

THE PENN'S CREEK MASSACRE AND THE
CAPTIVITY OF MARIE LE ROY AND
BARBARA LEININGER

Ruth Ann Denaci
Temple University

In the fall of 1755 violence erupted in Pennsylvania as Indian war parties from the Ohio Valley descended upon the white settlements on the frontier. Early in the morning on October 16 a small party of Delaware Indians attacked the settlement of Penn's Creek across the Susquehanna River from Shamokin. The Indian town of Shamokin was the home of Tutelos and Delawares as well as refugees from the Six Nations; the surrounding white settlements included English farmers and traders, and more recently, German and Swiss immigrants.¹ Jean Jaques Le Roy's farm was hit first. His hired man heard six shots as he went out to tend the cows. Almost immediately eight Indians entered the house and tomahawked Jean Jaques Le Roy. His son, Jacob, put up a struggle, but the Indians overpowered him. They captured Jacob, along with his sister Marie and another girl staying there. After plundering the house, the Indians set fire to it. They placed Jean Jaques Le Roy's body feet first into the flames, leaving his upper half with the two tomahawks planted in his skull exposed. Two members of the war party then went to the Leininger

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY: A JOURNAL OF MID-ATLANTIC STUDIES, VOL. 72, NO. 4, 2007.
Copyright © 2007 The Pennsylvania Historical Association

house half a mile from Le Roy's farm. Demanding rum and finding none, they settled for tobacco. After filling and smoking a pipe, they declared their purpose: "We are Alleghany Indians, and your enemies. You must all die!" After killing the men, the Indians took Barbara Leininger and her sister Regina prisoner; they were soon joined by the rest of the raiding party along with Marie Le Roy, her brother and the little girl.²

Between 1755 and 1765 Indians from the Ohio Valley attacked the frontier settlements of Pennsylvania and neighboring colonies and returned to their villages with nearly two thousand white captives.³ The Ohio Valley Indians took Euro-Americans captive for four main reasons: they were adopted into Indian families to replace members lost to disease or war; they were ransomed to the colonial authorities; they were used as slaves; or they were sold to the French or other Indian nations.⁴ However, the lines between these categories were not always sharply drawn; the Indians' objectives for taking captives could fluctuate, shifting as war or peace dictated diplomatic and political policies.⁵ Moreover, although the Ohio Indians continued to adopt white Pennsylvanians into their families, not all captives were willing to embrace Indian life and culture. The integration of captives into native society did not necessarily mean total acculturation.

This essay will explore the role that captivity played in this turbulent period in Pennsylvania's history by focusing on the captivity narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger written after their escape in May 1759. Although their captivity experience was shaped in part by the imperial struggle between Britain and France and their native allies as it unfolded on the Pennsylvania frontier, their narrative also shares important elements with earlier narratives of women taken captive in British North America. Like many captivity narratives of Euro-American women, a male editor frames Le Roy and Leininger's text. What does this narrative strategy reveal about Euro-American attitudes toward women, authority and appropriate feminine behavior? A full explication of Le Roy and Leininger's narrative needs to consider female agency and subjectivity as they are reflected in the events of the narrative and in the appropriation of the women's authorial voice by a male editor. Captivity narratives challenged conceptions of women as weak and helpless by portraying women as aggressive, physically strong, and at times, ruthless in their determination to survive. For women, survival in captivity required the transgression of prevailing gender assumptions and the rejection of socially prescribed passivity

and subordination. Although the circumscribing male voice in Le Roy and Leininger's narrative both reaffirms female dependence and reconciles unwomanly resistance with appropriate feminine behavior, this interpretation is often inconsistent with the action of the narrative itself. This inconsistency reveals a paradox at the heart of many narratives of female captivity: white ministers or other editors were faced with the task of valorizing female captives' rejection of Indian culture while simultaneously obscuring the active role women played in their own liberation.⁶

