not regard the gauntlet as important or significant during this time, since they used it only occasionally for their amusement.

Escaped captives seemingly raised less concern among the Indians during this period than in previous ones. When one of the captives taken in the 1703 raid on Deerfield escaped one night, the French commander rather than the Indians ordered John Williams to announce to the captives that if another escaped those remaining would be burned.[41] Daniel Howe tried to escape after his adoption. While watering horses, he stole a canoe and paddled across Lake Champlain. An Indian scouting party recaptured him on the opposite shore and returned him to his Indian parents who howled and scolded him. They threatened to tie him to a tree, stick him full of pine splinters, and burn him if he tried to escape again. Howe claims to have defiantly informed them that he would try again if given a chance, but his family watched him more closely after that.[42]

The Indians' apparent lack of concern over escaped captives, at least in the first case, occurred because of the large number of captives available. The second case resembled that of Pierre Radisson, discussed earlier, where the affection of the parents for their adopted captive outweighed their indignation at his attempt to escape. Howe's claim to have threatened to escape again most likely was an afterthought added to the narrative after his redemption, since the Indians rarely tolerated such insolence.[43] Radisson, it should be remembered, had a plausible though weak story to cover his guilt in escaping.

During the time 1701 to 1754, the Iroquois followed a policy of neutrality that dramatically decreased the number of captives taken. Those who suffered captivity generally received much better treatment than in previous periods. They became tribal members through adoption more often to help rebuild the numerical strength of the Iroquois. The Christianized Iroquois at the French mission of Caughnawaga merged elements of traditional Iroquois and Algonkin methods to form a unique method of treating captives. The Algonkin tribes continued their policy of war against the English, while remaining allies of the French. Their treatment, accordingly, varied only slightly from the previous period.

The most significant difference was an increased interest in ransoming hostages. By the end of the period, the Indians hesitated to slaughter wounded and infirm captives unless their failure to keep pace would delay the journey and thus endanger the Indians' lives.

The Algonkin rarely tortured their prisoners. Instead of using the gauntlet, they preferred forcing captives to sing and dance as a method of "welcoming" them to the villages. Drunken Indians sometimes caused problems, but their sober brethren or the French could usually control them. Illness or other bad fortune might cause an Indian to vent his frustration on hapless victims, as Elizabeth Hanson's narrative vividly illustrated. The Indians even tolerated escape attempts more readily without resorting to severe punishment.

Overall, during the first half of the eighteenth century, prisoners who survived the initial Indian attack generally received tolerable treatment during their captivity. A French presence further increased the chances for good treatment as they usually deterred any dangerous Indian behavior.

NOTES

[1] The Iroquois claimed to have "taken up the hatchet" against the French in 1746, during King George's War, at least when the English approached them. The Mohawk actually honored the declaration of war and fought beside the English; in response, the French declared war on that tribe. The other Iroquois Nations remained neutral claiming to the French that they had declared war simply to satisfy the English and had no intention of following through with combat. Richard Aquila, The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 96-100.

[2] Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, 73 Vols., (New York: Pageant Book Company, 1959), 69:12-13, 57-59.

[3] Francis Jennings, The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from its Beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744, (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984), 176.

[4] Joseph Francois Lafitau, Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times, 2 Vols., edited and translated by William N. Fenton and Elizabeth L. Moore, (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1874), 1: xxxii.

[5] Lafitau gives a general description rather than specific events that he witnessed. His arrival corresponded to the end of Queen Anne's War so it is probable that much of his evidence pertains to activities in that war, with some blending of more ancient customs. Therefore the following may not be a completely accurate rendition of the Indians treatment of captives after 1701 but it is probably a close approximation. The account also deals mainly with Indian captives and therefore is most applicable to those captives taken during the French and Iroquois wars with the southern tribes.

[6] Wampum refers to beads made from polished shells found along the coast. The beads were generally a quarter of an inch in length and purple or white. They were often woven into belts and used for decoration and ceremonies or to convey messages. They eventually became a medium of

trade between Indians and settlers.

[7] Adopted captives assumed the position of those they replaced. If they were fortunate and replaced a high ranking or well respected Indian, they received treatment relative to their predecessor's position. Thus, Father Milet, mentioned in the earlier chapter, obtained a seat on the council and became an influential member of his adopted tribe. On the other hand, if a captive's predecessor was a lazy Indian who was not respected within the tribe, the captive would be similarly shunned. In both cases, however, the captive could change his status though it generally took a long time and captives attempting to raise their status often considered their task hopeless.

[8] Lafitau, 2:151-157, 171-172.

[9] John Williams, The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion, 6th edition, (Boston: Printed by Samuel Hall, 1795; reprint by Ann Arbor University Microfilms, Inc., 1966), 13-14, 15, 17, 18-19.

[10] Ibid., 19.

[11] Ibid., 20-21.

[12] He was actually captured by three Indians but one of them was killed before the end of the raid. Ibid., 9-10.

[13] Ibid., 13-14.

[14] L. G. Benton, Grandfather's Captivity and Escape, (reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 103, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 2

[15] Ibid., 2-4.

[16] Cotton Mather, Good Fetch'd Out of Evil, (Boston: Printed by B. Green, 1706; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 4, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 39-40.

[17] Elizabeth Hanson, God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty, (Philadelphia: Printed by Samuel Keimar, 1728; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 6, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 5-6.

[18] Mather, 41-42.

[19] Hanson, 8-11.

[20] Ibid., 24-25.

[21] Ibid., 25-26.

[22] Another woman reported that her Indian captors almost roasted her baby after having been three days without food. The Indians had already placed the baby on a spit over a fire when another party of Indians arrived with a dog, which the hungry Indians substituted for the baby. Mather, 34-35.

[23] Mather, 42-43.

[24] Ibid., 35-36.

[25] Hanson, 12-13.

[26] Ibid., 24.

[27] Ibid., 14-15.

[28] Ibid., 19-22, 26-31.

[29] Ibid., 31-33.

[30] Ibid., 35-36, see also Mather, 33-34.

[31] Ibid., 39.

[32] Williams, 13.

[33] Lafitau, 2:148-149, and Noah A[mherst] Phelps, A History of the Copper Mines and Newgate Prison, at Granbury, Connecticut; Also, of the Captivity of Daniel Hayes, of Granbury, by the Indians, in 1707, (Hartford: Press of Case, Tiffany and Burnham, 1845; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 59, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 30.

[34] Benton, 2.

[35] Mather, 37.

[36] Francis Chase, ed., Gathered Sketches from the Early History of New Hampshire and Vermont, (Claremont, New Hampshire: Tracy Kenney and Co., 1856; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 68, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 47-50.

[37] John Norton, The Redeemed Captive, (Boston: Printed by S. Kneeland, 1748; Reprinted in Garland Library

of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 6, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 8-14.

[38] Phelps, 31-32.

[39] Benton, 3.

[40] Nehemiah How, A Narrative of the Captivity of Nehemiah How, (Boston: Printed by S. Kneeland, 1748; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 6, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 6-10.

[41] Williams, 13.

[42] Benton, 5.

[43] The entire Benton narrative has numerous questionably romantic episodes that do not always fit the traditional Indian behavior pattern. Although the basic outline of the captivity is most likely true, many of the episodes should be scrutinized closely and not necessarily taken at face value.

CHAPTER V

TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1754-1766

The prelude to the French and Indian War began in 1754, and with it came the end of fifty years of Iroquois neutrality. Three times before, twice during Queen Anne's War and once during King George's War, the Iroquois had almost abandoned neutrality when it appeared that the British would conquer the French. Each time, however, the English forces met with disaster before they could carry out their plans, leaving the Iroquois in the embarrassing position of begging forgiveness of the French.[1]

When the French and English again came to blows in 1754, the Iroquois determined to remain neutral. Several impressive French victories early in the war strengthened that resolve. As the tide of war turned and it became apparent that the French would eventually lose, the Iroquois joined the English in the final years of the war to drive their ancient enemy from the continent.

Early victories by the French won them several new allies, especially in the Ohio region. Among the most important and aggressive of these allies were the Delaware. Previous to this time, the Iroquois had subjugated the Delaware and denoted them with the appellation of "women."[2]

As women, the Delaware could not fight on their own behalf but supplied warriors to the Iroquois when the latter demanded them. In return for the warriors and tribute, the Iroquois took a protective role over the Delaware and guarded them from foreign invasion.

They could not shield the Delaware from the land-hungry English, and the Iroquois sometimes forced the Delaware to vacate land to benefit the English. The continuous expansion of the English soon drove the Delaware out of their eastern homelands, first to western Pennsylvania, then into present-day Ohio. By the time of the French and Indian War, the weakened Iroquois could no longer control the Delaware. The Delaware had escaped much of the bloodletting suffered by other eastern tribes by either moving west, keeping in front of the advancing whites, or living at peace with them. The latter was especially true in Pennsylvania, at least until William Penn returned to England.

By the time of the French and Indian War, many of the Delaware resided in Ohio and prepared to protect their new homeland. The first invaders were not English, however, but French. The Indians soon adjusted to this foreign presence when they discerned a vital difference between the two European powers. The French built forts, but little else, leaving the environment relatively undisturbed and giving the Indians a place to trade. The English, on the other hand, occupied vast sections of land and farmed, thereby destroying Indian hunting grounds.[3]

The English failed to convince the Indians of other intent, especially when General Edward Braddock led his English army into the region to capture Fort Duquesne. Braddock, confident of success, lost a valuable ally by bluntly telling the Indians that "No savage should inherit the land."[4] Thus, Braddock virtually destroyed any hope of gaining Indian support for the British.

When the French and their Indian allies, even though greatly outnumbered, defeated Braddock's army in 1755, the Delaware joined the French in an attempt to gain control of Ohio for themselves.[5] Once the Delaware declared war on the English, several quick and easy victories increased the Indians' confidence and shattered their old beliefs of white invincibility.[6] This new feeling increased their aggressiveness during the war.

The Delaware and other western tribes, including the Shawnee, Mingo, and Wyandot, treated their captives in a manner more similar to the Iroquois than to their eastern Algonkin kin.[7] Possibly their actions resulted from their close, although subservient, association with the Five Nations. Delaware warriors undoubtedly witnessed Iroquois torture practices when joining them on raids or perhaps even participated in them.

Many captivity narratives do not identify the individual tribe or tribes involved. Although most tribes resided in the locality of their raids, occasional war parties raided great distances from their homes. For example, in a battle near Ticonderoga, Indians from the Mississippi River valley captured Thomas Brown and after passing through Montreal took the captive back to their homeland.[8]

For this period the Algonkin can be divided into two parts, based on their treatment of captives. The original group that had participated in the earlier colonial wars occupied the region to the northeast of the Six Nations. The other faction, comprising the newly active tribes in Ohio, became more aggressive than their eastern relatives. The Iroquois themselves, after fifty years of neutrality, took up the hatchet again, but without their former intensity.

During the period from 1754 to 1766, the eastern Algonkin continued to increase their interest in ransoms for captives. As the French influence declined through the course of the war, the eastern Algonkin also decreased in importance as the power struggle moved westward. During the early years of the war, the eastern Indians continued to receive ransoms for captives or at least expected to. When captive Susannah Johnson gave birth to a baby during her captivity, her master clapped his hands in glee, shouting that he would now receive two ransoms.[9]

A few days later, driven by hunger, the Indians killed and ate the horse that they had allowed Johnson to ride.[10] Forced to walk, Johnson soon faltered and fainted. The last image she remembered was of an Indian, tomahawk raised, about to strike her. She awoke to find her master angrily chastising the Indian, telling him that it was dishonorable for him to attempt to deprive a brother of his prize.[11]

The Indians held a council and decided to allow Johnson's husband, James, also a captive, to assist her on the journey. Despite his help, Susannah's strength soon faltered, causing the Indians to halt and hold another council, while she lay gasping for breath on the ground. At the conclusion of the council, her master sprang toward her, tomahawk in hand, but instead of killing her, he passed by her, cut some bark, and built a pack saddle so that her husband could carry her more easily.[12]

At times, when her husband tired, one of the other captives carried Susannah while he recuperated.[13] Another captive took sole charge over her newborn infant. He fed it pieces of horse meat, which he first chewed in his own mouth, thereby keeping the baby nourished.[14]

Susannah's master eventually exchanged her and the infant to another Indian family for Johnson's six-year-old son and some blankets. The master wanted the boy to attend him on hunting trips.[15] Apparently Johnson's former master intended to adopt the boy and raise him as his own. The Indians often desired an impressionable or willing captive to replace a lost family member more than a ransom. Indians rarely ransomed adopted captives and often the captives themselves desired to remain with their adopted Indian families rather than return to their old way of life.[16]

The Indians sold many of the captives taken with Susannah Johnson when they reached the French settlements, including her husband, two daughters, and a sister. They sold another man when he proved to be a disappointment to his master on a hunting trip.[17] The influential family who traded for Susannah adopted her and lived in a style above the other Indians. She expressed her gratitude at being adopted and requested patience of her new family while she learned their customs.[18] Her attitude probably led to the tender treatment she received from her new family. The French eventually allowed her husband to journey to New England to procure funds to ransom her and other captives from the Indians.[19]

Other captives did not fare as well as the Johnsons, either in obtaining ransom or in gentle treatment by their captors. A raiding party captured Jemima Howe and her children in 1755, along with several others. After their arrival at the Indian villages, the Indians took several of the captives to Montreal to sell them but failed to find a market. They gave Howe's youngest daughter to the governor, had a drunken frolic, and then returned home with the rest of the prisoners.[20] It is unclear from the narrative exactly what happened, but it seems reasonable that they exchanged the girl for liquor, since it is unlikely the Indians would simply give up a captive as a gift.

Later, during the winter, Howe complained to her Indian "mother" that she would not survive if forced to live in the cold like the Indians and begged to be sent to Montreal to be sold to the French. The old woman agreed and sent Howe and her baby with a group of Indians to Montreal. On the long and tedious journey, the infant nearly froze to death. Unable to find a purchaser, the Indians finally returned to their village.[21] Howe eventually secured her release when her master became intoxicated and sold her for a trifling price at a nearby French fort.[22]

While Howe benefited from the intoxicated state of her master, most captives feared, with good reason, the presence of alcohol among the Indians. Captive Henry Grace narrowly escaped death from his drunken captors. The Indians returned from a raid on an English boat, bringing plundered liquor with them. Several of them quickly became intoxicated and searched for the captives in order to kill them. Fortunately, the Indian women hid them, placing Grace under a great tub outside a Frenchman's house. Grace remained hidden for three days while the Indians danced and sang, searched for the captives, but failed to find them. They sometimes sat on the very tub under which Grace hid. They discovered one captive, but Grace could never determine for sure what they did with him. Grace believed that they killed the captive since he never saw him again.

Eventually the Indians sobered, after some Frenchmen stole their remaining liquor. The Indians then asked for the captives, at which time the Indian women informed them that they had been murdered. When the Indians expressed their sorrow at the pretended bloody deed, the women surprised them by suddenly revealing the captives and the warriors endeavored to express their delight at their survival.[23]

Thomas Brown was staying with a French merchant when several of his intoxicated captors entered the house. They demanded that Brown be delivered to them. When Brown entered the room, one of the Indians began a war dance and attempted to stab him. Brown deflected the blow and ran to hide. Several Frenchmen threw the Indians out of the house, but one of the natives collapsed near the house and froze to death during the night. When the other Indians discovered the body, they accused Brown of murder and demanded that the French surrender him. The French refused and explained the circumstances of the Indian's death whereupon the Indians agreed not to kill Brown but to take him with them instead.[24]

Excluding incidents associated with intoxication, captives generally received the harshest treatment from Indians other than their masters. With no incentive to allow a captive to live, the Indians often dispatched weak or troublesome prisoners, while their masters had hope of either monetary gain or possibly adopting them to replace a lost family member if they survived. As seen above, Susannah Johnson's master became indignant when another Indian attempted to kill her.

During a battle with the French and Indians, a large Indian armed with a tomahawk compelled Israel Putnam to surrender when the British soldier's gun misfired.[25] The Indian tied his captive to a tree before returning to the battle. At one point the tide of the battle shifted so much that Putnam lay between the two warring parties and numerous bullets whizzed closely by him. When Putnam again fell behind the French lines an Indian amused himself by throwing his tomahawk at the bound man. Later, a Frenchman attempted to shoot Putnam but when the gun failed to discharge, he struck the prisoner on the jaw with its butt and left him. When the French withdrew, Putnam's captor returned and retrieved him.

The Indians stripped Putnam of his coat, vest, shoes, and stockings, then piled as much baggage as they could onto his back. They tied his hands tightly behind him, and set off toward their villages. When they halted several miles later, Putnam's swollen hands throbbed painfully and his bare feet bled freely. A passing French officer ordered the Indians to unbind him and remove some of his packs. At the same time, Putnam's master, who had been in the rear attending the wounded, arrived and expressed his indignation at the poor treatment offered to his captive. He supplied Putnam with a pair of moccasins but soon returned to the rear to aid the wounded.

In his master's absence, the remaining Indians drove Putnam forward. One of them gashed his face with a tomahawk. When they reached their encampment they decided to burn the prisoner. They led him into the forest, stripped off his remaining clothes, and bound him to a tree. They piled brush and other combustibles in a circle around their victim and set it on fire. Putnam was tied in such a fashion that he could move only enough to relieve himself partially from the heat of the blaze. Just as he had resigned himself to death, a French officer rushed to the scene, kicked his way through the fire, and rescued the sufferer. The Frenchman reprimanded the Indians and kept possession of the prisoner until his master returned.

When his master returned, he took Putnam to his wigwam and offered him some hard biscuit, but seeing that Putnam could not eat it because of his swollen jaw, the Indian soaked it in water so he could suck up the pulp. The following day, his master supplied him with a blanket and moccasins, permitted him to march without a pack, and protected him from the insults of the other Indians. Thus, in his master's presence Putnam received kind treatment, but in his absence the passions of the other Indians endangered his life, although a kind Frenchman could also rescue him from dangerous situations.

The master of another captive, Robert Eastburn, boiled some chocolate when he perceived that his captive, because of illness, could not stomach the course Indian food. When Eastburn ate the prepared chocolate, his master seemed pleased.[26] Other Indians treated Eastburn and his fellow captives more harshly.