This essay will also consider Indian-white relations in the Pennsylvania backcountry in the years before and during the Seven Years' War. The attack on Penn's Creek and the captivity of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger can be more fully understood within the context of the increasing conflict over land in the Ohio Valley. Recent scholarship has illuminated the shifting relationship between Native Americans and white settlers on the Pennsylvania frontier in the mid-eighteenth century.⁷ In the years after 1700, Germans, Scots-Irish, and English settlers as well as Delawares, Tutelos, Mahicans, Shawnees and Iroquois migrated into the region between the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers creating fluid multiethnic communities, linking Native Americans and white settlers in interdependent social and economic networks.⁸ By the mid-1750s, however, Indian-white relations had reached a critical juncture: white settlers continued to pour into the region while the growing imperial rivalry between Britain and France heightened tensions between Indians and whites. Struggling for domination of the lucrative fur trade in the Ohio Valley, both European nations sought alliance with the Delawares and Shawnees who inhabited the region.⁹

By early 1754, Conrad Weiser, the Indian agent for Pennsylvania, recognized that the province's Indian relations were shifting and uncertain.¹⁰ While the stream of settlers into Indian territory could not be stopped, provincial authorities believed that Indian resentment could be alleviated by a legal purchase from the Six Nations. Moreover, the increasing pressure of the French in the Ohio Valley made the purchase necessary not only to legitimize white settlement, but as a military strategy to defend Pennsylvania's western borders.¹¹ At the Albany Conference in June 1754 Iroquois council members agreed to sell the province seven million acres in western Pennsylvania for four hundred pounds. The Albany Purchase opened the western lands to white settlement—land that included established Indian villages in the Ohio Valley.¹² The purchase aroused Delaware suspicions of both the provincial authorities and the Six Nations. Despite their claims to

the western lands, the Delawares had not been present at the conference nor consulted in the ensuing land sale. Instead they were left to wonder "where the Indian's land lay" if "the French claimed all the Land on one side the River Ohio and the English on the other Side."¹³ Delaware dissatisfaction with Iroquois-Pennsylvania land deals and white settlement in the west began to strain their increasingly fragile friendship with the English.

While the Iroquois alliance with Pennsylvania affirmed the Six Nations' dominance over the Delawares and Shawnees of the Ohio country and strengthened the provincial government's claims to land in the Ohio Valley, it threatened the peaceful relations between the white settlers and native peoples who actually lived on the lands that were sold, contributing directly to the violence of the Penn's Creek massacre. Despite Iroquois claims to hegemony over the Ohio Valley Delawares, the Pennsylvania government and the Six Nations were unable to maintain peace, facilitate white settlement, and keep colonists and Indians separate.¹⁴ Increasing pressure from the French and anger over continuing white encroachment on land west of the Susquehanna River culminated in violence as Delawares and Shawnees attacked the Pennsylvania frontier in the fall of 1755.¹⁵ The raids, focused on disputed land, were violent expressions of the Ohio Indians' determination to regain their territory; they were also bloody testaments to Pennsylvania's failure to maintain her Indian alliances as the imperial struggle between Britain and France erupted into war.

The first major attack occurred on October 16 at Penn's Creek on the western branch of the Susquehanna River; the settlement lay within the recently concluded Albany Purchase. The Indians left fourteen persons dead and carried ten captives into the woods. Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger's narrative of the attack and their captivity was "Written and Printed as dictated by them" in 1759 after their escape from three and a half years in captivity.¹⁶ Both the Le Roy and Leininger families were recent arrivals to the new settlement of Penn's Creek. Marie Le Roy was born in Bondrut, Switzerland. She and her family immigrated to Pennsylvania in 1752.¹⁷ The Leininger family immigrated to Pennsylvania from Reutlingen, Germany, around 1750.¹⁸ "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger" provides no other biographical information. Moreover, even this scant account is not in the young women's own voices, it is conveyed to the reader by the unidentified transcriber who introduces their story. Although the voices of Le Roy and Leininger do eventually emerge, throughout the course of the text the narrator frequently reappears,

offering the reader an interpretative framework within which to understand the events of the narrative.