When Eastburn's captors first seized him, they stripped him of his clothes, leaving him only a sleeveless vest. One of the Indians put a rope around his neck and another around his waist. They tied his hands behind his back and loaded him with packs. One of them struck Eastburn a severe blow on the head before driving him through the woods.[27] The blow was likely in revenge for Eastburn's having killed one Indian and wounded another.[28] During part of the journey, an Indian followed Eastman, prodding him occasionally with a spear.[29]

When they stopped to encamp, the Indian whom Eastburn had wounded saw him and took away the captive's blanket. The Indian then ordered Eastburn to dance and sing around the fire. Eastburn stubbornly refused, even though his fellow captives urged him to obey. The Indian grew angry and pushed Eastburn toward the fire, but the prisoner deftly leaped over it. Fortunately for Eastburn, the other Indians took no part in the proceedings and his tormentor, weak from his wounds, desisted.[30] Eastburn's treatment was still relatively kind, especially considering that he had killed one Indian and wounded another.

The fate of wounded captives generally rested on the benevolence of their captors. The Indians killed and scalped a wounded man captured with Eastburn when he fell behind. The French and Indians carried their own wounded from the area.[31]

The Indians who captured Thomas Brown spared him despite his wounds. When French and Indian forces defeated an English army, the latter withdrew from the battlefield, leaving their wounded behind. Brown and two other wounded men decided to surrender to the French rather than be captured by the Indians. When they saw an Indian approach, Brown, the least wounded of the three, crawled away from their fire and into the darkness. The Indian scalped the most seriously wounded captive and carried the other off. Brown crawled away as quickly as he could but the Indians discovered him the next morning. When they ordered him to stop, he continued to crawl, hoping that they would kill him. Instead they ran to him, hugged and kissed him, placed dry leaves on his wounds, and ordered him to accompany them to their encampment. When they arrived near the camp, his captors gave a shout to announce the presence of another captive and the Indians rushed from the bivouac to greet him. One of them hit him with the flat of a cutlass while others butted him with their heads.[32]

Shortly after his arrival in the camp, the French took Brown for questioning and then sent him to a hospital where he remained for nearly two months before his captors returned to take him with them. They forced him to pull a large sled loaded with provisions. When they stopped to rest, Brown realized that he would be unable to pull the sled any further and, as a result, might suffer the wrath of the Indians. Therefore, he slyly asked three Indian women to climb onto his sled and pleasantly told them that he wished he could pull them. The other Indians witnessed the gesture and, apparently pleased, relieved him from further sled- pulling duties.[33]

The Eastern Algonkin rarely bound female captives, even at night. They bound male captives upon capture but rarely during marches after the first day. As seen above, the Indians untied Israel Putnam after a French officer ordered them to do so. The Indians kept Robert Eastburn bound throughout his first day of captivity.[34] They unbound James Johnson soon after his capture so that he could aid his pregnant wife and their children.[35]

At night, the Indians generally bound the male captives and then slept on the ends of the ropes.[36] The Indians restrained James Johnson and the other male captives in an unusual manner. They placed the prisoners' legs in split sticks, similar to stocks, tied them with cords, and then tied the other end of the ropes to trees, beyond the captives' reach. They forced Susannah Johnson's younger sister to lay between two of them with a cord over her which they lay upon.[37] One week later the Indians lessened their watch over the captives. They left James Johnson at liberty and bound the other two men only lightly. They allowed the sister to sleep by herself away from her Indian guards.[38] The Indians had little fear of Susannah escaping because of her weakened condition and they supposed that James would not leave his wife behind. By this time, too, they were far removed from the white settlements and it was unlikely that any captive would survive an escape attempt.

Captives invariably received an equal portion of the Indians' food supply. During a two-hundred-mile journey, when provisions grew scant, the Indians halted and ordered Robert Eastburn to collect firewood while the Indians built a fire or hunted. One of the Indians returned after two hours with a female beaver, big with young, which he cut up and threw into the pot, guts and all, along with the four unborn beaver. When it was well boiled, each person, Indian and captive, received an equal portion, a part of which was one half of an unborn beaver. Eastburn hid his share of the baby beaver, having had his fill before it was dished out and knowing he would offend his captors if he did not eat all they served him.[39]

As seen earlier, Johnson's captors slew the horse she had been riding when faced with starvation. They cooked it and offered the best parts to the captives.[40] Robert Eastburn chopped wood for an old Indian, who saw that he was a hard worker and treated him well. After a hard day's work, the Indian's wife gave the captive some milk and bread along with fish gills, apparently a delicacy to the Indians. When she saw that Eastburn did not like the gills, she offered him his choice of the fish parts.[41]

The Indians, especially those in the northeast, shared their provisions equally with their captives. The captives did not always appreciate this generosity because they had little appreciation for Indian food, however, in time with hunger they learned to enjoy the fare as much as their old meals.

Once the prisoners arrived at their destination, their captors forced them to sing and dance in Indian fashion or sometimes beat them. When the Johnsons arrived at an Indian village, the villagers, of all ages, sizes, and sexes, formed into two parallel lines a few feet apart. Each captor then took his captive's hand, ordered them to sing their song, and marched them between the two lines. The Indians only tapped them lightly on the shoulders as they passed by, much to the surprise and relief of the captives.[42]

Robert Eastburn's captors painted him and his fellow captives before entering the village. Once inside the village, the Indians surrounded the captives and ordered them to sing. When they finished the song, the Indians opened the ring to let the prisoners run out. One Indian ran in front of them to show them where to run while the others followed, beating them with their fists. Once they reached the designated wigwam, the beatings ceased.[43]

At a second village, Eastburn was the only captive, but he received a similar reception. This time, when he ran from the ring, he encountered over a hundred Indian boys who pelted him with rocks and dirt. He escaped the first volley without harm, but an adult Indian seized and held him until the boys rearmed themselves. After his release a rock hit his eye and dirt thrown in his face blinded him. Still, he managed to stumble into a hut, but his tormentors immediately drew him out again. The boys continued to pelt him until several Indian women rescued him. They took him inside a cabin, gave him some water to wash with, and fed him.[44]

Henry Grace, who ran the gauntlet several times, claimed that a captive never had to run the gauntlet more than once within a single Indian "nation."[45] The first time he ran the gauntlet and reached the hut of the chief, the Indians did not afford the usual kind treatment but instead forced him to kneel before a fire close enough to blister his skin. They then danced around him, threatened him with tomahawks and scalping knives, and they pulled his hair.[46]

Grace also received additional beatings during his captivity. An Indian raiding party once returned with fresh scalps, which they rubbed in Grace's face while forcing him to dance. When he performed poorly, they beat him. Once the Indians returned with a severed head and beat Grace's face with it so forcefully that they broke his nose. The same group of Indians brought home three more captives whom they tied to trees and beat so severely that they could not stand when the Indians released them.[47]

Therefore, the gauntlet, except in the case of Henry Grace, apparently had less importance in the eastern Algonkin culture than singing and dancing.[48] Several captives never faced the gauntlet or ran a mild, symbolic version of it. Eastburn's rougher treatment might have resulted from his having killed an Indian before his capture or from his refusal to perform the Indian dances and songs. Grace traveled extensively during his captivity and his captors might have been western Algonkin, which would explain his rougher treatment.

After their adoption, captives received a considerable amount of freedom. Titus King worked for the French when his adopted family suffered from a food shortage. Eastburn's masters watched him more carefully. When they noticed that he often withdrew to a private place, they grew suspicious, but when they later learned that he used the solitude to pray they no longer bothered him.[49] Still later, Eastburn and some of his fellow captives conspired to escape, but a female captive reported their plans to a French priest and the Indians apprehended them. The Indians held a court and decided to send Eastburn and another captive to more distant Indian villages to prevent any more plotting. When he arrived at his new home, his new hosts surprisingly allowed him to walk and work where he pleased within a limited area.[50]

The eastern Algonkin rarely tortured their prisoners. An exception occurred to a fellow captive of Thomas Brown. Soon after their capture, the Indians stopped to cut one of the captive's hair in Indian fashion. The captive resisted and the Indians immediately prepared to burn him. A French officer noticed the activity and halted it, but the next night the Indians stripped the captive, tied him to a stake, and built a fire. The Indian women cut small pine splinters which they stuck into the man's body and then set on fire. The Indians forced Brown to join them in dancing around the victim. After the dance, they cut the man's bindings and forced him to run. The prisoner eventually pitched himself into the fire which consumed him.[51] Since both the Iroquois and the western Algonkin used this method of torture, it is likely that elements of those tribes participated in and possibly initiated the torture. Brown's master resided near the Mississippi River and took Brown there after passing through Montreal. The victim's masters were probably western Algonkin, since the eastern Algonkin usually killed their captives quickly with a tomahawk blow.

Because of the Iroquois alliance with the British, few English accounts of their brutality during the French and Indian War have come to light. The English seldom noted torture committed by their own allies while condemning the excesses of the natives allied with the French. A few accounts do exist, however. For example, Caleb Rhea, a surgeon in a regiment near Ticonderoga, noted that when the Mohawk captured an enemy they formed a ring around him. They then scourged him with whips, pricked him with sharp sticks, tore out his fingernails, and scalped him. The torture generally extended over a period of several days.[52] Henry Grace passed through the Iroquois Nation as a captive and noted that although they were supposed to be allies of the English he received no better, perhaps worse, treatment among them than among the other nations.[53] The main differences distinguishing Iroquois treatment of captives from that of the Algonkin were the tearing out of fingernails and the length of the torture. Algonkin torture rarely lasted more than a few hours, a day at the most, whereas Iroquois torture usually lasted for several days.

The influence of Iroquois brutality emerged clearly when examining the treatment of captives by the western Algonkin, especially those tribes who had considerable association as subjects of the Five Nations. The Delaware and Shawnee were among the most active tribes to the west of the Iroquois, along with the Wyandot and the Mingo.

These tribes killed their captives more often and sometimes resorted to torture. Their close association with the Iroquois increased their aggressiveness, and their limited participation in the earlier colonial wars made them unaccustomed to the ransoming of captives. They rarely spared adult male captives except for torture and killed babies and small children, much like the eastern Algonkin did in earlier periods.

The Miami Indians, another Algonkin tribe, moved into the Ohio area from the west and had little contact with the Iroquois. They treated their captives in a fashion amazingly like that used by their eastern relatives. In 1754 a Miami Indian captured Jane Frazier, supplied her with a horse to ride for most of the trip, and protected her when the group passed through several villages on the way to their final destination. Villagers ran out curiously to see the captive but never harmed her. A prominent Indian family adopted Frazier and treated her as one of their own. When she gave birth a month after her capture, her new family stole clothes from nearby settlements to present to the baby. Despite their kindness, the baby died a few months later. During the absence of most of the Indians on raids or hunting trips, Frazier later escaped with two captive

Dutchmen.[54]

For whatever reason, the western Algonkin who were more closely associated with the Iroquois were not as kind to their captives. They took captives for their own purposes, rather than in the hopes of gaining ransoms. Thus, they often killed adult males on the spot or soon after capture.[55] Sometimes the Indians spared them to take them to their villages to torture or for some other reason. The captors of a twenty-five-year-old man spared him so that he could carry a wounded Indian on his back. As a reward for his task, the Indians excused him from the beatings that the other captives received at each village.[56] A benevolent captor might also protect an adult male captive. Thomas Gist became separated from his comrades during a battle and several Indians pursued him. Wounded and fatigued, Gist could not outrun his unwounded pursuer who captured him. Gist's captor marched him to the Indian encampment where the other Indians leaped up, seized their weapons, and ran toward Gist threateningly. Gist's master pushed him into a nearby wigwam, thereby sparing him from a beating and possibly saving his life.[57]

Because the Indians had little or no interest in ransoming captives, they targeted young boys and women for assimilation into their tribes. They also saved young healthy men whom they regarded as cooperative. William Fleming's captor told him that he had ordered his men to spare only young men and women.[58] How young they meant was questionable since they told him this so that he would lead them to his wife whom the other Indians might not spare. William was twenty and his wife twenty-five.[59] A young man captured shortly after Fleming refused to accept his fate and continually resisted his captors. Fleming, who was waiting for a chance to escape, was afraid to tell the captive to remain calm until a chance for escape came, because the Indians spoke English and might discover his plan. Before they had gone very far, the Indians held a council. They tied Fleming to a tree and then dispatched the troublesome captive with several tomahawk blows. After scalping their victim, they warned Fleming that a similar fate awaited him should he become unruly.[60]

Likewise, a young boy, captured shortly after Peter Williamson, complained bitterly about his unfortunate fate. One of the Indians, perceiving the undesirable attitude, tomahawked the boy, scalped him, and left the body behind.[61] Uncooperative captives, no matter what their age or sex, endangered themselves when they complained too often.

Curiously, the western tribes seemed more careless about binding their captives than the Iroquois or even their benevolent eastern relatives. In fact, William Fleming and his wife escaped the very night after their capture. They spent most of the night conversing with their captors on numerous subjects and apparently won their confidence. Two hours before dawn, the Indians prepared for bed and showed the Flemings how and where to lie. The Indians slept on their guns as a precaution, but left the captives unbound. The captives, after wandering noisily around the camp to assure themselves that their captors were actually asleep, escaped.[62] On the other hand, five days after her capture Jean Lowry was still bound when she was almost rescued, although her children were not.[63] Perhaps in the latter case, the Indians suspected that a rescue party was nearby.

The lack of care in securing their captives in the first instance might have resulted from the Indians mistaken belief that the Flemings would not or could not escape, even though they were very near to their own residence, because of the numerous small bands of Indians in the area. In any case, it seems odd that the Indians did not bind their captives or watch them more carefully on their first night of captivity.

Captives who reached the Indian villages of the western Algonkin invariably underwent the gauntlet or some other form of beating. Unlike warriors of the Iroquois and eastern Algonkin tribes, the warriors of the western Algonkin often participated in beating the captives. Men, women, and children all suffered beatings, although in varying intensities, unless a benevolent master spared them.[64]

Adult males sometimes died from the severe beatings they received, or, if they survived, they might be tortured to death.[65] Women also received beatings, varying widely in severity. In one village, Jean Lowry was beaten even after she fell to the ground, but she received only a single blow in a later village.[66] Mari Le Roy and Barbara Leininger received three blows each, "administered with great mercy" on their backs.[67] Boys, especially young ones, were encouraged to fight Indian boys their own age to prove their worth, and if they defeated their opponent, the Indians exempted them from further beatings.[68] In addition, the gauntlet sometimes served as a form of punishment. In these cases, the gauntlet generally took on a more severe form than the original. A British soldier ran the gauntlet three times after an Indian council sentenced him to death. On his final run the Indians knocked him to the ground and they presumed that he was dead. The Briton recovered, however, and his captors eventually sold him to the French.[69]

Thomas Gist met a different fate when he arrived at his destination, a Wyandot town. Having previously witnessed several prisoners being beaten to death a few days earlier at a previous encampment, Gist expected to receive the same fate when the inhabitants with blood curdling screams ran out to meet him and several other captives. Instead of beating him, several Indian boys led the captives to a post in the center of the village. The captives stood naked as the villagers passed by and inspected them. After an hour the Indians led the captives to several houses, where they lodged for a few days.

Finally, an Indian crier passed through the village to gather the villagers at a designated hut where the captives collected. The council appointed the captives one by one to their new families, who took them away, washed them thoroughly in the nearby river, and took them to their new homes.[70] Gist's experience among the Wyandot resembled the ancient Huron treatment of captives, but without the torture. Instead of using a scaffold in the center of the village for ridicule and torture, the Wyandot only stripped their captives with no apparent attempt to harm them. Perhaps their removal from the presence of the Iroquois caused them to abandon their old methods. They claimed that they tortured their captives simply in revenge for their own people whom the Iroquois had tortured.

Adoption seems to have been more prevalent and permanent among the western Algonkin than among their eastern kin. The Indians dressed the captives in Indian fashion either during the journey or after arriving at their final destination. They shaved or plucked the hair from the males' heads, leaving only a scalp lock. They then painted the prisoners and held a council to determine their distribution. Almost immediately after accepting the captive, the adopting families took their captives to the nearest body of water and scrubbed them thoroughly to symbolize the washing away of their white blood and replacing it with Indian blood. The Indians invariably informed the captives as they emerged from the water that they were now Indians. Many of the captives at first thought they were to be drowned because of the roughness with which they were handled and scrubbed. After the ceremonial bath, the Indians took their latest family members to their homes and introduced them to their new relatives. From that point on, the Indians accepted the captive as a member of their family.[71]

Once adopted, the captive received treatment equal to that of an original family member, so long as he at least kept up the appearance of contentment. Captives could become well respected and important members of the tribe. One woman became a nurse and physician among her captors and succeeded so well that they considered her sacred. She eventually used this trust to her advantage and escaped one day while pretending to gather herbs and spices as she usually did.[72]

Some captives had difficulty convincing their "families" of their sincerity. Hugh Gibson's master remained suspicious of the adoptee throughout his captivity. Several times he beat Gibson or ordered the Indians to burn him for real or imagined plots to escape. Each time Gibson convinced the Indians of his innocence.[73] At one point, Gibson's master tried to marry him to an Indian woman to bind him more firmly to the tribe but Gibson refused the advances of the woman, rather roughly, and his master beat him with a hickory switch for his refusal.[74]

Once the captives convinced their family of their contentment, they usually received a great deal of freedom. The family which adopted Thomas Gist allowed him to choose which part of his extended Indian family he wished to live with. He chose those nearest to his fellow captives.[75]

James Smith often wandered far from his Indian home to hunt and sometimes became lost, remaining absent for several days. The Indians searched for him when he did not return, but upon seeing the crooked path he had taken, they realized that he was lost and not trying to escape. They punished him, however, by taking away his gun and demoting him to use a bow and arrow for almost two years.[76] Later, Smith showed such fortitude and ingenuity when he became lost again that the Indians bought him a new gun so that in the future he might be able to start a fire and hunt game until he found his way back.[77]

The kindness that Smith received deterred him from escaping at one point. While hunting with his crippled sixty-year-old "brother" and a ten-year-old boy, Smith left them to hunt game. During the hunt, he attempted to escape, but after traveling a dozen miles, he killed a large buffalo cow. After sating his hunger, Smith regretted his intention to abandon the Indians in such a miserable condition. He packed up as much of the meat as he could carry and headed back to the camp. His brother happily welcomed him and thanked him for his exertion.[78]

The western Algonkin rarely tortured captives without a specific reason, although they likely did more than the eastern Algonkin. In a failed rescue attempt, the Indians captured one of Jean Lowry's intended rescuers and tortured him. The Indians forced her to watch the procedure. The Indians tied him to a tree, scalped him, and then heated their daggers in a fire and pushed them through the fleshy parts of his body. His cries and screams seemed to please his tormentors. The Indians continued the torture for two hours, until they had half roasted the would-be rescuer. The tormentors untied the man, forced him to run, and then dispatched him with their tomahawks.[79]

Peter Williamson recorded the horrible fate of three captives who attempted but failed escape. The men had been poorly treated by their captors and tried to escape. Far from home and unfamiliar with the area, they soon lost their way. The Indians recaptured them, bound two of the captives to trees, and then built a large fire around them, which horribly burned and scorched their bodies. An Indian ripped open their bellies with a scalping knife and burned their entrails before their eyes. Other Indians, meanwhile, tore or pierced the victims' bodies with knives or hot irons.

The third captive suffered a crueler fate. The Indians tied his arms tightly to his sides and then placed him upright in a hole. They then packed the dirt firmly around him up to his neck so that only his head remained exposed. They scalped him and left him to suffer for several hours. When they returned, they kindled a small fire near his head and kept it burning for two hours until his brain boiled in his head and his eyes gushed from their sockets. The Indians cut off his head to bury it with the other captives' bodies. They forced Williamson to dig the graves.[80]

The Indians used these tortures as punishment for an attempted escape or to intimidate remaining captives from attempting to escape. The Indians also tortured women who attempted to escape. Le Roy and Leininger witnessed a British woman tortured from nine in the morning until near sunset, when a French officer stepped in to end her misery.[81] Gibson could not discern whether a woman he witnessed being tortured had attempted to escape or had been a troublesome captive, but learned from the Indians that he would meet a similar fate if he attempted to escape.[82]

Sometimes, captors tortured their prey for revenge or to celebrate a great military victory. James Smith witnessed the maltreatment of several captives taken during Braddock's defeat. The Indians brought the captives to the edge of the settlement, stripped them, tied their hands behind their backs, fastened them to stakes, and applied hot irons to their bodies. The other Indians danced and sang until the victims expired.[83]

A few years later, Thomas Brown and his fellow captives with their hosts passed near the scene of Braddock's defeat. The group paused in the region to torture one of the captives. They ripped open his belly, tied his entrails to a tree, and then drove him around the tree with his innards trailing until he died.[84]

Peter Williamson's captors, after forcing him to march throughout the night with a heavy burden, stopped at dawn and tied him to a tree. They built a fire near the tree and then began to sing and dance around their prisoner. When they tired of dancing, they applied firebrands and hot coals to his face, head, hands, and feet, and threatened to burn him entirely if he cried out. He managed to remain silent, but tears streamed from his eyes, which the Indians dried by applying hot coals near his eyes.[85]

This same group later captured an old man, then slaughtered his wife and four children before his eyes. When they camped, the Indians entertained themselves by tormenting the old man. They stripped him and painted his body different colors, or plucked the gray hair from his head, telling him he was a fool for having lived so long. At other times they tied him to a tree and whipped him or scorched his cheeks or legs with hot coals.[86]

Thus, the western Algonkin sometimes tortured their prisoners for no other apparent motive than sadistic pleasure, but usually they had a stated motive. Although some Indian tribes used torture, the eastern Algonkin seldom did so unless influenced by western tribesmen attending the ceremonies. Apparently the Iroquois tortured their captives more often during the French and Indian War than during their neutrality period, but with less ritual and brutality. Perhaps they knew that when the war ended, they would need to reestablish peaceful relations with many of the neighboring tribes. Still, when they did torture captives they extended the victim's suffering more than their Algonkin neighbors.

NOTES

[1] Richard Aquila, The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754 (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 85, 97-98.

[2] For differing viewpoints concerning the meaning of the appellation, see Francis Jennings, The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from its Beginning to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744 (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984), 45-46, C.A. Weslager, The Delaware Indians: A History (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1972), 179-82, and Charles Colcord, "Putting Pants on the Lenni Lenape or Cutting the Iroquois Down to Size," The Indian Historian, 10 (Winter, 1977): 44-47.

[3] Stephen F. Auth, The Ten Years' War: Indian-White Relations in Pennsylvania, 1755-1765 (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1989), 19-20.

[4] Ibid., 25-26, Weslager, 224-226.

[5] Auth, 24-27. For background to the situation see Ibid., 11-24.

[6] Ibid., 37-39.

[7] The Mingo were Indians from the various Six Nations tribes who removed from New York to strike out on their own in Ohio. Within a few years the Iroquois in New York had no control over them and the Mingo acted totally independent of them. The Wyandot were a tribe of the Huron confederacy.

[8] Thomas Brown, A Plain Narrative (Boston: Fowle and Draper, 1760; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978)

[9] Susannah Willard Johnson Hastings, A Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Johnson (Walpole, New Hampshire: Printed by David Carlisle, Jr., 1796; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 23, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 27.

[10] As in earlier periods eastern Algonkin usually allowed female and young captives to ride while they walked. Western Algonkin often did the same. See "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger, for Three Years Captives among the Indians." The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 39 (1905), 408.

[11] Hastings, 35-36.

[12] Ibid., 36-37.

[13] Ibid., 45-46.

[14] Ibid., 43.

[15] Ibid., 64-65.

[16] For examples and a discussion, see James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," The William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series, 32 (January 1975), 55-88, esp. 60-63. See also James Smith, An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Col. James Smith during his Captivity with the Indians (Lexington: John Bradford, 1799; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 24, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979), 50-53. The Indians carried an eight-year-old boy captured with Titus King when he could no longer keep up. Titus King, Narrative of Titus King (Hartford: Connecticut Historical Society, 1938; Reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 7.

[17] Hastings, 67-68.

[18] Ibid., 65-66.

[19] Ibid., 72-75.

[20] Jemima Howe, A Genuine and Correct Account of the Captivity, Sufferings and Deliverance of Mrs. Jemima Howe (Boston: Belknap and Young, 1792; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 19, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 6.

[21] Ibid., 7-9.

[22] Ibid., 13-15.

[23] Henry Grace, History of the Life and Sufferings of Henry Grace (Reading, England, 1764; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian

Captivities, Vol. 10, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 20-22.

[24] Brown, 16-18.

[25] The following paragraphs on Israel Putnam's captivity come from David Humphrey, An Essay on the Life of the Honorable Major-General Israel Putnam (Hartford: Hudson and Goodwin, 1788; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 19, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 65-72.

[26] Robert Eastburn, A Faithful Narrative (Philadelphia: William Dunlap, 1758; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 10.

[27] Ibid., 6-7.

[28] Some of Eastburn's fellow captives later informed him that the Indians were angry with him for having killed one of them. Ibid., 7.

[29] Ibid., 11.

[30] Ibid., 14-15. Later, at a French house, the wounded Indian related the affair to the Frenchmen in the house and they helped the Indian to compel Eastburn to dance and sing. The women of the house rescued him by taking him into another room until the Indian's temper cooled. The Indian agreed to forego his demands if Eastburn would shave off his beard instead. Ibid., 16-17.

[31] Ibid., 10.

[32] Brown, 4-9.

[33] Ibid., 14-15. The appearance of compliance was almost always rewarded by the Indians and in many cases the captives managed to catch their masters off guard and escape. Likewise, constant crying and complaining incurred the wrath of the Indians and often resulted in the murder of the discontented.

[34] Eastburn, 9.

[35] Hastings, 19-20.

[36] See King, 6, and Eastburn, 9.

[37] Hastings, 24.

[38] Ibid., 44.

[39] Eastburn, 21-22.

[40] Hastings, 32-33. See also Ibid., 50-51, 76.

[41] Eastburn, 23.

[42] Hastings, 59-61.

[43] Eastburn, 17-18.

[44] Ibid., 19-20.

[45] Grace, 31.

[46] Ibid., 12-14.

[47] Ibid., 15-19.

[48] King, 8-9, 12. His song was of a semi-humorous content, to the effect that he was sorry he had been captured and wanted to go home and see the girls. See also Hastings, 53-54.

[49] Eastburn, 23n.

[50] Ibid., 27-29.

[51] Brown, 15.

[52] Edward P. Hamilton, The French and Indian Wars: The Story of Battles and Forts in the Wilderness (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), 60-61.

[53] Grace, 32.

[54] Jane Frazier, Narrative of the Captivity of Jane Frazier ("Taken from Thomas' History of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania," 1930; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 4-7.

[55] John Frost, Heroic Women of the West: Comprising Thrilling Examples of Courage, Fortitude, Devotedness, and Self Sacrifice, Among the Pioneer Mothers of the Western Country (Philadelphia: A. Hart, 1854; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 66, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 45-46, 243-44.

[56] Archibald Loudon, A Selection of some of the Most

Interesting Narratives, of Outrages, Committed by the Indians, in their Wars, with the White People (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: A. Loudon, 1808), 315-16.

[57] Thomas Gist, "Thomas Gist's Indian Captivity, 1758-1759," edited by Howard H. Peckham, The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 80 (April 1956): 292-4.

[58] William Fleming, A Narrative of Sufferings and Deliverance (Boston: Green and Russell, 1756; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 7-8.

[59] Ibid., 3-4.

[60] Ibid., 8-11.

[61] Affecting History of the Dreadful Distresses of Frederic Manheim's Family (Exeter, Massachusetts: H. Ranlet, 1793; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 30-31

[62] Fleming, 17-18.

[63] Jean Lowry, A Journal of the Captivity of Jean Lowry (Philadelphia: William Bradford, 1760; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 5.

[64] Gist, 293-94.

[65] Ibid., 294-95. See also Smith, 6-7, 29 and Frost, 244-45.

[66] Lowry, 8-9. See also Ibid., 11.

[67] "Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 409.

[68] Marion Morse Davis, ed., History of the Captivity of David Boyd (1931; reprinted in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 24, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 31-32. See also Loudon, 304-5.

[69] James Everett Seaver, A Narrative of the Life of Mary Jemison: The White Woman of Genesee (New York: The American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, 1925) 116. See also Isaac Hollister, A Brief Narration of the

Captivity of Isaac Hollister (New London, Connecticut: Printing Office, 1767; reprint in The Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 10, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 2, 6-7.

[70] Gist, 298-99.

[71] Gist, 298-300, Davis, 32-33, Timothy Alden, ed., "An Account of the Captivity of Hugh Gibson among the Delaware Indians of the Big River and Muskingum from the Latter part of July, 1756 to the Beginning of April, 1759," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Series Three, Vol. 6 (Boston: American Stationers Co., 1837), 142-43, Loudon, 305-306, Smith, 9-11, Alexander Henry, Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories Between the Years 1760 and 1776, edited by James Bain (Toronto: George N. Morang and Company, Ltd., 1901), 111-12. Henry assumed Indian attire, at the suggestion of his captors, to conceal his English identity from a band of Indians who were scheduled to arrive in the village and had lost some of their friends and relatives in a recent battle.

[72] Frost, 45-46.

[73] Alden, 144-48.

[74] Ibid., 153.

[75] Gist, 300-301.

[76] Smith, 14-15.

[77] Ibid., 35-39.

[78] Ibid., 50-53.

[79] Lowry, 5-6.

[80] Affecting History, 34-35.

[81] "Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 410.

[82] Alden, 143-44.

[83] Smith, 9.

[84] Brown, 18.

[85] Affecting History, 28-29.

[86] Ibid., 32.

CHAPTER VI

TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS, 1766-1783

During the years prior to and including the American Revolution, 1766-1783, the Indians of the northeast followed three distinctly different patterns in their treatment of captives. The eastern Algonkin treated their captives with more benevolence than in any previous period. The Six Nations Iroquois, who remained neutral until they eventually became embroiled in the war, treated their captives with more cruelty than in recent periods but not with the sadism of their original methods. Finally, the western Algonkin continued to treat their captives as cruelly as in the previous time and perhaps exceeded the Iroquois in ruthlessness.

As mentioned, the eastern Algonkin, allies of the British, treated their captives with more kindness than in any former period. The British apparently refused to pay ransoms for women and children, because the Indians rarely took them. The Indians even left wounded men behind, knowing that they would be unable to make the journey to Canada. Perhaps the British felt more kinship to the Americans than to the French and encouraged the benevolence of the Indians.

When a party of British and Indians raided Noah Strong's house in 1777, they found him incapacitated with a severe axe wound to the leg. They did not attempt to take him captive or harm him, but simply took what they needed from his home and continued on. At the next house the raiders discovered four brothers. Two of the men tried to escape by crossing a log that lay across a stream but slipped off. The Indians shot and scalped them and captured the two men remaining in the house.

Next, the party stopped at Joseph Barker's house. Barker, knowing that resistance against such odds would only lead to his and probably his family's death, immediately ran out to the Indians as they prepared to fire at him and surrendered. They accepted his surrender but killed his livestock to satisfy their hunger and then plundered his home.

The Indians delighted in Barker's wife's distress as they stole objects precious to her but meaningless to them. She appealed to the British officer and he commanded the Indians to return the absconded items. After they had ransacked the house, they set it on fire and informed the woman, who was pregnant and gave birth the following day, that she could go to Strong's home where she would be safe, but that Barker must go with them to Canada. The Indians allowed Barker and his wife to take leave of each other, then started on their trek northward with their captive.

They left the woman and her fourteen-month-old daughter to make their own way to Strong's house.[1]

In another case, Nathaniel Segar and two companions saw several armed Indians approaching them. They thought little of it because they had always been on friendly terms with the Indians and expected no danger. Upon reaching the three men, the Indians informed them that they were now prisoners and must accompany them to Canada. The captors took their victims to a nearby house and bound them, commanding them to be still or be killed. One of the captive's wife was in the house and acted so fearlessly and boldly toward the Indians that Segar feared for her life. The Indians, however, did not molest her.

After they had taken what they desired from the house, the Indians warned the woman to remain indoors because hundreds of them roamed the area and if she ventured outside she might be killed. They then loaded their three captives with heavy packs and marched toward Canada.[2]

A party of two hundred Indians raided a settlement in Vermont and captured Abijah Hutchinson. A group of Indians broke into his house one night after the family had gone to bed, seized Hutchinson, and ordered him to dress. One of the Indians bound him while the others plundered his home. The Indians treated the women of the house humanely, throwing them articles of clothing as they shivered in the chilly night air. One of the plunderers discovered an expensive silk dress and hid it in his pack. The woman who owned the dress, waiting for an opportune moment, extracted the dress and tied it around her waist under her other clothes. The Indian witnessed the maneuver but, apparently pleased by her bravery, took no action.[3]

In another settlement, the Indians netted an additional twenty captives. They had just crossed a river and were about to continue their journey when a widow, whose only son was among the captives, ran to the river and struggled across. Upon reaching the Indians, she pled for them to release her son, whom she claimed would never survive the journey to Canada. The Indians, impressed with her courage and zeal, released her son to her, and upon her impassioned request delivered up the other children they had taken. Her attempt to secure the release of the adult captives, however, fell on deaf ears. She then requested that the Indians assist her and the released children back across the river, hoping to delay them long enough for rescuers to arrive. The main party, wary of impending pursuit, departed, but left a single brave to carry out the request.[4]

The eastern Algonkin then, either through the influence of the British or for their own purposes, acted more humanely during the period of the American Revolution than at any previous time. They ceased taking female captives and left wounded men behind unmolested.[5] They sometimes took boys, but an impassioned plea often secured their release. They rarely killed captives unless they attempted to escape or resisted. If captives resisted, then they could be considered to have transformed from a civilian to a warrior and therefore were subject to being killed. Segar noted a possible exception in his narrative.

The Indians involved reached the house of James Pettengill just as he returned. He paused when he saw the Indians and then went to them when they motioned for him to come. After taking possession of their captive, the Indians plundered his home. The Indians did not harm his wife and children in any way but informed them that Pettengill must accompany his captors to Canada. The prisoner claimed to have no shoes. After the Indians made a thorough search but failed to turn up a pair, they consented to let their prisoner remain behind if he agreed to stay inside his home.

The raiders departed but halted a mile later. Two of the Indians left and returned shortly with Pettengill. The party then continued, but Segar soon noticed that Pettengill was missing and assumed that he had been sent home again. He later learned that the unfortunate man had been murdered about a half mile from his home.[6] This curious incident raises a number of questions. Why did the Indians return to take Pettengill captive? If they planned to kill him, why did they bring him back to the other captives? While neither of these questions can be answered absolutely, a plausible solution is that the Indians wanted to assure themselves that Pettengill had kept his word to remain inside his home and not attempt to raise the alarm. Perhaps, upon their return, they had encountered him, or perhaps they had found some shoes for him. Segar did not indicate whether Pettengill wore shoes when the Indians brought him in. Finally, since the Indians took the trouble to bring the captive all the way to the awaiting party, rather than killing him along the way, it is logical to assume that they intended to take him to Canada. Since Pettengill was murdered only half a mile from his home, it is possible that he was attempting to escape and return to his family when the Indians overtook him and killed him. If this was the case, then it fits the usual eastern Algonkin pattern.

The eastern Algonkin also relaxed their method of binding their prisoners at night. The captors of Nathaniel Segar had little fear of pursuit and stayed in a deserted cabin. The Indians simply ordered Segar and his companions to lie down and then lay down around them.[7]

Joseph Barker began planning his escape as soon as the Indians separated him from his wife. On the first night of his captivity, after ingratiating himself as much as possible with his hosts, Barker lay down between his guards, two athletic Indians. The Indians placed two cords over his body, one over his chest and the other over his thighs, and then threw a blanket over him and lay on its ends. As soon as the Indians fell asleep, Barker began to feign illness, tossing, turning, grunting, and groaning, so that his guards could not sleep. The Indians were very compassionate and even made him some herbal tea in hopes of soothing him, but he continued his antics throughout the night to keep them from sleeping.

The next morning, the Indians asked if he felt better and he replied that he did. He spent the day serving the Indians as best he could, never showing the least inclination to escape. He knew that the Indians often tested captives by apparently leaving them alone, while secretly watching them to see if they would attempt to escape. Barker, however, planned to escape that night, knowing that his guards would be weary because of his antics during the previous night. That night, when the Indians threw the cords and blanket over him, he contorted his body so that they would be looser about him. Once his guards were asleep, Barker managed to work his way from beneath the blanket and cords and escape.[8]

If they themselves were pursued, Indians would sometimes kill captives rather than have them be rescued. A rescue party pursued Abijah Hutchinson's captors and in a skirmish killed one Indian and wounded several others. The Indians killed a few of the captives and then sent word to the would-be rescuers that further pursuit would lead to the deaths of other captives.[9]

When Segar's captors prepared to enter the wilderness on their way to Canada, the Indians paused and gave Segar a piece of bark and ordered him to write that the Indians would murder the captives if any pursuers overtook them.[10] When they reached the Indian villages, an Indian saved Segar from harm by leading him quickly to a wigwam. The same Indian also rescued Segar's two companions. The Indians had surrounded one of them and were throwing firebrands at him. The next day, the Indians dressed Benjamin Clark, one of the captives, in Indian style, like a chief, and gave him liberty among them. When the British came to claim the prisoners, the Indians hoped to retain Clark, but the British refused, and after stripping off his Indian apparel the Indians released him to the British.[11]

The eastern Algonkin, therefore, appear to have been primarily motivated to take captives for the British. They targeted primarily men old enough to bear arms. They rarely took women and children or molested wounded men. The Indians only killed captives who tried to escape or resist or to discourage pursuit. They generally took the others to Canada as prisoners of war and surrendered them upon request to the British.