The narrative of the New England captive Mary Rowlandson employed a similar editorial strategy.¹⁹ The first edition of Rowlandson's narrative was framed by two masculine voices: a preface, usually attributed to Increase Mather, introduced the narrative, and a sermon by her husband, Joseph Rowlandson followed her text. Enclosing Rowlandson's narrative by appropriate masculine voices not only sanctioned her writing, it represented the Puritan ministry's effort to control her text and to ensure that it be read and understood in ways that supported and confirmed Puritan beliefs. The author of the preface begs the reader to excuse Rowlandson's unseemliness in coming forward and hopes that "none will cast any reflection upon this Gentlewoman, on the score of this publication of her affliction and deliverance."²⁰ Surrounding the narrative by male voices of authority legitimized its meaning and purpose, and more important, authorized Rowlandson's right to appear in print. Although the editor of Le Roy and Leininger's narrative did not ask the reader's pardon for the publication of their experiences, his introduction to the text and his usurpation of the women's authorial voice similarly served to sanction their appearance in print.

After his brief biographical introduction, the transcriber of Le Roy and Leininger's narrative launched into a description of the attack on Penn's Creek, the capture of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger and their siblings. Did Le Roy and Leininger know their captors? At the Leininger house there is the suggestion that the family suspected nothing unusual. The Indians asked for rum and smoked a pipe before declaring their intentions. The Delawares from Shamokin and the settlers from the surrounding white settlements such as Penn's Creek were neighbors, they worked alongside each other in the fields, they traded with each other, and they shared news and gossip.²¹ According to the naturalist John Bartram, the settlers claimed that "most of the Indians which are so cruel are such as was allmost dayly familiar at thair houses eate drank & swore together was even intimate playmates & now without any provokation destroyeth all before them with fire ball & tomahawk."²² Bartram's observation suggests that the imperial conflict created a deep sense of betrayal among both the native peoples and the English, Swiss and German settlers who had once lived together as neighbors in the communities surrounding Shamokin.

In the early section of the narrative, the Indian attackers performed most of the action; they killed all the males present, except for Le Roy's brother,

Jacob, who was also taken captive. He “defended himself desperately,” wrote the narrator, before the Indians overpowered him.²³ The actions and responses of Marie, Barbara, her sister Regina and the little girl taken with them, however, are undisclosed. We are merely told that they were made prisoners of the Indians. Although the Indian attackers naturally dominate the events surrounding the capture, the contrast between the narrator’s description of the actions of Le Roy’s brother and the young women is striking. Did they attempt to resist their attackers? Did they struggle to aid their stricken relatives, or did they passively submit to their ordeal without so much as a cry for help? The narrator directs the reader to the appropriate interpretation of the events of their captivity. He provides a lens through which to view the two young women and interpret the events of the attack: they are observers rather than initiators of action. Le Roy and Leininger become victims of a dual captivity: their physical captivity by Indians parallels their authorial captivity by a male narrator who denies them both voice and agency.

Finally in the fifth paragraph the women speak in their own voices to inform the reader that “we were taken” into the forest. “We two girls as also two horses, fell to the share of an Indian named Galasko.”²⁴ Here again, there is a suggestion of passive submission. Yet something happened to sharply undermine this apparently submissive feminine behavior. Having only two horses, the Indians kindly allowed Barbara and Marie to ride while the rest of the party walked. Barbara, now on horseback, attempted to escape. Deep in the forest and surrounded by a party of Indians, Barbara seized the initiative.²⁵ When the narrative voice shifts to the women themselves, Le Roy and Leininger are no longer passive observers; instead, they become active participants, aggressively seeking to survive by controlling the course of events.

After her attempted escape, however, Barbara was quickly recaptured, “and condemned to be burned alive.” Interestingly, the Indians gave her a “French Bible, which they had taken from Le Roy’s house, in order that she might prepare for death.”²⁶ Not only did the Indians retrieve the Bible from Le Roy’s burning house, which suggests that they understood the importance of the book, they also knew enough of the Christian faith to understand that the Bible might afford Barbara some comfort in her last moments. Moreover, when she told them she could “not understand it,” they gave her a German one. If the French Bible was taken from the Le Roy house, where did the German Bible come from? Did it belong to the Indians? Had they perhaps obtained it from Moravian missionaries, or were some of the Indians Christians? Clearly, the Indians were not unacquainted with Euro-American

religious practices. The Moravian mission, located on the outskirts of Shamokin, afforded the Delawares and the other Indians on the Susquehanna River frequent contact with European cultural and religious practices. Moreover, in their efforts to convert the Indians, the Moravian missionaries developed friendly social and economic relationships with native communities in the region. Recent scholarship has shown that despite mutual mistrust and fear, white settlers and the native peoples of the Ohio Valley worked and socialized with each other on a day-to-day basis that provided the opportunity for peaceful interaction and cultural exchange up until the mid-1750s.²⁷