The Six Nations Iroquois treated their captives more violently than the eastern Algonkin. Although they tried to remain neutral during the Revolutionary War as they had in earlier wars, their strategic geographical position made that nearly impossible. When they finally entered the war they did so with venom, although their treatment of captives never reached the cruelty it held in the seventeenth century.

The Iroquois exceeded the eastern Algonkin in their proneness to murder wounded captives unless British soldiers interceded. When a band of Tories and Indians captured Freegift Patchin and his companions, they killed three of the captives in the struggle. The Iroquois questioned the remaining captives concerning the number of troops in a nearby fort. The captives exaggerated the number of soldiers in the fort to discourage an attack. Many of the Indians wanted to kill the captives and attack the fort, but their leader canceled the attack and announced that the group would return to Canada with the prisoners. He also warned the captives that if they failed to keep pace they would be killed.[12]

Later, the group captured an old man and his grandsons. The aged man managed to keep pace for a day and a half before his strength failed. He begged to be released or left behind, declaring that he was an old man and therefore no threat to them, but a pair of Indians, true to their threat, took him to the rear of the column and murdered him.[13]

Sometimes a captive saved the life of a wounded comrade. When a small American military unit surrendered after being overpowered by a larger British and Indian force, the Indians took possession of the captives and their arms. The victors tomahawked two of the wounded prisoners and draped another wounded man over a rock where several Indians shot off the top of the semi-conscious man's head. Moses Van Campen, the commander of the defeated Americans, saved a fourth soldier, wounded in the arm, when he blocked the fatal blow of the executioner. Several of the Indians respected the commander's bravery and protected him from the wrath of the other Indians and spared the life of his wounded subordinate.[14]

The Indians treated the rescued captive kindly thereafter, even though his wound caused him to be a burden. The Indians dressed and treated his wound and even invited Van Campen to visit him from time to time and see for himself how well they treated the prisoner. The commander encouraged the wounded man to show no weakness and the Indians appreciated his actions.[15]

Unlike the eastern Algonkin, the Iroquois did not exempt women from captivity or threats. A party of eleven Indians broke into Benjamin Gilbert's home and captured his entire family as well as three residents from nearby houses. The Indians took them all, men, women, and children, and quickly left the vicinity. Gilbert's wife faltered during the journey but constant threats from the Indians drove her onward.[16]

The Iroquois had no qualms about taking female captives but, unlike their ancestors in the seventeenth century, they treated the female prisoners with more gentleness. Perhaps their long association with Europeans gave them a new attitude toward women. Before 1700 the Iroquois treated both sexes almost identically, binding both sexes in a similar manner both day and night on the journey to their villages. Sometimes they placed the sexes on separate scaffolds upon reaching the villages, but not until they held a council to determine their fate did their treatment of men and women vary. At that point the Iroquois adopted a larger percentage of their female captives into the tribe. By the time of the American Revolution, the Iroquois attitude toward women had apparently softened.

This change was most notable in their binding of captives at night. Often the Iroquois did not bind women at all, and they also relaxed their previously thorough tying of male captives, sometimes with deadly results.[17] Rather than binding the captives in a spread eagle position, with each wrist and ankle secured to a stake, which was the common method before the eighteenth century, the Iroquois adopted a method similar to that used by the Algonkin. When camping, the Iroquois often bound their captives and then laid one or more cords over their bodies with a warrior reclining on each end.[18] Zadock Steele, restrained in this manner, extracted himself enough to sit up, but could not escape because of the watchful Indian sentinels.[19]

The Indians who captured the Gilberts used a different method. They cut a sapling and notched it so that it fit over the captives' legs. Each male captive then lay on his back with the notched log staked down over his legs, effectively confining him in a manner similar to stocks.[20] They did not bind women and children but simply forced them to lie among their captors.[21]

A few days after they captured Freegift Patchin and his companions, the party of Indians encountered a pair of Indians, one of whom was badly wounded. The pair related that they had barely escaped when their prisoners rose up and killed the other Indians in their sleep. After hearing the story, Patchin's captors began to sing and dance menacingly around their captives, brandishing their tomahawks. Even as the captives prepared themselves for death, the very Indian who had escaped the murder of his companions leaped unarmed to the center of the angry natives and defended the captives. He argued that they should not be held accountable for the actions of others and thereby he saved their lives.[22]

One of the reasons that captives resolved to escape at the first opportunity was the harsh treatment and constant threats that the Indians heaped upon them. Many of the threats were hollow and were only intended to terrify the captives, but the prisoners could never tell when to believe their oppressors. Benjamin Gilbert's family received a steady barrage of threats throughout their journey, but they all arrived safely at their destination. In one instance the Indians separated four of the captives from the others and took them by a different path. The remaining captives inquired into the fate of the four. Their hosts informed them that the four had been killed and scalped and those who remained might expect similar treatment that night. This news terrified the captives and one of them escaped. The Indians, immediately upon discovering his absence, set out to retrieve him but failed. They returned and vented their anger on the other captives. They threw one of them to the ground and prepared to tomahawk him, but his mother threw herself across his body. The Indians became enraged, kicked the woman aside, and then tied the two unfortunates to a tree by their necks until the Indians' anger had subsided.[23]

Luke Swetland suffered mental torture during the rest stops on his journey. His master would often approach him, place the muzzle of his gun to the captive's breast, cock it, and then grin and place his finger on the trigger. When the captive showed no response, the Indian would open the pan, remove the old priming and reprime the gun, afterward placing the muzzle to the captive's head.[24]

Sarah and Ben Gilbert traveled with a band of Indians who suffered greatly from lack of provisions. One night, one of the Indians asked Sarah if she had ever eaten horse or dog flesh. She replied that she had not. He then asked her about human flesh, at which she expressed abhorrence. He then added that it might be necessary to kill and eat Ben in order to survive, which terrified her.[25] In all likelihood, the Indian was only trying to frighten the girl, as he himself seemed repulsed at the idea.

Physical abuse often accompanied or replaced the threats of the Indians. For example, Luke Swetland's master struck him on the hips and sides with a tomahawk as he drove his captive along.[26] Benjamin Gilbert, a sixty-nine-year-old captive, began to falter as his party neared the end of its journey. His master, irritated at Gilbert's lack of stamina, tied a rope around his neck to lead him. When the old man fell, exhausted, the Indian nearly choked him by pulling roughly on the rope. Gilbert's wife, Elizabeth, intervened and begged the Indian to show mercy. Eventually the captor allowed Elizabeth and her husband to follow after the others.[27]

Freegift Patchin and his fellow companions perhaps escaped death during their march to the north because of the illness of the Indian leader. Three feet of soft snow lay on the ground and the Indians, donning snowshoes, could easily outdistance their captives. Fortunately for the prisoners, the Indian leader fell ill and had to stop often to rest. Thus, the captives also stopped and rested frequently and consequently kept up with the reduced pace.[28]

Despite their sometimes cruel actions and threats, the Indians almost always fed their captives as well as they themselves ate. A little girl captive, Abby Byrom, received her portion of the provisions even in times of scarcity.[29] Other captives noted similarly generous distributions of food.[30] Zadock Steele observed that his captors urged him to eat as much as he wanted, although they subsisted on half rations because of their shortage of provisions. The captives could not even halt to pick berries without being offered more food by the Indians, and they always received a portion of the best available at the time.[31]

The Iroquois, then, often cruelly threatened their captives during the march to their villages but they rarely allowed this cruelty to extend to murder, except in the case of severely wounded captives. Their threats to laggards often kept the prisoners moving, but sometimes they administered blows to drive the captives forward. If all other methods failed, the Indians then might murder the fatigued captive but usually only as a last resort.

Once they entered their villages, Iroquois treatment of captives became more traditional, beginning in most cases with the gauntlet. The Indians beat each member of the Gilbert family and their fellow captives upon their arrival at the first Indian village. Two of the women entered on horseback but fell from the frightened animals when the beatings began. The flogging continued until a chief interfered, stopped the thrashings, and led the captives to a cabin to feed them.[32]

Luke Swetland passed through a Tory encampment before reaching the Indian villages. The Tories cursed the captives but offered no physical abuse and even fed them. The next morning, a group of Tories told Swetland's master that the captive was an honest man. As a result, Swetland received kind treatment. When they left the camp Swetland's master left him behind because of Swetland's lameness. Another Indian followed the crippled prisoner, kicking him and striking him on the head until, growing tired of the sport, the tormentor returned to his camp. When Swetland reached the next village, his master whisked him away before the inhabitants could harm him. His companion did not fare as well but suffered a bruising and bloody treatment before he finally joined Swetland within the wigwam.[33]

The next day a pair of Indians conducted Swetland through the town. A small party of Indians intercepted them and removed Swetland's clothes. One of them struck the prisoner across the back with the flat of a sword. Other Indians quickly formed into two parallel ranks of fifteen each along Swetland's path. As he passed them, each Indian struck him with a stick, but they did little harm.[34] In this case Swetland underwent an unorganized beating as well as the gauntlet. Perhaps, because the Indians did not beat him upon his arrival, or because he arrived after dark, the Iroquois decided to at least go through the motions of the gauntlet the following day.

When William Scudder arrived in the Indian village before his companions, a young Indian woman took him by the hand, led him to a cabin where she gave him food and drink, and then guided him to the door to watch the arrival of his fellow captives. As each prisoner arrived, one of the Indian boys took his hand and ran with him to a pole in the center of the village. When all had arrived, the entire group, Indians and captives alike, danced around the pole for fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of the dance, each Indian who had taken a captive took him by the hand and ran as fast as they could to a council house while the villagers followed, yelling and screaming. Once inside the council house, they again danced before settling down to a meal. Scudder noted the lax treatment afforded the captives and attributed it to the presence of a chapel and three Roman Catholic clergy who resided in the village.[35]

In the absence of priests, the Indians sometimes took it upon themselves to protect their captives. Joseph Brant, a Mohawk sachem, whom American contemporaries considered a bloodthirsty savage, spared a group of captives from a severe beating. When his party neared their destination, a British fort, Brant caused most of the Indians encamped around it to be sent away before he brought the prisoners in. Still, at the first encampment, the few remaining Indians, mostly old women and children, quickly formed a gauntlet when the party came into sight. One old woman approached Freegift Patchin in a friendly manner and then suddenly struck him viciously on the head. At the next encampment, where the more violent Indians generally camped, a British patrol marched out of the fort to protect the captives. Even so, an Indian youth managed to strike Patchin between the eyes with a hatchet, knocking him nearly senseless and causing blood to gush from the wound. One of the soldiers quickly seized the boy's weapon and threw it into the lake.[36]

The use of the gauntlet prevailed among the Iroquois and with few exceptions every captive ran it in some form. In addition, the Indians subjected their captives to beatings upon their arrival at each new village or encampment. Children sometimes only had to endure beatings rather than running the gauntlet.[37] An Indian commander, British soldier, or priest could often lessen the severity of the beatings or in some cases dispense with them all together. The beatings generally continued until the Indians formally adopted the captive into a family or surrendered them to the British.

The Iroquois used a less elaborate adoption process than the Algonkin. Generally, the villagers gathered in a council house or at some central location within the village where the chief, or head of the village, began the ceremony by giving a speech designating the distribution of the captives. The prisoners went to the home of their new families where, after weeping over their lost relative, the family rejoiced at his replacement by a new family member.[38]

After the adoption, the families generally treated their captives as equals. A Seneca chief's daughter adopted Rebecca and Benjamin Gilbert, Jr., into her family and gave them much better treatment than usually afforded captives. Rebecca's youth exempted her from the amount of work done by the adult Indian women, who often sent her home to prepare the meals. Young Benjamin, considered the king's heir, received such preferential treatment that only frequent counsel with his fellow captives kept him at least partially interested in returning to his former life.[39]

On the other hand, Thomas Peart replaced an Indian who had not been highly esteemed among his peers and as a result, no matter how hard he tried, Peart could not elevate himself above the level his deceased predecessor had held.[40] Once, on a hunting trip, Peart became ill and his companions left him behind to follow later if he could. He decided to return to the Indian village alone while the hunters continued on. He succeeded in reaching the village and the returning hunters seemed pleased and surprised to see him when they returned, suspecting that he had died before he could make it back.[41]

Although Peart claimed to have done all in his power to overcome the stigma of his predecessor, it is possible that he simply did not try long enough. Perhaps he did not have the patience to keep trying when he saw that his efforts had no immediate result. He mentioned several times that he quit trying when he saw that he could not raise himself, thereby losing any ground he had gained. Perhaps the Indians interpreted this vacillating behavior as being unworthy of a reward.[42]

When captives became ill they received care in proportion to their worth. As related above, the Indian left Thomas Peart to struggle on his own when he became ill. When Rebecca and Benjamin Gilbert, Jr., suffered with chills and fever for nearly three months, their Indian family treated them kindly throughout their illness. When it appeared that the children would not recover on their own, the Indians prepared an herbal decoction and bathed the children with it.[43]

Elizabeth Peart also received kind treatment when she became ill. However, when she did not recover quickly, the Iroquois discontinued their attention and built her a small hut in the cornfield so that she could better tend the corn. She later recovered, but could not return to the village until the corn had ripened and been gathered.[44]

Luke Swetland also fell ill during his captivity.

When he contracted a fever and ague, the people in the town attended to his needs by bringing him butter, milk, and buttermilk. His adopted sister brought him water daily from a spring one-half mile from camp, even though she had other water available nearby. One Indian woman brought him a special root to steep in water for him to drink.[45]

Popular captives, especially young ones, received special care when they became ill. Older captives, such as the Pearts, might not receive any special care, or might not be attended to if their sickness seemed to drag on for an extended period of time. Those who fell ill outside the village or on a march might be abandoned all together.

Torture among the Iroquois was more brutal than among the eastern Algonkin, but not as rigorous as it had been in previous times. Usually torture victims were war prisoners. Daniel McCollum witnessed two distinct methods of torture during his captivity. In the first case, the Indians stuck the victim's body full of pine splinters and then set them on fire. In the second case, the torturers tied their victim to a tree with his hands bound above his head. Then they heaped a circle of combustible material around him, but at a distance to prevent the victim from being consumed too quickly. Once lit, the fire slowly burned the victim over a period of several hours.[46]

Lieutenant Thomas Boyd, a member of American General John Sullivan's army, which devastated many Iroquois villages, suffered another fate when captured. Mohawk chief Joseph Brant protected the Lieutenant until Brant left for other business, after which a British officer turned the unfortunate man over to the Indians when he refused to divulge military information. The Indians stripped Boyd and tied him to a sapling. They then tested his nerve by throwing tomahawks close to his head, being careful not to strike him. Some of the Indians then danced around their unhappy victim, brandishing knives, tearing out his fingernails, cutting off his nose, plucking out one of his eyes, cutting out his tongue, and stabbing him in various non-fatal places. Once the Indians had tired of this amusement, they cut a slit in his abdomen, tied one end of his intestines to the tree and then untied him and drove him by brute force around the tree so that the motion caused his entrails to be drawn out. They ended his torment by decapitating him. At the same time, they decapitated another captive but did not torture him.[47]

The Iroquois' torture of only one captive shows a dramatic change in their cruelty. In the seventeenth century, the Iroquois tortured to death large numbers of prisoners on a single day and seemed almost insatiable in their appetite for torture. Then, during the American Revolution, torture of one victim apparently satisfied them to the point that they simply killed outright another available captive. In addition, Sullivan's raid on the

Iroquois villages drove the Indians into the violent rage that caused Lieutenant Boyd's death. Even though the Iroquois torture methods remained among the most cruel and sadistic of the northeast Indians, their frequency declined at a rapid rate.

During the American Revolution period, the western Algonkin continued to be much more active than their eastern kin in their cruel treatment of captives and perhaps surpassed the Iroquois. One possible cause for this callous treatment was the British practice in the west of paying bounties for scalps rather than for captives. The British apparently did not distinguish between male and female scalps, since the Indians scalped numerous members of each sex during the period.[48]

The temperament of the individual Indians greatly influenced the treatment their captives received. Alexander M'Connel killed a deer and approached to dress the animal when several Indians surprised and captured him. Caught completely off guard, M'Connel offered no resistance. The Indians did not bind him and allowed him to keep his gun and hunting utensils. Later, he shot an additional deer for his captors. When they camped at night, however, they bound M'Connel.[49]

Another party of Indians raided a family's home while the men worked in the field. A nine-year-old girl rescued her two-year-old brother by carrying him to a nearby fort.

The Indians chased her but apparently only wanted to scare her and did not plan to catch her. They captured two boys and a five-year-old girl who remained behind but later released one of the boys because of his lameness.[50]

Two women crossed a river in a canoe to visit with friends but, unused to using the canoe, they drifted downstream out of sight of their destination and became stranded on a sand bar. As they waded ashore, three Indians captured them. The women had little choice but to surrender and the Indians hustled them through the forest. One of the Indians became smitten with his captive and informed her that she would become his wife. Despite his affection for her, he prodded her and struck her with a stick during the journey. She did all in her power to delay the party and to leave signs which might be followed by a rescue party. The other Indians perceived her activities and attempted to murder her, but her newfound friend prevented them and at one point even paused to construct a pair of moccasins for her damaged feet.[51]

Usually, when the Indians attacked a homestead or a group, they dealt with men and babies quickly and mercilessly while sparing women and children.[52] However, the Indians sometimes varied from this pattern. For example, when a dozen Indians attacked the Baldwin family inside their home, the attackers cut a hole in the door large enough for them to enter one at a time, but instead of invading the home they set it on fire. The inhabitants of the burning dwelling had no other choice but to attempt escape. Baldwin's oldest son grabbed an axe, ran out the door, and killed one Indian who attempted to intercept him, but other marauders quickly overpowered the boy. His younger brother attempted to follow him but an Indian knocked him down and scalped him. The attackers killed Baldwin's wife but spared a daughter after she begged for her life. Unable to outrun his pursuers, Baldwin also surrendered.[53]

Simon Kenton and his companions attempted to steal horses from an Indian camp. When the Indians discovered and surrounded Kenton, he offered to surrender if the Indians promised to treat him properly. The Indians agreed. When one of them grasped his hand apparently more roughly than Kenton considered proper, the captive raised his gun to strike the offending Indian. At that moment another Indian seized Kenton from behind, pinioning his arms. The other Indians then fell upon him and beat him, informing him all the time that he had been attempting to steal their horses. Another Indian returned to the group with the scalp of one of his companions and waved it in Kenton's face, threatening the prisoner with a similar fate.[54]

In Kenton's case, his attempt to strike his captor might have been interpreted as a breach of good faith, thus giving the Indians justification, in their eyes at least, for beating him. On the other hand, Kenton, once surrounded, had little choice but to surrender and might have misinterpreted the Indians' agreement to his hopeful request for leniency.