After giving Barbara the Bible, the Indians prepared a "large pile of wood and set it on fire, intending to put her into the midst of it."²⁸ Her life was spared, however, when a young Indian begged that she be pardoned if she promised never to attempt to escape again. The Indians' decision to spare Barbara's life suggests that perhaps her captors merely meant to teach her a lesson and that her life was never actually in danger. The Indians used violence, or the threat of violence, to control the newly captured. The fourteen year-old Hugh Gibson, a Pennsylvanian taken captive in 1756, initially experienced harsh treatment at the hands of his captors. "I was taken back to their towns," he recalled, "where I suffered much from hunger and abuse: many times they beat me most severely, and once they sent me to gather wood to burn myself, but I cannot tell whether they intended to do it or to frighten me; However I did not remain long before I was adopted into an Indian family."²⁹ Despite the deteriorating relations between the Pennsylvania authorities and the Ohio Valley Indians, the Indians continued to adopt captives, particularly women and young children, into their families to re-populate their war-devastated communities.³⁰ As the Delaware warrior Shingas explained to the missionary, Frederick Post, despite "the great price on his head, he never thought to revenge himself, but was always very kind to any prisoners that were brought in."³¹ However, torture and execution of captives did occur, and when it did, it provided a compelling lesson to other captives.³²

The next day the party was divided into two groups, one marching in the direction of the Ohio, the other group containing Le Roy, Leininger and their Indian "master" Galasko, left for Chinklacamoose, a Delaware town on the West branch of the Susquehanna. After resting there for two days they proceeded to Punxsutawny. Marie's brother remained there while she and Barbara, after five days rest, left for Kittanning, their "place of permanent abode."³³ Typically when a raiding party returned to the village with captives they would be forced to "run the gauntlet." The newly arrived captives were

lined up and instructed to run a course of twenty to forty yards between two rows of villagers who would beat them as they ran past. While the intended purpose of the rite was to sever captives' ties with their past lives through ritual humiliation, not all captives received equally harsh treatment.³⁴ Le Roy and Leininger described their "welcome, according to Indian custom." The ritual consisted of three blows on the back, gently administered. "Indeed, we concluded that we were beaten merely in order to keep up an ancient usage and not with the intention of injuring us."³⁵

The severity of running the gauntlet appears to have varied depending upon the age and sex of the prisoner. John M'Cullough and his brother, only eight and five years old at the time of their capture in 1756, remembered that "a great number of Indians of both sexes were paraded on each side of the path to see us as we went along; some of them were shoving little fellows to strike us, and others advising me to strike them, but we seemed to be both afraid of each other."³⁶ M'Cullough's captors, like Le Roy and Leininger's, seem to have observed the form of the rite without intending to inflict any harm on the boys. Young prisoners, both male and female, appear to have been subjected to a milder form or escaped the ritual entirely.³⁷ The eighteen-year old Pennsylvanian James Smith was forced to undergo a more rigorous form of the gauntlet:

I saw numbers [of Indians] running towards me stripped naked, excepting breech-clouts, and painted in the most hideous manner... As they approached, they formed themselves into two long ranks, about two or three roods apart. I was told by an Indian...that I must run betwixt these ranks, and they would flog me all the way. When I got near the end of the lines, I was struck with something that appeared to me to be a stick, or the handle of a tomahawk, which caused me to fall to the ground. They continued beating me most intolerably, until I was at length insensible.³⁸