The method of binding captives also varied with the benevolence of the captors. Ironically, the Indians who bound their captives in a lax or gentle manner often paid for their kindness with their lives. For example, during the first days of his captivity, the Indians tied Alexander M'Connel's wrists together and then slept on the ends of the ropes. One night, when M'Connel complained that the tight ropes hurt his wrists, the Indians wrapped the cords more loosely around his wrists and tied a simple knot. That night M'Connel obtained a knife, cut himself free, and killed or chased away his captors.[55] Two girls killed their captor with an axe when he left them unbound as he lay down to rest.[56]

The western Algonkin rarely bound captive women and children and in this respect resembled their eastern kin more than the Iroquois. By the time of the American Revolution, the Iroquois also took less pains to bind female captives. Simon Kenton's captors tied him in a method similar to the traditional Iroquois spread eagle. His captors forced him to lie on his back with his arms stretched out to the side. They then laid a pole across his chest and tied his wrists to the pole's ends with buffalo hide. They then drove stakes into the ground near his feet and lashed his ankles to them. The Indians placed a halter around Kenton's neck, tied the other end to a nearby sapling, passed another cord beneath his body, secured the ends to the pole on his chest, and then wrapped it around his elbows to bind them to the rod. During the procedure, the Indians continually insulted and beat him before leaving him for the night.[57] Kenton's binding might have been more for punishment than to restrain him or to keep him from escaping.

Once the western Algonkin reached their villages, their treatment of captives resembled that of the Iroquois much more than their linguistic relatives to the east. Beatings and/or the gauntlet became almost certain upon arrival at the villages. Even those who had been treated very kindly by their masters fell prey to the violence of the villagers. Jasper Parrish became the property of a war chief upon his capture. The chief left Parrish with an Indian family while the Indian left to carry out additional raids. The family treated the new arrival with kindness and gave Parrish medicine when he became ill. He refused to take it at first, fearing they meant to poison him, but when he finally relented, the cure worked almost immediately.

Despite this initial kindness, Parrish's fate remained uncertain. When his master returned and took him to the village, the men and boys ran out to meet Parrish, pulled the captive from his horse, and beat him with clubs, whips, and tomahawk handles until his master called for a halt. The master then led the bruised and shaken prisoner to the sanctuary of a hut.[58]

A chief approached Simon Kenton before the group entered the villages. The chief, who had been sent for earlier, asked Kenton if he had attempted to steal the Indians' ponies. Kenton freely admitted his guilt and the chief beat him severely on the back and shoulders with a hickory switch until the prisoner bled freely. The entire group of Indians then alternately scolded and whipped him as they worked their way to the village. The villagers greeted him with shouts and hoots, heaped more abuse upon him, and then demanded that the unfortunate man be tied to a stake. The mob quickly stripped Kenton and tied his hands to the top of a pole. The whole crowd then danced around the victim, striking him with switches or their bare hands as they passed. Finally, at midnight, the Indians released Kenton and took him to a cabin to spend the night.[59]

The next morning his captors led Kenton from the wigwam toward two parallel lines of Indian men, women, and children that stretched for almost a quarter of a mile to a council house. At the signal to begin the run, Kenton veered off to the side rather than running between the two rows, causing the Indians to break ranks to pursue him. He darted past several Indians and entered the council house after receiving only a few minor blows.[60]

The Indians, who often admired such ingenuity and bravery, seldom punished captives for not following the intended paths. When the pursued reached the designated council house, they escaped further harm. Another captive who ran the gauntlet returned the blow of the first Indian who struck him. This action so impressed the Indians that they exempted him from the rest of the run and adopted him.[61]

Women sometimes did not have to run the gauntlet, but usually received at least a token beating upon their arrival in the Indian villages. Margaret Paulee arrived at a village, apparently late at night, since only a few inhabitants came out to meet her. In the morning, however, the returned war party fired guns and shouted to announce their arrival. A huge procession greeted them. One Indian approached Paulee as she stood beside a fire. He extended his hand, but when she reached out to shake it, he quickly withdrew it and struck her violently on the temple with his fist, almost knocking her into the fire. Her eye swelled shut for several days and her master expressed his indignation at the blow she received. Paulee believed that she escaped the gauntlet because of the sympathy arising from the blow.[62]

Elizabeth Hicks escaped the gauntlet or beatings because her master ran with her through each town they passed through in order to avoid the residents.[63] Likewise, Abel Janney escaped the usual beating because of the villagers' absence when he arrived.[64] Janney later escaped, but another tribe recaptured him. His new masters treated him kindly even though they knew he had escaped from another tribe. They even dressed him in Indian fashion and gave him a gun, so that he would not undergo the usual beatings as he passed through other villages. They eventually took him to Detroit and released him as they had earlier promised.[65]

Captives taken during William Crawford's disastrous campaign against the Indians in 1782 received perhaps the cruelest treatment. It should be remembered that the captives were members of an invading army rather than civilians taken from their homes during Indian raids. The Indians routed Crawford's army and captured him as well as several others when they surrendered.

The Indians took a total of nine captives and marched them back to their village. During the march, the captors killed and scalped four of the captives, who were probably wounded. Before entering the village, the Indians seated the remaining captives on the ground. They set Crawford and Dr. Knight, another captive, apart from the others. A group of Indian women and boys fell upon the other captives and tomahawked them. They decapitated one of the prisoners and the Indians kicked his head around like a ball. They shook the bloody scalps of their victims in the faces of the two survivors and then pushed on to the village.

As the party neared the town, each Indian they encountered struck the prisoners with sticks or their fists. The captives arrived at a fire, where the Indians ordered them to sit. After a short while the hosts stripped the captives and beat them again. They bound Crawford's hands behind his back, attached a rope to the ligature between his wrists, and tied the other end to the top of a fifteen-foot high post. The rope had sufficient slack in it to allow Crawford to walk several times around the post.

At the conclusion of an Indian chief's speech, the other Indians howled and shot powder into Crawford's body with their guns. They discharged almost seventy loads into the sufferer's body. The torturers then cut off his ears and applied burning sticks to his body. Two or three tormentors would approach at the same time from different directions so that even though he had some freedom of movement he could not entirely avoid the flames. Indian women tossed burning coal and cinders at him with flat boards. The ground around him quickly became covered with the hot embers, affording him no comfortable place to stand.

After two hours of torture, Crawford lay down on the embers at his feet and the Indians scalped him. They beat Knight in the face with the bloody trophy, taunting him with a similar fate. Meanwhile, an old Indian woman heaped coals and ash upon Crawford's back and naked skull, whereupon he struggled back to his feet. As he walked aimlessly around the pole the Indians continued to apply firebrands to his body, but he now appeared insensitive to pain. At this point an Indian led Knight away to bind him for the night, but in the morning he saw the charred remains of his commander among the ashes of the fire.[66]

John Slover was among another group of Crawford's command that was captured. He and his companions received severe beatings upon their arrival at a village. The Indians blackened one of the captives with coal and water as a sign that he was to be burned, even though the Indians assured him that he would not be harmed. The group soon continued on to a larger village, preceded by a warrior who informed the town of their impending arrival. At the groups approach, the inhabitants armed with guns, clubs, and tomahawks ran out to meet them. The captives' guards instructed the prisoners to run to a nearby council house three hundred yards away. The Indians concentrated their efforts on the blackened man, some of them shooting powder into his body as he passed. The other captives reached the council house relatively unscathed, but their unfortunate companion suffered tomahawk cuts, gunpowder burns, and severe bleeding where wadding had hit him between the shoulder blades. Contrary to the usual custom, when the blackened man reached the council house his tormentors dragged him back outside and beat him again. They eventually beat him to death and cut his body into pieces.[67]

Both Knight and Slover eventually escaped to relate their horrifying tales. The Indians not only vented their rage on captured invaders, but also upon other Americans who the Englishmen residing among them said showed no mercy to Indians that they captured.[68] The validity and importance of British involvement is questionable, since Americans used many of the narratives as propaganda against the British as well as against the Indians during the Revolution. Undoubtedly a few renegades, both British and American, lived among the Indians and incited them to greater violence against their enemies.

With the addition of the use of a gun to blow powder into the victim's body, the method used to torture the captives of Crawford's command appears similar to that used by the Iroquois. This practice appears to have been used only rarely, since the Indians seldom had powder to spare.[69] The Indians used slow burning with mutilation of the victim's body as the usual method of torture, accompanied by singing and dancing by the Indians and the forced onlooking by the other captives.[70]

In one case, the Indians burned a baby to death. The infant's mother, forced to carry her baby, became too weak to continue. The Indians held a council and decided to kill the child so that the mother could continue more easily. They built a large fire which they allowed to burn down to coals and then snatched the baby from its distressed mother and tossed it upon the burning embers. They immediately withdrew it and returned it to its mother, only to repeat the process again and again. The agonized mother screamed in horror and the Indians yelled in response. When at last the baby died, the Indians ripped its body into pieces.[71]

If a captive survived the journey to the Indian villages and the subsequent beatings, but escaped death by torture, in all probability he or she would be adopted into the tribe as a full and complete member of an Indian family. Still, adopted captives often considered the normal Indian lifestyle a form of torture and regarded their lives to be constantly endangered unless an Indian family formally adopted them.

George Ash's captors transferred him from family to family and often treated him harshly until one of the families adopted him. After his adoption, they treated Ash like the other Indian children.[72] A white renegade who lived among the Indians rescued Simon Kenton from death. For several weeks Kenton lived peacefully and unmolested among his captors until at another council Indians from other villages who apparently had grievances with the whites wanted to vent their fury on Kenton. The renegade again appealed to the Indians to spare Kenton but this time did not succeed. After the council ended, the Indians bound Kenton and marched him toward a neighboring village. Along the way, the group met an Indian who, upon seeing the prisoner, attacked him with an axe, breaking his shoulder and nearly severing his arm. The other Indians immediately intervened and chastised the attacker for trying to rob them of the pleasure of torturing the captive. Fortunately, an Indian trader drew Kenton away from his Indian guards and rescued him before the death sentence could be carried out.[73]

Often the village adults compelled Indian boys and their white counterparts to immerse themselves in icy rivers in the dead of winter. They carried out this activity, according to the Indians, to toughen the children and make them more hardy.[74] Other captives, especially women, had to work extensively. Elizabeth Hicks's "daughter" took her to a large Indian family of nineteen persons, who quickly put her to work. Hicks had to fell the trees, cut them into firewood, and haul the pieces to the hut. Sometimes the Indian women assisted her. Twice a day she waded across a wide brook to milk a cow that the Indians kept on the opposite bank. She also fetched the horses whenever her captors demanded. This task sometimes took two or three days because of the great distances that the horses had strayed. Once she had completed all of her outdoor tasks, the Indians required her to sew, which became more difficult because the rough work and exposure to weather caused her hands to be raw and bloody.[75]

Once officially adopted into a family, captives rarely suffered from abuse. However, if a captive attempted to escape or refused to accept his or her new life, the family might disown him or her. The major danger that adopted captives faced came from drunken Indians. Jasper Parrish and his Indian family encamped near several Indians who became intoxicated. Several of Parrish's own adopted family became drunk and discussed how they might obtain more rum. They plotted to kill Parrish to sell his scalp to the British. Parrish learned of their plan and managed to stay away from them until they had sobered.[76]

The Indians of the northeast, during the years from 1763-1783, generally became more cruel and aggressive in a westward progression. The smaller white population in the western region contributed to the aggressiveness of the Indians, since they could more easily overpower the few white people living in the area. In the east, even with British assistance, the eastern Algonkin treated their captives relatively well and rarely murdered or tortured their victims. The Iroquois become more aggressive during this period, although they tried at first to retain their neutrality. They exhibited more aggressive behavior than at any other time during the eighteenth century, but were not nearly as violent as they had been during the seventeenth century. The western Algonkin were the most aggressive Indians during the period, perhaps because they had the greatest success against the whites and had not yet suffered the serious defeats their eastern cousins experienced. The western Algonkin were the only Indians to remain active, on a large scale after 1783. The eastern Algonkin and the Six Nation Iroquois played a limited role in the taking of captives after this time.

NOTES

[1] Solomon Barker, Interesting Narrative of the Sufferings of Joseph Barker and his Wife, (Rochester, New York: Cunningham and Brooks, 1848; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 63, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 5-7.

[2] Nathaniel Segar, A Brief Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Lieutenant Nathan'l. Segar, who was Taken Prisoner by the Indians and Carried to Canada, During the Revolutionary War, (Paris, Maine: The Observer Office, 1825; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 37, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 14-15.

[3] K. M. Hutchinson, Memoir of Abijah Hutchinson, (Rochester, New York: William Alling, 1843; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 59, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 10-11.

[4] Ibid., 12-13.

[5] See also Segar, 18.

[6] Segar, 17.

[7] Ibid., 15-16.

[8] Barker, 9-10.

[9] Hutchinson, 13.

[10] Segar, 20.

[11] Ibid., 24-25, 27.

[12] Josiah Priest, The Captivity and Sufferings of General Freegift Patchin, (reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 52, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 6-9.

[13] Ibid., 11-12. See also William Scudder, The Journal of William Scudder, (Privately printed, 1794; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 22, New York: Garland Publishing,

Inc., 1977), 40-41.

[14] John Niles Hubbard, Sketches of the Life and Adventures of Moses Van Campen, (Dansville, New York: George W. Stevens, 1841; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 13, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 247-249.

[15] Ibid., 254-255.

[16] William Walton, A Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Benjamin Gilbert and his Family, (Philadelphia: Joseph Crukshank, 1784; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 15, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1975), 6-9.

[17] For examples see Hubbard, 219-220 and Josiah Priest, Stories of the Revolution, (Albany: Hoffman and White, 1836; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 52, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 11-12.

[18] Luke Swetland, A Narrative of the Captivity of Luke Swetland, in 1778 and 1779, Among the Seneca Indians, (Waterville, New York: James J. Guernsey, 1875; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 17, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 4.

[19] Zadock Steele, The Indian Captive, (Montpelier, Vermont: published by the author, 1818; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 36, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 55-56.

[20] Walton 1784, 9-10.

[21] William Walton, A Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Benjamin Gilbert and his Family, 3d edition, revised and enlarged, (Philadelphia: John Richards, 1848; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 15, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1975), 34-35. See Priest, Stories of the Revolution, 5-6 for a variation of this method.

[22] Priest, Patchin, 14-16. The Indian was known to the captives and had lived near them before the war and was considered an inoffensive and kind-hearted man. See also Walton 1784, 12-13.

[23] Walton 1784, 13-14.

[24] Swetland, 5.

[25] Walton 1784, 71.

[26] Luke Swetland, A Very Remarkable Narrative of Luke Swetland, (Hartford: privately printed, 178-?; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 17, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 4.

[27] Walton 1784, 18. Later Elizabeth became too weak to keep pace and after numerous threats an Indian gave her a horse so that she might keep up. Ibid., 21.

[28] Priest, Patchin, 9-10, 12.

[29] John McConnel McElroy, Abby Byram, and her Father, (Ottumwa, Iowa: Cook and Algire, 1897; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 99, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 7-8.

[30] Priest, Patchin, 13, 16-17, Scudder, 38-39, 42-43, Swetland 178-?, 4.

[31] Steele, 56-57.

[32] Walton, 1784, 24-25. See also Walton 1784, 72-73, Swetland 1875, 20, and Hubbard, 263-267.

[33] Swetland 1875, 5-7.

[34] Ibid., 7-8.

[35] Scudder, 52-54. Scudder was probably among the Caughnawagas.

[36] Priest, Patchin, 21-22.

[37] Priest, Stories of the Revolution, 6.

[38] Scudder, 54-55, Swetland 1875, 7-8, Walton 1784, 36-36, 40-41, 46-47, 75, Steele, 64, Jasper Parrish, The Story of Captain Jasper Parrish, Captive, Interpreter, and United States Subagent to the Six Nations Indians, (Buffalo Historical Society Publications, 1903, Vol. 6, 527-546; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 105, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 533.

[39] Walton 1784, 62-63.

[40] Ibid., 75-76.

[41] Ibid., 81-82.

[42] Ibid., 83.

[43] Ibid., 64.

[44] Ibid., 49.

[45] Swetland, 8-9.

[46] O. Z. Brown, A True Narrative of Daniel McCollum, A Captive Among the Indians During the Revolution, (Union, New York: printed at the "News" office, 1853; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 65, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 8.

[47] Authentic Particulars of the Death of Lieutenant Thomas Boyd, (Rochester, New York: Roderick M. Colton, 1841; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 56, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 8-9, Hubbard, 169-170, James Everett Seaver, A Narrative of the Life of Mary Jemison, the White Woman of Genesee, 22d edition, (New York: The American Scenic and Historical Preservation Society, 1925), 72-73.

[48] For contemporary accusations of this practice see Parrish, 531-532, John Dodge, A Narrative of the Capture and Treatment of John Dodge, by the English at Detroit, (Philadelphia: T. Bradford, 1779; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 12, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 13-14.

[49] The Escape of Alexander M'Connel, (Hunt's Family Almanac, for 1855, Philadelphia: U. Hunt; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 37, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 7-9. Sometimes the Indians promised not to harm their victims if they surrendered. The whites often complained that the Indians broke this promise upon capture. It appears that the promise was meant to be only a temporary truce, lasting as long as the captive remained passive, or until the group reached the Indian villages at which point a council would determine their fate. To this effect, the Indians generally kept their word, seldom beating captives who surrendered under such terms, at least until they reached the villages where the traditional beatings occurred. See also Abel Janney, Narrative of the Capture of Abel Janney by the Indians in 1782, (Ohio Archaeological and

Historical Publications, vol. 8, Columbus, 1900, 465-473; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 104, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 465-466.