Following his recovery, the Indians took Smith to an Indian town on the west branch of the Muskingum where he was adopted into an Indian family. A head-man of the village explained, "My son, you are now flesh of our flesh, and bone of our bone; you are taken into the Caughnewago nation...you are adopted into a great family...we are now under the same obligations to love, support, and defend you, that we are to defend one another...you are to consider yourself as one of our people." Although Smith wrote that he did not at first believe this speech, "since that time I have found that there was much sincerity in said

speech...for, from that day, I never knew them to make any distinction between me and themselves in any respect whatever until I left them."³⁹

Smith's treatment stands in sharp contrast to Le Roy and Leininger's treatment by their captors. If the young women were adopted, their narrative is silent about the adoption ritual or adopted family members. The only reference to their possible adoption occurs in the very last section of the narrative after their escape. Upon reaching the English they were asked by an "Indian with the soldiers" why they had run away. Marie replied, "that her Indian mother had been so cross and had scolded her so constantly, that she could not stay with her any longer."⁴⁰ It is unclear whether this was in fact the case, or merely the response they thought would satisfy their Indian questioner. Nevertheless, whether or not they had been adopted, they thought of themselves as prisoners, not adopted kin. The language used to describe their captors suggests that they never felt like members of an Indian family; they consistently refer to their captor as "master" and to themselves and their fellow captives as "slaves" or "prisoners," emphasizing the hard labor they performed for their master rather than familial affection. The difference between Le Roy and Leiningers' captivity and Smith's experiences suggests that captivity, even in the same place and at nearly the same time could mean very different things. Although Smith eventually chose to return to white society, he retained respect and affection for his adopted family.⁴¹ Le Roy and Leininger's narrative contains no hint of such sentiments. Their contrasting perception of their Indian captors stems from the difference in the nature of their captivity—Smith was adopted kin, Le Roy and Leininger were prisoners of war.

Le Roy and Leininger remained at Kittanning from December 1755 until September 1756. During those months, and throughout the years of their captivity, they were kept busy "keeping house for the savages" and working in the fields.⁴² Although they may have been unaccustomed to the heavy physical labor they were required to perform, such as clearing fields and cutting down trees, they also engaged in more familiar tasks such as washing and cooking. In contrast to Euro-American practice, in Native American society planting corn and laboring in the fields were central aspects of "women's work." The captive, John M'Cullough explained, "women have to do all the domestic labour—such as raising corn, cutting firewood and carrying it home on their backs."⁴³ Fellow Pennsylvanian, James Smith, was pleasantly surprised by the Indian's sexual division of labor. "I, in the company with a number of young Indians, went down to the corn field to see the squaws at work...they asked me to take a hoe, which I did, and hoed for some time. The Squaws applauded

me as a good hand at the business; but when I returned to the town, the old men hearing of what I had done, chid [*sic*] me, and said that I was adopted in the place of a great man, and must not hoe corn like a squaw." Smith readily assented to their request. "They never had occasion to reprove [*sic*] me for anything like this again; as I never was extremely fond of work, I readily complied with their orders."⁴⁴ The difference between Native American gender roles and those of white society required captive men and women to adapt to Indian life in different ways, to use different skills and to readjust their notion of what constituted proper gender behavior. As Smith's response suggests, captivity could hold attractions for young men who preferred hunting to fieldwork, making the transition from white to Indian society more appealing.

Le Roy and Leininger relied on old skills and learned new ones to assimilate to the gendered division of labor of village life. They tanned leather to make moccasins, they worked in the fields alongside the other women, and they cut down trees and built huts. The young women's use of domestic skills to accommodate to Indian life recalls the earlier experiences of the New England captive, Mary Rowlandson. Like Le Roy and Leininger, Rowlandson depended on her domestic skills to survive in captivity: she knit stockings and she made caps for her Indian master and she even made a shirt for King Philip's son for which he paid her a shilling.⁴⁵ However, as Laurel Thatcher Ulrich has pointed out, it was also her "understanding of servility" that enabled her to adapt to her new environment.⁴⁶ "Growing up in a hierarchal society," writes Ulrich, "she had learned what it meant to be an inferior."⁴⁷ Rowlandson adapted to the hierarchal structure in which she was placed; she understood her role as a subordinate and her Indian master's role as a patriarchal authority figure. Le Roy and Leininger similarly accommodated to the new social structure in which they now found themselves by assuming a subordinate, dependant position in relation to their captors. Their master, for example, received their wages from the French for the work they performed while they were at Fort Duquesne.⁴⁸