[50] John Frost, Thrilling Adventures Among the Indians, (Philadelphia: J. W. Bradley, 1850), 228.

[51] Adventures with the Indians, 355-357.

[52] See Elizabeth Hicks, Elizabeth Hicks, A True Romance of the American War of Independence, 1775 to 1783, (London: William Hardwick, 1902; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 104, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 38, Old Record of the Captivity of Margaret Erskine 1779 (Baltimore, Maryland: The Lord Baltimore Press, 1912; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 108, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 8-10, and John Frost, Heroic Women of the West, (Philadelphia: A. Hart, 1854; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 66, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 206-210.

[53] Narrative of the Massacre, by Savages, of the Wife and Children of Thomas Baldwin, (New York: Martin and Wood, 1835; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 52, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 7-8. The Corbly family met a similar fate. The Indians killed or scalped the entire family except for the father, who, being some distance from the massacre, managed to escape. Two of his daughters also survived despite being scalped. Affecting History of the Dreadful Distresses of Frederic Manheim's Family, (Exeter, Massachusetts: H. Ranlet, 1793; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 8-9.

[54] John A. M'Clung, Sketches of Western Adventure: Containing an Account of the Most Interesting Incidents Connected with the Settlement of the West, from 1755 to 1794, (Philadelphia: Grigg and Elliot, 1832; reprint New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), 104-109.

[55] The Escape of Alexander M'Connel, 7-9.

[56] Frost, Thrilling Adventures, 29-31. See also 31-32.

[57] M'Clung, 109-110.

[58] Parrish, 528-529.

[59] M'Clung, 110-111.

[60] Ibid., 112.

[61] Old Record of The Captivity of Margaret Erskine 1779, 17.

[62] Ibid., 15-16.

[63] Hicks, 42-43.

[64] Janney, 467.

[65] Ibid., 470-472.

[66] [Brackenridge, Hugh Henry, ed.], Narratives of a Late Expedition Against the Indians, (Philadelphia: Francis Bailey, 1783; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 12, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978, 8-13.

[67] Ibid., 21-22.

[68] Ibid., 24-25.

[69] See Ibid., 30-31 note.

[70] See Erskine, 29-30, Narrative of the Massacre, by Savages, of the Wife and Children of Thomas Baldwin, 9-10, Brackenridge, 26-29, Janney, 467.

[71] Elizabeth Fries Lummis Ellet, "Mary Nealy" (Harper's New Monthly Magazine, Vol. 36, #213, Feb. 1868, 348-354; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 81, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), 350.

[72] Frost, Thrilling Adventures, 432-433.

[73] M'Clung, 115-122.

[74] Parrish, 529-530, Erskine, 26.

[75] Hicks, 49-50.

[76] Parrish, 531-532.

CHAPTER VII

TREATMENT OF CAPTIVES BY NORTHEASTERN INDIANS AFTER 1783

After the American Revolution the eastern Algonkin no longer took captives. They lacked sufficient organization to carry out raiding campaigns and most of them had settled onto reservations or dispersed to small thinly settled regions where they no longer threatened the white man. The Six Nations Iroquois, although they had not considered themselves defeated in the American Revolution, lost most of their autonomy after the war and the ensuing Treaty of Paris in 1783. The British once again abandoned them to their own fate and as enemies of the Americans most Iroquois removed to Canada where the British supplied them with reservations. The Americans seized their old lands, allowing only the Onondaga and Tuscarora to retain at least a majority of their former land holdings.[1] By accepting these new reservations and because the frontier had moved beyond their territories, the Six Nations Iroquois, like the eastern Algonkin, abandoned warfare and many of their traditional customs and played little role in taking captives thereafter.

To the west, however, Algonkin tribes such as the

Delaware, Shawnee, and Wyandot, as well as renegade Iroquois, usually generically called Mingo, continued to wage war and take captives through the War of 1812. After the war Americans finally subjugated them and forced them to retreat to Canada or to accept reservations carved from their traditional hunting grounds. They had previously been overshadowed by the powerful Six Nations, but in 1784 the Iroquois Confederacy collapsed as an effective organization and the western Algonkin emerged as the newest Indian power.[2] They launched sporadic raids against unwary hunting parties and the fledgling white settlements in the Ohio River Valley and successfully defended themselves against several American armies sent to subdue them. Then, with British backing, Shawnee leader Tecumseh attempted to form an Indian confederation to drive the Americans from the Indians' lands. Unfortunately for the Indians, when the war ended in 1814 with the Treaty of Ghent, the British abandoned their Indian allies. Without supplies and ammunition, the Indians accepted peace on American terms. After 1815, with the English no longer backing them, the western Algonkin, like their eastern brothers and the Six Nations before them, accepted small reservations or fled the advancing frontier.

After the close of the War of the American Revolution, Indians in the Ohio River Valley continued to prey on unwary settlers. Matthew Bunn was hunting with several companions when they separated in order to cover a larger area and to have a better chance of sighting game. Bunn searched on one end of the line of hunters and suddenly discovered himself surrounded by a band of armed Indians. Realizing he could not escape, he dropped his gun and extended his hand toward his captors. Each of the Indians shook his hand and then the group led him deeper into the woods. Soon other Indians arrived, armed with knives or tomahawks and covered with war paint. The new arrivals also shook Bunn's hand, except for three or four who cast surly looks at him. A pair of the Indians then led him to a little knoll within a swamp, took his hat, coat, waistcoat, shoes, and shirt, and replaced them with an old, worn, dirty shirt. An English-speaking Indian then arrived and questioned the prisoner concerning a nearby American army. After the interrogation, the Indian served Bunn roasted venison and bear meat, allowing him to eat as much as he wanted. They then packed up their goods and, with Bunn in tow, headed for their villages.[3]

Mary Kinnan, captured approximately the same time as Bunn, received harsher treatment. As she worked in her house, three Indians broke in and shot her husband. She snatched up her infant and ran from the intruders. Kinnan probably could have escaped, but when she heard her daughter cry for help, she returned to assist the child. An Indian intercepted her, and when she resisted he knocked her down with a tomahawk, after which she submitted. After the Indians plundered the house and scalped the other members of the family, they pinioned Mary Kinnan's arms behind her and marched her through the night even though it rained in torrents.[4]

As seen from the above account, when the Indians attacked a family they usually killed the men quickly, since they were most likely to resist. Women most often became captives and children's fates were the most questionable. In the above case the captors threatened but spared the babies and children. Another family was less fortunate. The Indians killed the father and stabbed and slit the throats of the three youngest children as they lay in their beds. They ordered the mother to stand in the center of the room and threw the bloody bodies of her murdered children at her feet. Her oldest child, a girl of eight, ran terrified to her mother pleading to be spared, but the attackers tomahawked and stabbed the girl despite her pleas.[5]

Sometimes supernatural beliefs caused Indians to spare captives. For example, when several Shawnee attacked three families staying at Henry Bird's house they killed or wounded all nineteen of the inhabitants. Two bullets struck Bird in the hip as he struggled to reach a gun. One of the Indians followed him, struck him on the shoulder with a tomahawk and then proceeded to hack and cut at Bird's body until he believed the man was dead. The Indians retreated to their canoes until morning, fearing that the noise of the struggle might alert neighboring settlers.

In the morning, finding that all was still quiet, the attackers returned to plunder the Bird's house. As the Indians stripped the bodies of their victims and piled them in the center of the room, they discovered that Henry Bird was still alive. One of the Indians prepared to scalp Bird, but the Indian chief prevented him. The chief had, previous to the attack, often come and slept at Bird's house. Bird begged to be killed and reminded the chief that he had never treated him badly when he had visited Bird's home. The chief examined Bird's wounds and exclaimed that the Great Spirit would not allow Bird to die and decided to take Bird home to care for him. The chief ordered two of his men to wrap Bird in a blanket and carry him to the canoes. At the canoes the chief dressed the captive's wounds while the other Indians removed the plunder from the house and then burned the house with the bodies inside.[6]

Indians rarely saved a severely wounded captive. In Bird's case, his friendly relationship with the chief probably had as much to do with his rescue as the Indian's supernatural belief. In many instances Indians rescued white men who had befriended them when war broke out.[7] In most cases, however, especially if soldiers were involved, the Indians killed wounded prisoners without mercy.[8]

A captive's brave action often impressed the Indians.

Too much resistance, on the other hand, could often prove fatal. Men especially had to know when to surrender and when to resist in order to survive. Luck often played a large role in the outcome.

William Biggs and a companion met a group of sixteen armed Indians while traveling between two small frontier towns. The Indians fired a salvo which wounded Biggs's horse, causing the animal to pitch its rider to the ground. Biggs regained his footing and outran the Indians for several hundred yards. Upon looking back he saw that his pursuers had given up the chase. Unfortunately, Biggs became entangled in the strap of his shot pouch and fell several times. When the Indians saw him fall, they thought he was wounded and resumed the chase. This time Biggs was unable to escape. As the first Indian neared him Biggs decided to turn and fight hoping to wrest a weapon from the nearest Indian.

When he turned, the Indian grasped Biggs's shoulder and raised his tomahawk but made no effort to strike him. Biggs paused to see what would happen. Two other Indians quickly arrived and held Biggs while the first rubbed the captive's body with the handle of his tomahawk, symbolizing that he would be spared. A fourth Indian arrived shortly thereafter and twice tried to kill Biggs, but each time the captive's protector prevented the murder. The Indian leader then explained to Biggs that he was now an Indian and must accompany them.[9]

Five Indians captured William Moore while he was hunting. He had just killed a deer and lashed it onto his back to carry it home when Indians in the area fired upon him. Two of the balls caused minor wounds, but Moore still outran his pursuers despite his burden. After a time, he cut the deer loose but failed to leap across a creek bed. Following a brief struggle with the Indians, who reached him before he could climb the opposite bank, Moore surrendered.[10]

In these two cases the captives escaped death more because of chance than any other reason. Both luckily survived the initial onslaught and then, through misfortune, became captives. Both were athletic men, which probably added to the Indians' desire to spare them in an effort to adopt them into their tribes. In addition, neither of the two men made an effort to kill their attackers, which probably saved their lives.

Once the Indians had subdued their captives, they began their journey to their villages or the English settlements in Canada. As in all previous periods, the Indians threatened, beat, and then often killed captives who failed to keep pace.[11] Some exceptions occurred, however. O. M. Spencer noted that his captors never exceeded his maximum pace. Spencer's master even gave the boy a pair of moccasins when he noticed the boy's bare feet. Spencer gave his master a handkerchief in exchange, which appeared to please the Indian.[12]

Mary Kinnan's captors beat her severely and threatened to kill her when she could not keep pace. Fortunately for her, a snake bit one of the Indians and the entire party camped for nineteen days while he recovered, allowing her to regain her strength.[13] Matthew Bunn's captors gave him a load of meal and skins to carry and traveled at a trot until well into the afternoon. Then the Indians told Bunn that they must now run. When the captive protested that he could not, an Indian struck him on the back of the head with a gun, knocking him to the ground. Realizing that he must run or forfeit his life, Bunn ran until the Indians halted that evening.[14]

Indian treatment of captives during the march toward the their villages reflected the character of the master more than any other factor. A strong benevolent captor treated his captives well and protected them from others. Weak or inattentive masters might show kindness to their captives but often proved unable to prevent other Indians from abusing their wards. If a captive was unfortunate enough to fall into the hands of a cruel, vindictive master, then they often suffered abuse or death. Still, other factors also played a role in the captive's treatment. The prisoners' physical fitness, age, sex, and ability to convince the Indians of his or her sincerity in accepting their new position all helped determine the treatment a captive received.[15]

Charles Builderback was tortured to death when his captors learned that he had participated in an earlier raid against them and had scalped an Indian chief.[16] Another captive suffered the unfortunate fate of being claimed by two masters. The prisoner had paid one of the Indians to conduct him safely to a British settlement, but another Indian claimed the prisoner as his own. When the hireling refused to surrender his charge, the claimant shot the captive and scalped the body.[17]

A captive named Davenport suffered a fractured leg from a musket ball prior to his capture. The Indians spared him despite his wound, possibly because he revealed to an Indian that he was unmarried. This revelation seemed to please his captor, who smiled and informed the captive that he would soon become an Indian.[18] During the period after the American Revolution, the western Algonkin showed much more interest in sparing captives for possible adoption than in previous periods, especially if the captive was unmarried and healthy.

During a march, the Algonkin rarely bound female captives. They often allowed them to ride horses if sufficient mounts were available.[19] Male captives, on the other hand, rarely rode and the Indians sometimes bound them. Lent Munson, for example, surrendered after a brief struggle. The Indians stripped off his clothing, gave him an old coat to wear, and although they did not bind him, they drove him in front of their horses for several days.[20]

Ten-year-old O. M. Spencer rode a horse behind one of his two Indian captors while the other walked. The two Indians alternated walking and riding until the horse became unresponsive and refused to continue.[21] When they found another horse, they allowed Spencer to ride it alone while they both walked.[22] The Indians apparently did not fear Spencer's escape because the horse was an old pack animal.

Each night the Indians bound their male captives in order to prevent them from escaping. The binding generally continued for nine successive nights, after which the Indians concluded that they would be beyond their captives' territorial knowledge and restraint would no longer be necessary to prevent escape. During this period, the usual method of binding included tying the captives elbows behind their backs with their wrists secured in front of them. The Indians then bound the captives knees and ankles together, with additional ropes connecting the captives' wrists, knees, ankles, and necks to stakes or trees. The Indians then reclined upon these cords to detect any movement. Sometimes the Indians tied moccasins over the captive's hands to prevent them from untying themselves.[23]

On the fifth night of his captivity, Biggs complained that his bonds were too tight and informed his captors that if they did not loosen them he would die before morning. The Indians relented and loosened the cords about his wrists and then went to sleep. Biggs discovered that he could withdraw his hands from the loosely tied ropes and did so, intending to return them before his captors awoke. He felt such relief, however, that he fell asleep with his hands unbound and woke to discover one of the Indians sitting on his chest, puffing on a pipe, and rubbing Biggs's head with a tomahawk. The Indian threatened to kill Biggs for his apparent attempt to escape but the captive refused to be intimidated, and after a council the Indians decided to spare Biggs but retied his wrists as tightly as before.[24]

The Indians might also bind female captives but usually not as extensively. The Indians, if they bound women at all, almost never used stakes. Instead, they bound the woman's arms or hands and then simply slept in a circle around her, much like their eastern Algonkin relatives in previous times.[25]

Unlike their eastern kin, or even the Iroquois, the western Algonkin seem to have taken less care to feed their captives sufficiently. A Mrs. Lewis complained of the scanty allowance of broiled meat that her captors supplied the captives.[26] The Jordon family also apparently received only enough raw food to keep them alive.[27] Matthew Bunn also complained of his rations. He, however, was referring to a time of shortage, when corn was scarce and meat was poor. During this time his captors killed a raccoon and Bunn's portion consisted of the head. Sometimes such an unsavory morsel was his allowance for two to three days. Fortunately, he often found ground nuts to supplement his diet.

On one occasion, some of the Indian boys found a large black snake on their hunting trip. They roasted it together with a squirrel and gave it to Bunn to eat. When he discovered the meal's contents he threw it down and his mistress bluntly informed him that if he could not eat that then he would not have anything. She offered him no food for the next three days.[28] Apparently the black snakes were not deemed fit to eat and the boys had given it to Bunn as a joke. It is possible that his mistress did not know of the contents of the meal and was upset when she saw her captive wasting what might have appeared to be good food. This event also calls into question the food shortage, as the Indians would most certainly not have wasted a squirrel simply to torment a captive if the Indians themselves were suffering from hunger.

A few days after the above incident Bunn killed several black snakes while hunting. He brought them back to his mistress's cabin. At a distance, she thought he was bringing her black squirrels, but when he threw the snakes at her feet she became enraged, threw a tomahawk at him, and chased him out of the camp with a firebrand. This event amused the other Indians in the camp who felt that he had fairly avenged himself upon his mistress. When he explained the reasons for his actions to her, she let the matter drop.[29]

Still, despite these claims, the majority of captives received portions of the provisions at least equal to that of their captors. In fact, immediately after his capture and interrogation, Bunn's captors gave him as much roasted venison and bear meat as he could eat.[30] Darnall's captives usually served him before they ate.[31] Mary Kinnan had little desire to eat after her capture, although venison and other game abounded. In fact, the Indians threatened her with a horrible death if she did not eat.[32]

Biggs's captors prepared him a special meal when he proved unable to stomach their food. The Indians had killed a deer, cut out its guts, and squeezed the dung out with their hands. After beating the innards against a tree two or three times, the Indians tossed them, along with some meat, into a pot and made soup. The soup was thick and greenish from what remained in the intestines and Biggs could not eat it. The next day, the Indians killed two fat ducks. They gutted one and roasted it on a stick, serving it to Biggs on a block of wood along with some salt and grease. Biggs ate the entire duck and would have eaten more had it been available. The Indians cooked the other duck for themselves, tossing it guts, feathers, and all into a pot.[33]

It appears that the western Algonkin for the most part continued, like the other Indians of the northeast, to feed their captives sufficiently during their involuntary stay. Exceptions most likely resulted from food shortages or an act of punishment rather than from outright cruelty.