Shortly before Le Roy and Leininger left Kittanning Colonel John Armstrong led a detachment of the Pennsylvania Regiment in a raid on the town in an attempt to rescue the large number of captives known to be held by the Indians. The expedition of September 1756 was portrayed in the provincial press as a great victory:

On the Whole, it is allowed to be the greatest Blow the Indians have received since the War Began, and if well followed, may soon make

them weary of continuing it. The Conduct of Colonel Armstrong in marching so large a Body through the Enemy Country, and coming so close to the Town, without being discovered, is deservedly admired and applauded; as well as the Bravery of both Officers and Men in the Action. And we hope their Example may have all the good Effects that are naturally to be expected from it.⁴⁹

Despite the congratulatory tone of the author, the attack was less than successful. Of the estimated one hundred captives in the town only seven prisoners were liberated, and Armstrong's forces suffered heavy casualties.⁵⁰ Unfortunately for Le Roy and Leininger, they were both in the part of the village that lay on the opposite side of the Allegheny River from where the English attacked. At the onset of the assault by Armstrong's forces they were immediately taken ten miles further into the interior, "in order that we might have no chance of trying, on this occasion to escape." In fact, they were warned that if they did attempt to escape, they would be killed.⁵¹ The Indians' continuing distrust of the captives and their severe warning raises questions about the status of the captives and the motives for captive taking. Were they adopted kin, or were they hostages, who might prove useful in the wartime negotiations with the Pennsylvania government?⁵² Following Armstrong's unsuccessful attempt to attain the release of the captives by military means, the provincial authorities turned to negotiation and diplomacy to free the captives.⁵³

After their return to the smoking remains of Kittanning, the young women witnessed the death of an English woman who "had attempted to flee out of her captivity and to return to the settlements with Col. Armstrong." The Indians had tortured her for several hours, when "a French officer took compassion on her, and put her out of her misery."⁵⁴ To white Pennsylvanians the vivid descriptions of Indian torture contained in the narrative would have dramatically emphasized the need for military action against a savage enemy. It is tempting to see Le Roy and Leininger's narrative as a critique of the provincial authorities' failure to maintain peaceful relations with the Indians and to provide protection for the inhabitants of the frontier once violence had erupted. Shortly after the discovery of the attack on Penn's Creek the surviving residents of the settlement had petitioned the governor for aid. While the governor and the Assembly dragged their feet, the frontier was in confusion and panic.⁵⁵ Clearly, backcountry settlers felt that the Pennsylvania government was not only obligated to protect them, but had failed miserably in its

responsibility to do so. Le Roy and Leininger's narrative not only reinforced these sentiments, it provided a compelling illustration—in the captivity of two helpless young women—of the province's failure to protect its frontier inhabitants.

The wide circulation of captivity narratives and the graphic accounts of Indian atrocities in the colonial press meant that most Pennsylvanians had horrific visions of what captivity meant.⁵⁶ The narrative of Peter Williamson, who was taken captive in 1754, contained grisly descriptions of Indian torture and a pointed attack against the Pennsylvania authorities, whose inaction allowed such atrocities to occur:

From these few instances of savage cruelty, the deplorable situation of the defenceless inhabitants, and what they hourly suffered...must strike the utmost horror, and cause in every breast the utmost detestation, not only against the authors, but against those who, through inattention, or pusillanimous or erroneous principles, suffered these savages at first, unrepelled, or even unmolested, to commit such outrages, depredations, and murders.⁵⁷

The eruption of violence in the mid-1750s undermined the negotiated interactions between Indians and whites that had characterized the frontier settlements in the years before 1750 and forced both groups to define their positions and declare their loyalties.⁵⁸ Fear, loss of trust, and a sense of betrayal fed the hatred of all Indians—allies or foes.