Upon their arrival at the Indian villages, the western Algonkin continued their traditional custom of beating captives, generally using the gauntlet. The severity of the beatings varied from village to village and from tribe to tribe. At one village, for example, four captives fainted under the blows and the Indians immediately scalped, tomahawked, and tortured them while the survivors looked on.[34] When Matthew Bunn's captors approached their village, an English-speaking Indian explained that the villagers would soon come out to strike him. When they did, the Indian continued, Bunn should run to a long house and upon entering the building the beatings would cease. At the entrance to the village, a young warrior ran up to Bunn and struck him on the back of the neck, knocking him down. Before he could regain his feet, the captive received a severe kick. A third Indian pulled Bunn to his feet, shouted at him to run, and then delivered his own blow to the dazed man. One hundred yards from the long house, the villagers formed a gauntlet for Bunn to run through. Each Indian struck the runner as he passed until he reached the sanctuary bruised and bloody.[35]

Young O. M. Spencer escaped the gauntlet, not because of his age but because weakness from dysentery prevented him from moving faster than a walk. Instead, the Indians simply gathered around the boy and examined him and his clothes thoroughly.[36] The same Indians required William Moore, an athletic young man, to run the gauntlet when he entered their village. After examining the new arrival, two hundred Indians formed two parallel lines four to five feet apart, extending 300 yards along level ground. At the end of the line, the chiefs and principal warriors stood within a few yards of the cabin selected as the goal. Because of Moore's strength and vigor, the Indians tied his wrists together to hinder his speed and prevent him from retaliating against his tormentors but still allow him to protect his face. Moore ran so swiftly that most of the blows missed him. As he neared the end of his run, the Indians began to close their ranks in order to impede his progress, but the captive used his feet, head, and bound hands so effectively, knocking down several of his attackers, that the Indians soon reopened the file and he sprinted to his goal. The Indians praised him as a brave man and applauded his resistance when they had tried to close ranks.[37]

Many women also ran the gauntlet. Mary Kinnan's captors stopped one-half mile from their village where they painted themselves and Kinnan before giving a series of whoops to announce their location to the villagers. The villagers came out to meet the returning party, shaking hands with each warrior, and striking Kinnan with great violence on the head or shoulders until she could not see and fell senseless. The Indians revived her and helped her walk into the village, explaining that they administered the beatings to welcome her.[38]

Sometimes Indians satisfied themselves with simply dressing their captives in Indian fashion without resorting to beatings. Indians painted Lent Munson on the third day of his captivity. When he arrived at the village the Indians cut his hair, put a jewel in his nose, and attempted to cut his ears but gave up after Munson resisted strongly.[39] Likewise, Davenport related that the Indians cut off his hair, leaving only a scalplock, painted him, adorned him with earrings and bracelets, and put a silver band on his head. They attempted to get him to wear a breechcloth but he refused, at one point taking the offered article and stomping it. The incensed Indians nonetheless offered no violence for his insolence.[40] Another captive arrived at an Indian encampment a few miles from Detroit. The Indians stripped him of his clothing, dressed him in Indian fashion, shaved his head except for a scalplock, bored his ears, and placed earrings in them. They attempted to bore his nose also, but he resisted and they did not insist.[41]

The western Algonkin became more forgiving of transgressions and were less likely to kill captives during this period than in previous periods. The gauntlet rarely resulted in death and assumed a more symbolic existence. Sometimes the hosts omitted it completely. The Indians also forgave their captives for resisting some portion of Indian culture more commonly than in previous periods. In earlier times Indians generally slew resisting captives.

The Indians often encouraged male captives to marry into the tribe. When Elias Darnall arrived at the Indian village, his captors conducted him to a large house filled with Indian women and children. One of the Indians asked if he was married, and when he replied that he was not, the Indian addressed the women in the cabin and they began to twitter and grin, which Darnall interpreted to mean that he was destined to marry one of them.[42]

Some captives, once adopted, received equal, if not preferential, treatment from their new families.[43] Others, like Matthew Bunn received almost continuous abuse. During the winter, Bunn's captors often relocated. After each move, Bunn's tasks included building new huts for five Indian families, cutting and gathering wood for them, as well as dressing skins and hunting raccoons. The Indians constantly subjected him to shouts to exert himself fully lest they kill him, and young boys often played pranks on the unfortunate captive. The Indians did not allow Bunn to sleep within the camp, and when he attempted to build his own hut, the boys would tear it down. At night, the young natives put live coals on his feet while he slept just to watch him start. They often stole his food and gave it to their dogs. Once, while Bunn sat by a fire, an Indian boy sat down across from him and shot wooden arrows at him. When one of them hit Bunn in the wrist, the captive picked up a block of wood and struck the boy. Fortunately for Bunn, his master was absent at the time and the boy had forgotten the incident by the time he returned.[44]

Indians usually separated families captured together in order to speed their integration into Indian society. When the Lewis family reached their destination, an old Indian woman who had recently lost her baby took Mrs. Lewis's child. The captive woman's young daughter pled with the Indians to allow her to stay with her mother, but the Indians threatened her with a tomahawk and compelled the girl to leave her parent.[45] Later during her captivity, Mrs. Lewis was surprised when several Indians entered her cabin and one of them clasped his hands around her neck. She looked up to discover that the perpetrator was her son, who had been adopted into the tribe, found favor with one of the chiefs, and, no longer considered a captive, could visit and converse freely with his mother.[46]

Once captives gained the trust of their captors or adopted family, they usually received gentler treatment and their hosts generally protected them from outside accusers. Henry Bird, for example, often encountered captive American women while carrying out his chores. When one of the Indians witnessed Bird and a woman conversing, he immediately assumed that the pair were planning an escape. A group of Indians seized the captives and took them to Bird's master, one of the leading chiefs of the village. The chief threatened the prisoners with death if they did not reveal their plot, but both professed their innocence. The captain ordered an Indian to twist off Bird's thumbnails, but when the captive continued to proclaim his innocence, his master accepted his plea and directed Bird to twist off the thumbnails of his accuser as compensation. Bird declined the offer.[47]

Acts of torture among the western Algonkin generally resulted from an outside influence or as punishment for a real or imagined transgression, as in Henry Bird's case. The most common cause of torture was the result of the intoxication of Indians. Captives unfortunate enough to fall into the hands of inebriated Indians often suffered torturous deaths. The Jordan family met such a fate. During the party's march to the Indians' territory, the Indians became drunk on plundered whiskey. In their drunken state, the Indians beat the children so severely that they could not walk the next morning. The Indians believed that the children were being stubborn and beat them more, cut and slashed them with knives, and burned them with firebrands. When they perceived that the children still did not move, they began digging six holes in the ground, five feet deep. The children's father realized what was about to happen, broke his bonds, and attempted to escape. The Indians quickly recaptured him, placed him upright in one of the holes, and packed the dirt tightly around him so that only his head and shoulders remained exposed. Likewise, the Indians planted the children in the remaining holes. The Indians danced around their victims for half an hour and then lit fires near them. Fifteen minutes later, the captives died agonizing deaths and the intoxicated Indians fell into a drunken sleep. Mrs. Jordan, who had somehow been spared, escaped unharmed.[48]

If the captives had a warning or assistance when the Indians became drunk, they still usually suffered some hardship. Several Indian women hid a captive named Mallary for four days without food when the men became drunk. When he asked for food from the women who visited him daily, they replied that nothing would be provided until the men sobered and went hunting or drew provisions from a nearby British post. They finally brought him some dog meat on the fourth day.[49]

O. M. Spencer often escaped from drunken Indians by running from his bed whenever he heard them approaching. He hid behind the nearest tree or log or in the snow until the drunkards left the vicinity. Spencer had reason to fear for his life, since he had once discovered the body of a fellow captive whose master had tomahawked, scalped, and mutilated him in a drunken rage.[50]

Thus, even a captive who escaped death at the hands of his drunken hosts usually suffered at least some discomfiture during the frolic. Physical hardships such as hunger and exposure as well as mental anguish and constant fear added to the captive's torment. In addition, the captive had to remain constantly alert whenever his captors consumed alcohol.

A failed escape attempt usually resulted in torture of a captive. Henry Bird attempted to escape his captors when his master and mistress both fell into a drunken sleep. He had earlier hoarded a store of provisions from his daily allowance and traveled nearly thirty miles before his pursuers recaptured him. Bird's master noticed his absence soon after he left and sent out nearly three hundred warriors in parties of five to recover the fugitive. The group that captured Bird tied his hands behind his back and marched him to a nearby hill where they built a fire and discharged their guns as a signal to the other searching Indians. During the night several other parties joined those who had captured Bird and the following morning they drove the captive back to the village. There the Indians held a council and decided that since Bird would not remain with them, he should be burned to death over a three-day period.

The following morning his executioners led Bird to the war dance ground where three to four hundred Indians gathered to watch the proceedings. The Indians tied the prone Bird to several stakes driven into the ground and tortured him by applying a firebrand first to his hand and then to his arm, all the while taunting him, asking if he planned to run away again. Other Indians then followed a similar procedure at half-hour intervals so that he might recover slightly and thus be more susceptible to pain. During the intervals, the Indians danced and hurled insults at their victim, mocking his groans, and calling him a "woman" for crying out. Two hours before sunset, with Bird's fingers nearly consumed and his arm burned to the bone, an Indian trader happened on the scene and purchased Bird's freedom with a gallon of rum.[51]

Young O. M. Spencer also attempted to escape his captors. While the Indians hunted, Spencer untied himself, stole a horse, and rode off. Unfortunately for him, the horse could not be driven faster than a trot and by nightfall the boy had traveled only a few miles. He stopped for the night and hid under a fallen log, but in the morning discovered two Indians searching the area. He decided that he might fare better if he surrendered willingly and approached his pursuers, claiming that he had been picking raspberries. One of the Indians raised his gun to kill the boy but the other knocked it aside. Instead, both Indians cut switches from a thicket and beat Spencer unmercifully on the head and shoulders until the whips were "used up." Spencer took the punishment without complaint or resistance, except to protect his face with his arms. When the Indians tired of beating him, they warned him that another attempt to escape would result in his death.

They then set off to return to camp. As punishment for his escape, the Indians tied Spencer in a painful position immediately upon entering the camp. First, the Indians tied his elbows closely together, nearly dislocating his shoulders. Then they tied his wrists so tightly that the circulation was nearly cut off. Next, they fastened the ends of the ropes to a forked stick stuck in the ground in such a manner that the captive could not lie down and felt that his ribs would separate from his sternum and his shoulder blades would break from his body. Spencer stayed in this uncomfortable position until the following morning. As additional punishment, his hosts refused to feed him for thirty-six hours.[52]

The western Algonkin also used torture to avenge the deaths of relatives or friends, often causing the Indians to torture captives who might otherwise have been spared. Unlike torture for punishment, the recipient of cruel treatment motivated by revenge might have had no connection with the incident although he often had some involvement.

One captive related seeing a war party return with five captives, four men, and one woman. A chief chose to adopt the woman and he immediately released her from her bonds. The Indians had apparently lost four of their party in the raid and sought to kill the four male captives in revenge. The Indians stripped their victims and bound them to a wooden frame. The tormentors then covered the captives with pitch and cut off their fingers and toes one joint at a time. When the Indians had completed their torture, they piled dry brush around the sufferers and burned them.[53] In this case, the motive was clearly revenge for the losses inflicted upon the Indian raiding party during its attack.

Sometimes the Indians used torture in an effort to provoke a nearby garrison to leave its fortification and attempt to rescue a victim. Abner Hunt, captured a few hours before an Indian attack on a garrison near Cincinnati, suffered this fate. When the garrison refused to surrender to the attacking Indians, they tied Hunt to a sapling in plain sight of the stronghold where those inside could clearly hear his screams. They then built a large fire near him so that he roasted slowly. Occasionally an Indian applied hot coals to the victim's skin. When he appeared to grow insensitive to the flames, the Indians cut gashes in his flesh as if to renew his susceptibility to pain. Finally, with the captive exhausted, fainting, and near death, the torturers ended his suffering by applying firebrands to his exposed bowels.[54] Here Indians used torture in an attempt to reduce a fortification which they could not, without great loss, otherwise conquer.

Torture for punishment generally consisted of beatings and whippings and rarely resulted in death except for serious infractions. Exceptions occurred, especially if the Indians did not officially adopt a captive or if a sadistic master adopted an unfortunate prisoner. One cruel master tied a woman's child to a tree because it constantly cried for something to eat until the child froze to death. The Indian later bound the woman to a tree for three days, where she almost perished from hunger and exposure. A few weeks later the Indian tied her to another tree and she perished.[55]

A rescue party sent to disperse a raiding party who had captured several men, women, and children from a boat stumbled upon a ghastly scene. They discovered the bodies of several who had been aboard the boat stripped, tied to trees, and covered with lash marks. The Indians had apparently whipped their victims to death as the would-be rescuers discovered several large rods, apparently worn from use, laying nearby.[56]

The western Algonkin, after the American Revolution, remained the only actively hostile Indians in the northeastern woodlands. Although the eastern Algonkin and the Six Nation Iroquois both remained neutral and played little role in taking captives, elements of their past behavior could be observed in the activities of the western Algonkin. In addition, certain practices of the more western prairie and plains Indians became prevalent in the western Algonkin actions.

The western Algonkin tortured wounded or fatigued captives with more frequency than their eastern relatives in previous periods, but they never tortured to the extent or ferocity of the seventeenth-century Iroquois. One of the most drastic changes in the treatment of captives by the western Algonkin after 1783 was their lessened care in feeding their captives. Almost all captives of the eastern woodlands Indians prior to the Revolution commented on the Indians' care in providing food, sometimes to the point of allowing the captives to eat before they themselves did. It is possible that the western prairie and plains Indians, who were less concerned about the feeding of captives, influenced the Algonkin to this less caring attitude. The gauntlet and ritualistic beatings continued to play a large role during this period but with slightly less violence than in the earlier times. The Algonkin apparently took greater care to spare captives for adoption to increase their dwindling numbers than in earlier periods. Finally, the western Algonkin's use of torture declined and never achieved the previous large scale violence of their Iroquois neighbors. Additionally, the western Algonkin used torture primarily for revenge or punishment, while the Iroquois had used it to intimidate and subjugate their enemies.

By the time the War of 1812 ended, most of the western Algonkin of the Ohio River Valley had succumbed to the white man's advance. With the British no longer able or willing to supply and support them, the Indians could no longer halt the advancing settlers. A few tribes continued to resist and moved west in front of the advancing white tide, but their ability to take and maintain captives dissipated. In addition, the more powerful plains tribes soon replaced them as the next obstacle to American expansion.

NOTES

[1] William T. Hagan, American Indians, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 52-3.

[2] Anthony F. C. Wallace, Death and Rebirth of the Seneca, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), 154.

[3] Matthew Bunn, Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Matthew Bunn, (Batvia, New York: Adams and Thorn, 1827; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 7-8. The Lewis family suffered a similar fate. Mary Kinnan, A True Narrative of the Sufferings of Mary Kinnan, who was Taken Prisoner by the Shawnee Nation of Indians, (Elizabethtown: Shepard Kollack, 1795; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 4-6.

[4] Hannah Lewis, Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Mrs. Hannah Lewis, and Her Three Children, who were Taken Prisoners by the Indians, (Boston: Henry Trumbell, 1817; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 36, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 4-5.

[5] John Frost, Heroic Women of the West: Comprising Thrilling Examples of Courage, Fortitude, Devotedness, and Held Sacrifice, among the Pioneer Mothers of the Western Country, (Philadelphia: A. Hart, 1854), 13-4.

[6] Henry Bird, Narrative of Henry Bird who was Carried away by the Indians, after the Murder of his Whole Family in 1811, (Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press, 1973), 3-5.

[7] Juliette Augusta Magill Kinzie, Narrative of the Massacre at Chicago, August 15, 1812, and some Preceding Events, (Chicago: Ellis and Fergus, 1844; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 59, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 22-3.

[8] Elias Darnall, A Journal; Also Two Narratives, (Paris, Kentucky: Joel R. Lyle, 1813; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities,

Vol. 33, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978), 40-4.

[9] William Biggs, Narrative of William Biggs, while he was a Prisoner with the Kickepoo Indians, (Printed for the author, 1825), 3-5. In an unusual turn of events, theIndians who captured Biggs held a council the afternoon of his capture. Their purpose, however, was not to determine the captive's fate, but rather the fate of the Indian who had attempted to murder Biggs after the others had subdued him. Apparently this young Indian, of a different tribe from the others, was a coward and would not enter a struggle until all danger was over. He also disobeyed the chief's orders. Therefore the Indians decided to murder him and the following day they carried out the sentence. Ibid., 6-7.

[10] O. M. Spencer, The Indian Captivity of O. M. Spencer, (Chicago: The Lakeside Press, 1917), 98-9.

[11] Affecting History of the Dreadful Distresses of Frederic Manheim's Family, (Exeter, Mass.: H. Ranlet, 1793; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 51-2, 45.

[12] Spencer, 45-6.

[13] Kinnan, 6.

[14] Bunn, 8-9.

[15] Affecting History, 22. See also Kinzie, 24.

[16] Frost, Heroic Women, 111-12.

[17] Darnall, 58.

[18] Ibid., (Davenport Narrative), 62.

[19] Mrs. Heald's captor put her on a horse, but when the motion of the unsaddled animal caused her pain she dismounted and a pair of Indians assisted her on the march. Kinzie, 22-3.

[20] Alexander Viets Griswold, A Short Sketch of the Life of Lent Munson, (Litchfield: Thomas Collier, 1797; Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 24, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979), 2.

[21] Spencer, 53-4.

[22] Ibid., 57.

[23] Biggs, 7-8, Bunn, 9, Spencer, 47-8.

[24] Biggs, 9.

[25] Affecting History, 22-3.

[26] Lewis, 5.

[27] Archibald Loudon, A Selection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives, of Outrages, Committed by the Indians, in their Wars, with the White People, 2 Vols. (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: A. Loudon, 1808), 1:131.

[28] Bunn, 17.

[29] Ibid., 18-9.

[30] Ibid., 8.

[31] Darnall, 47.

[32] Kinnan, 7.

[33] Biggs, 8-9.

[34] Affecting History, 46.

[35] Bunn, 11-3.

[36] Spencer, 73-4.

[37] Ibid., 100-1.

[38] Kinnan, 7-8. See also Lewis, 8-9.

[39] Griswold, 2.

[40] Darnall, (Davenport Narrative), 62.

[41] Ibid., (Mallary Narrative), 58-59.

[42] Ibid., 45-6.

[43] Ibid., 47.

[44] Bunn, 13-7.

[45] Lewis, 9.

[46] Ibid., 12-3.

[47] Bird, 6-7.

[48] Loudon, 1:131-4.

[49] Darnall, (Mallary Narrative), 59.

[50] Spencer, 110-1.

[51] Bird, 7-11.

[52] Spencer, 58-71.

[53] Lewis, 14-15.

[54] Spencer, 14-16.

[55] Lewis, 14-15.

[56] John A. M'Clung, Sketches of Western Adventures: Containing an Account of the most Interesting Incidents Connected with the Settlement of the West, from 1755 to 1794, (Philadelphia: Grigg and Elliot, 1832; Reprint New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969), 268.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Almost all North American Indians tribes took captives, but each tribe treated its captives in a different manner, as did each individual Indian. Despite this diversity, general trends developed within each tribe or group of Indians. When the first Europeans arrived on the American stage they immediately began to exert influence and pressure upon the aborigines to which the Indians responded by harsh treatment of their white captives.

The treatment of captives fell into three broad categories: torture, adoption, and ransom. Stronger tribes often used torture as a tribal policy to intimidate weaker enemies. The dominant tribes kept their superior position by using terrorism to control and subjugate potentially unfriendly or dangerous neighbors. This policy, used most effectively by the Five Nations Iroquois before the seventeenth century, became ineffective when their targets grew too strong or refused to be intimidated by these tactics. The Algonkin used torture on a small scale to retaliate against the English in New England but quickly abandoned the policy when it proved unsuccessful. In fact, the use of torture might have proved detrimental by causing the colonists to launch retaliatory strikes.

Only strong, powerful tribes could successfully use a policy of wholesale torture effectively. The Iroquois used it successfully against their weaker Indian neighbors, but the policy failed against the increasingly powerful European settlers. The Algonkin used torture against the Iroquois in retaliation for Algonkin captives tortured by the Iroquois, but the Algonkin never succeeded in halting the destructive Iroquois raids until they allied themselves with the French against the Five Nations.

Thus, once the Europeans arrived and began to equal or surpass the Indians both numerically and militarily, torture as a tribal policy ceased. Individual Indians and remote tribes continued to torment captives, but their purpose shifted from attempting to intimidate an enemy tribe to terrifying other captives to better behavior. Indians also used personal mistreatment to celebrate victories, to mourn the loss of friends or family members in battle, to take revenge on a captive from an enemy tribe, or to satisfy individual sadistic desires.

Adoption as a tribal policy became more prevalent as the white man became more numerous. The Iroquois used adoption concurrently with torture in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to replace members lost in their wars. Women especially would be spared after undergoing the mandatory torture sessions if they married into the tribe.

The Iroquois sometimes spared young men and boys to adopt into families and raise as Iroquois. After a series of deadly wars with the French in the late seventeenth century, the Iroquois dropped their torture policy and increased their adoption policy. High casualties, in addition to disease, liquor, and a low Indian birth rate, forced the Iroquois to adopt a higher percentage of their captives in an effort to replenish their population. They made peace with the French, whose captives showed little propensity for assimilation, while continuing raids on the southern Indians to gather potential new members.

The Algonkin used adoption more extensively than the Iroquois because of their numerical inferiority to the Iroquois and later the Europeans. In the east, this policy, raised the ire of the English settlers. The sight of white men, women, and children living among the red "savages" caused the whites to retaliate to rescue the captives. In addition, Europeans did not readily accept assimilation. Numerous examples exist of Europeans adopting Indian lifestyle and culture completely, but these people comprised only a minority of the captives taken. Indians from other tribes assimilated much more easily and quickly into other Indian tribes. Compared to adoption policies of eastern native groups, the efforts of western tribes proved to be more successful because sparse white settlements in the western country diminished the opportunities for white captives to escape.

The Iroquois generally alternated between torture and adoption as their tribal policy. The Algonkin resorted to a third practice, that of ransoming captives. This change allowed the Algonkin to take advantage of the French and British rivalry. The French often encouraged their Indian allies to capture their British enemies and then paid the Indians to deliver them to Canada. The remoteness of the Algonkin from the New England settlement allowed them to raid, capture settlers, and flee to Canada with their captives with little fear of retaliation. The eastern Algonkin required ransoms to purchase needed supplies because of the destruction of the necessities of Indian lifestyles by the advance of white civilization. Once the British removed the French presence from the North American mainland after the French and Indian War, the Algonkin found new rivals in the British and Americans during the American Revolution. After the restoration of peace in 1783, however, the eastern Algonkin no longer had rivals to play against each other, and with the increased density of white settlement the Algonkin accepted life on the reservation.

The ransom policy proved to be the only viable policy regarding captives for the eastern Algonkin. They were too weak to intimidate their European enemies with torture, and an adoption policy only succeeded in bringing the wrath of the white men upon them. In addition, the whites did not easily assimilate into the Indian culture. Most peace treaties signed with the Indians demanded that they return all white captives, adopted or not. The profitable nature of ransoming the captured enemy ceased with the dominance of the Americans in that region following the War for Independence when the Indians could no longer play of one outside rival group against the other.

In the west, where the white presence was slower to exert itself, the western Algonkin used both torture and adoption with varying levels of success. Their use of torture came from their former subjugation by the Iroquois, while their adoption policy resulted from their Algonkin heritage. Here, again, the Indians used a policy of torture when they were in a position of strength and a policy of adoption when in a weak position. A ransom policy never fully developed because of the lack of sufficient white settlements willing to pay ransoms. In addition, the abundance of resources in the west gave the Indians sufficient material to trade for white goods and supplies without having to resort to trading captives as their eastern kin were forced to do.

Each tribe developed its own policy regarding the treatment of captives, depending upon its intentions, strength, and perseverance. If the tribe desired war or wanted to dominate the group from which they had taken captives, they usually tortured the captives to death. If, on the other hand, the capturing tribe was weaker than their adversary, they might treat their captives leniently, adopt them into their own tribe to augment their population, or ransom them for needed goods and supplies. Stronger tribes, such as the Iroquois, were less likely to be influenced by outside forces than their weaker neighbors. The eastern Algonkin, for example, were dominated first by the Iroquois, then by the Europeans.

Before the arrival of the Europeans, the Algonkin used a torture method similar to that of the Iroquois. As contact with the Europeans increased, they quickly adopted a more lenient stance. This change probably coincided with their treatment before they had adopted torture as a defense against the Iroquois. It should be recalled that several western Algonkin tribes who had no contact with either European or Iroquois treated their captives in a manner similar to the benevolence of their eastern Algonkin kin.

As the unstoppable whites conquered their homelands, each of the northeastern woodlands Indian nations entered their most benevolent stages. They probably realized the futility of further resistance and hoped that their more humane practices would help them better assimilate into their new lifestyle within the white man's domain. Those who refused assimilation were killed or fled west, trying in vain to stay ahead of the frontier line. By the end of the War of 1812 the Indians of the northeastern woodlands had been subjugated and the white Americans began to pressure the tribes living upon the expanding western frontier.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Adams, Arthur T., ed. The Explorations of Pierre Esprit Radisson. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Ross and Haines, Inc., 1961.

Affecting History of the Dreadful Distresses of Frederic Manheim's Family. Exeter, Massachusetts: H. Ranlet, 1793; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Alden, Timothy, ed. "An Account of the Captivity of Hugh Gibson Among the Delaware Indians of the Big River and Muskingum from the Latter part of July, 1756 to the Beginning of April, 1759." Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Series Three, Vol. 6. Boston: American Stationers Co., 1837.

Authentic Particulars of the Death of Lieutenant Thomas Boyd. Rochester, New York: Roderick M. Colton, 1841; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 56. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Barker, Solomon. Interesting Narrative of the Sufferings of Joseph Barker and His Wife. Rochester, New York: Cunningham and Brooks, 1848; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 63. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Benton, L. G. Grandfather's Captivity and Escape. [n.p.] Reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 103. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Biggs, William. Narrative of William Biggs, While He Was a Prisoner with the Kickepoo Indian. [n.p.]: Printed for the Author, 1825.

Bird, Henry. Narrative of Henry Bird Who Was Carried Away by the Indians after the Murder of His Whole Family in 1811. Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press, 1973.

Brown, O. Z. A True Narrative of Daniel McCollum, a Captive Among the Indians During the Revolution. Union, New York: printed at the "News" office, 1853; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 65. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Brown, Thomas. A Plain Narrative. Boston: Fowle and Draper, 1760; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

[Brackenridge, Hugh Henry, ed.] Narratives of a Late Expedition Against the Indians. Philadelphia: Francis Bailey, 1783; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 12. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Bunn, Matthew. Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Matthew Bunn. Batvia, New York: Adams and Thorn, 1827; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Champlain, Samuel de. Voyages of Samuel de Champlain, 1604-1618. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Darnall, Elias. A Journal; Also Two Narratives. Paris, Kentucky: Joel R. Lyle, 1813; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 33. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Davis, Marion Morse, ed. History of the Captivity of David Boyd. 1931; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 24. New York: Garland Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Dodge, John. A Narrative of the Capture and Treatment of John Dodge, by the English at Detroit. Philadelphia: T. Bradford, 1779; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 12. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Eastburn, Robert. A Faithful Narrative. Philadelphia: William Dunlap, 1758; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Ellet, Elizabeth Fries Lummis. "Mary Nealy." Harper's New Monthly Magazine. Vol. 36, No. 213 (February 1868): 348-354; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 81. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

"The Escape of Alexander M'Connel." Hunt's Family Almanac, for 1855. Philadelphia: U. Hunt; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 37. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Fleming, William. A Narrative of Sufferings and Deliverance. Boston: Green and Russell, 1756; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Frazier, Jane. Narrative of the Captivity of Jane Frazier. "Taken from Thomas' History of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania," 1930; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Gist, Thomas. "Thomas Gist's Indian Captivity, 1758-1759." Ed. by Howard H. Peckham. The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 80 (April 1956).

Grace, Henry. History of the Life and Sufferings of Henry Grace. Reading, England: [n.p.], 1764; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 10., New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Griswold, Alexander Viots. A Short Sketch of the Life of Lent Munson. Litchfield: Thomas Collier, 1796; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 24. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979.

Gyles, John. Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverance, Etc. Boston: Printed by S. Kneeland and T. Green, 1736; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 6. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Hanson, Elizabeth. God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty. Philadelphia: Printed by Samuel Keimar, 1728; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 6. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Hastings, Susannah Willard Johnson. A Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Johnson. Walpole, New Hampshire: Printed by David Carlisle, Jr., 1796; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 23. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Henry, Alexander. Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories Between the Years 1760 and 1776. Edited by James Bain. Toronto: George N. Morang and Company, Ltd., 1901.

Hicks, Elizabeth. Elizabeth Hicks, A True Romance of the American War of Independence, 1775 to 1783. London: William Hardwick, 1902; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 104. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Hollister, Isaac. A Brief Narration of the Captivity of Isaac Hollister. New London, Connecticut: Printing Office, 1767; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 10. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Hosmer, James Kendell, ed. Winthrop's Journal, 1630-1649. 2 Vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

How, Nehemiah. A Narrative of the Captivity of Nehemiah How. Boston: Printed by S. Kneeland, 1748; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 6. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Howe, Jemima. A Genuine and Correct Account of the Captivity, Sufferings and Deliverance of Mrs. Jemima Howe. Boston: Belknap and Young, 1792; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 19. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Hubbard, John Niles. Sketches of the Life and Adventure of Moses Van Campen. Dansville, New York: George W. Stevens, 1841; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 13. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Humphrey, David. An Essay on the Life of the Honorable Major-General Israel Putnam. Hartford: Hudson and Goodwin, 1788; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 19. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Hutchinson, K. M. Memoir of Abijah Hutchinson. Rochester, New York: William Alling, 1843; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 59. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Janney, Abel. "Narrative of the Capture of Abel Janney by the Indians in 1782." Ohio Archaeological and Historical Publications. Vol. 8. Columbus: 1900: 465-73; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 104. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

King, Titus. Narrative of Titus King. Hartford: Connecticut Historical Society, 1938; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 109. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Kinnan, Mary. A True Narrative of the Sufferings of Mary Kinnan, Who Was Taken Prisoner by the Shawnee Nation of Indians. Elizabethtown: Shepard Kollack, 1795; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 21. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Kinzie, Juliette Augusta Magill. Narrative of the Massacre at Chicago, August 15, 1812, and Some Preceding Events. Chicago: Ellis and Fergus, 1844; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 59. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Lahontan, Baron de. New Voyages to North-America, 2 Vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.

Lewis, Hannah. Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Mrs. Hannah Lewis, and Her Three Children, Who Were Taken Prisoners by the Indians. Boston: Henry Trumbell, 1817; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 36. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Lincoln, Charles, ed. Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Lowry, Jean. A Journal of the Captivity of Jean Lowry. Philadelphia: William Bradford, 1760; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 8. New York: Garland

Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Mather, Cotton. Decennium Luctuosum: An History of Remarkable Occurrences in the Long War Which New England Hath Had with the Indian Salvages, from the Year 1688 to the Year 1698. Boston: Printed by B. Green and F. Allen, 1699; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 3. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Mather, Cotton. Good Fetch'd Out of Evil. Boston: Printed by B. Green, 1706; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 4. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Mather, Cotton. Humiliations Follow'd with Deliverances. Boston: Printed by B. Green and F. Allen, 1697; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 1. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Mather, Increase. An Essay for the Recording of Illustrious Provinces. Boston: Printed by Samuel Green, 1684; reprint Delmar, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1977.

McElroy, John McConnel. Abby Byram, and Her Father. Ottumwa, Iowa: Cook and Algire, 1897; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 99. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

M'Clung, John A. Sketches of Western Adventure: Containing an Account of the Most Interesting Incidents Connected with the Settlement of the West, from 1755 to 1794. Philadelphia: Grigg and Elliot, 1832; reprint New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969.

"Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger, for Three Years Captives among the Indians." The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 39 (1905): 407-420.

Narrative of the Massacre, by Savages, of the Wife and Children of Thomas Baldwin. New York: Martin and Wood, 1835; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 57. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Norton, John. The Redeemed Captive. Boston: Printed by S.

Kneeland, 1748; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 6. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Old Record of the Captivity of Margaret Erskine 1779. Baltimore, Maryland: The Lord Baltimore Press, 1912; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 108. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Parrish, Jasper. *The Story of Captain Jasper Parrish, Captive, Interpreter, and United States Subagent to the Six Nations Indians*. Buffalo Historical Society Publications, 1903, Vol. 6, 527-546; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 105. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Phelps, Noah A[mherst]. *A History of the Copper Mines and Newgate Prison, at Granbury, Connecticut; Also, of the Captivity of Daniel Hayes, of Granbury; by the Indians, in 1707*. Hartford: Press of Case, Tiffany and Burnham, 1845; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 59. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Priest, Josiah. *The Captivity and Sufferings of General Freegift Patchin*. [n.p., n.d.]; Reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 52. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Priest, Josiah. *Stories of the Revolution*. Albany: Hoffman and White, 1836; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 52. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Scudder, William. *The Journal of William Scudder*. [n.p.]: Privately printed, 1794; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 22. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Seaver, James Everett. *A Narrative of the Life of Mary Jemison: The White Woman of Genesee*. 22nd ed. New York: The American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, 1925.

Segar, Nathaniel. *A Brief Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Lieutenant Nathan'l Segar, Who Was Taken Prisoner by the Indians and Carried to Canada, During the Revolutionary War*. Paris, Maine:

The Observer Office, 1825; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 37. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Smith, James. *An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Col. James Smith During His Captivity with the Indians*. Lexington: John Bradford, 1799; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 24. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1979.

Spencer, O. M. *The Indian Captivity of O. M. Spencer*. Chicago: The Lakeside Press, 1917.

Steele, Zadock. *The Indian Captive*. Montpelier, Vermont: Published by the author, 1818; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 36. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Swetland, Luke. *A Narrative of Captivity of Luke Swetland, in 1778 and 1779, Among the Seneca Indians*. Waterville, New York: James J. Guernsey, 1875; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 17. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

________. *A Very Remarkable Narrative of Luke Swetland*. Hartford: Privately published, 178-?; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 17. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Thwaites, Reuben Gold, ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*. 73 vols. New York: Pageant Book Company, 1959.

Underhill, John. *Newes From America*. London: Printed by J. D. for Peter Cole, 1638; reprint Amsterdam, New York: DaCapo Press, 1971.

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

Walton, William. *A Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Benjamin Gilbert and His Family*. Philadelphia: Joseph Crukshank, 1784; reprinted in *Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities*, Vol. 15. New York: Garland

Publishing, Inc., 1975.

________. A Narrative of the Captivity and Sufferings of Benjamin Gilbert and His Family. 3d edition revised and enlarged. Philadelphia: John Richards, 1848; reprinted in Garland Library of Narratives of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 15. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1975.

Williams, John. The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion. 6th ed. Boston: Printed by Samuel Hall, 1795; reprint by Ann Arbor University Microfilms, Inc., 1966.

Secondary Works

Books

Aquila, Richard. The Iroquois Restoration. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983.

Auth, Stephen F. The Ten Years' War: Indian-White Relations in Pennsylvania, 1755-1765. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989.

Chase, Francis, ed. Gathered Sketches from the Early History of New Hampshire and Vermont. Claremont, New Hampshire: Tracy Kenney and Co., 1856; Reprinted in Garland Library of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 68. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Eccles, W. J. Canada Under Louis XIV, 1663-1701. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Frost, John. Heroic Women of the West: Comprising Thrilling Example of Courage, Fortitude, Devotedness, and Self Sacrifice, Among the Pioneer Mothers of the Westerrn Country. Philadelphia: A. Hart, 1854; Reprinted in Garland Library of North American Indian Captivities, Vol. 66. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

________. Thrilling Adventures Among the Indians. Philadelphia: J. W. Bradley, 1850.

Graymont, Barbara. The Iroquois in the American Revolution. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1972.

Hagan, William T. American Indians. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Hamilton, Edward P. The French and Indian Wars: The Story of Battles and Forts in the Wilderness. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962.

Howard, Hames H[enri]. Shawnee!: The Ceremonialism of a Native Indian Tribe and its Cultural Background. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1981.

Hubbard, William. The History of the Indian Wars in New England, 2 Vols. Roxbury, Massachusetts: Printed for W. Elliot, 1865; Reprint New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969.

Hunt, George T. The Wars of the Iroquois. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1960.

Jennings, Francis. The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984.

Kehoe, Alice Beck. North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Lafitau, Joseph Francois. Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times, 2 Vols. ed. and trans. by William N. Fenton and Elizabeth L. Moore. Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1874.

Loudin, Archibald. A Selection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives, of Outrages, Committed by the Indians, in Their Wars, with the White People, 2 Vols. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: A. Loudin, 1808.

Morgan, Lewis H. League of the Ho-Do-No-Sau-Nee or Iroquois, 2 Vols. New York: Dodd Mead and Company, 1901; Reprint New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, 1954.

Reaman, G. Elmore. The Trail of the Iroquois Indians. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1967.

Sylvester, Herbert Milton. Indian Wars of New England, 3 Vols. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1910.

Trigger, Bruce. The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660, 2 Vols. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. Death and Rebirth of the Seneca. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

Weslager, C. A. The Delaware Indians: A History. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1972.

Wissler, Clark. Indians of the United States: Four Centuries of Their History and Culture. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1940.

Articles

Axtell, James. "The White Indians of Colonial America." The William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Series 32 (January 1975): 55-88.

Brown, Wallace. "Magnificent Were the Iroquois." American History Illustrated 8 (January 1974): 22-33.

Colcord, Charles. "Putting Pants on the Lenni Lenape or Cutting the Iroquois Down to Size." The Indian Historian 10 (Winter, 1977): 44-47.