Although Le Roy and Leininger's narrative contains isolated expressions of Indian kindness, for the most part, benevolence is overshadowed by Indian violence. Following the Pennsylvania Regiment's raid on Kittanning, the Indians made an example of an Englishman who attempted to escape with the colonial forces. "His screams," they recalled, "were frightful to listen to." He finally died when melted lead was poured down his throat. These graphic descriptions of torture would seem to undermine one of the stated purposes of Le Roy and Leininger's narrative: to reassure the families of those still held in captivity that "their nearest kith and kin are still in the land of the living."⁵⁹ Knowing that your loved ones were at the risk of such a fate can hardly have been reassuring. However, such descriptions would have fuelled hatred for the Indian enemy and encouraged the raising of troops for the defense of the province.

Immediately after Le Roy and Leininger's description of the Englishman's death the editor reemerges to comment on the horrific effect such a sight would have on a fellow captive. The narrator not only usurps Le Roy and Leininger's authorial autonomy, he turns the captive from a "she" to a "he". "It is easy to imagine," he wrote, 'what an impression such fearful instances of cruelty make upon the mind of a poor captive. Does he attempt to escape from the savages, he knows in advance that, if retaken, he will be roasted alive.' If he is fully "resolved to endure" such a cruel death, "then he may run away with a brave heart."⁶⁰ The narrator's use of the male pronoun suggests that a woman, lacking a "brave heart," would not be faced with such a choice. Resolution and bravery were masculine attributes; the male pronoun served to emphasize the gendered nature of these qualities. Yet the events of the narrative are inconsistent with the notion that resolve and bravery are distinctly masculine attributes. As we have seen, an English woman risked the threat of a gruesome death to attain her freedom, and Le Roy and Leininger will not only successfully escape from their captors, they will endure a difficult ordeal before finally reaching the English. The reappearance of the editor served to reconcile the contradiction between the actual events of the narrative and socially prescribed female behavior by obscuring the women's aggressive efforts to survive.

Le Roy and Leininger's captors now moved them from Kittanning to Fort Duquesne where they remained for about two months. Despite the greater abundance of food available at the fort, the women declined the offer to remain with the French and "forsake the Indians." "We believed," they explained, "that it would be better for us to remain among the Indians, in as much as they would be more likely to make peace with the English than the French, and in as much as there would be more ways open for flight in the forest than in a fort."⁶¹ Their decision appears to have been carefully considered and suggests their understanding of the complicated relations between the French, the British and their native allies. Moreover, it shows that they had not resigned themselves to captivity; they still planned to escape when the opportunity arose.

Another consideration in their decision to remain with their Indian captors may have been the risk posed by the French soldiers, many of whom had not seen a white woman for many months or possibly years.⁶² Because adoption still remained the primary reason for captive taking among the Indians, instances of sexual assault were rare. The Indians' strong incest taboos would have prevented a warrior from violating his possible future sister, daughter or

cousin. Indian trader George Croghan explained that were an Indian warrior "to indulge himself with a captive taken in war, and much more were he to offer violence in order to gratify his lust, he would incur indelible disgrace."⁶³ Le Roy and Leininger's decision to remain with the Indians not only reflects the Euro-American emphasis on female chastity, it also attests to their determination to retain control over their own survival by choosing the option that offered the greatest possibility for escape.

After their brief sojourn among the French, the young women accompanied their "Indian master to Sackum" for the winter hunting season.⁶⁴ In the spring they left for Kaskaskunk, an Indian town on Beaver Creek. Here, in addition to their domestic chores they were required to clear fields in "the German fashion, to plant corn, and to do other hard work of every kind."⁶⁵ Although Le Roy and Leininger appear to have been socially and economically integrated into village life, they were clearly not resigned to remaining with the Indians. Moreover, their descriptions of other white captives suggest that their sentiments were not unique. After three years in captivity, they remarked that they had "seen no one of our own flesh and blood, except those unhappy beings who, like ourselves were bearing the yoke of the heaviest slavery."⁶⁶

In September 1758, however, Le Roy and Leininger "had the unexpected pleasure of meeting with a German, who was not a captive, but free, and who, as we heard, had been sent into this neighborhood to negotiate a peace between the English and the natives. His name was Frederick Post."⁶⁷ The Pennsylvania authorities had sent Post to assure the Ohio Indians of Pennsylvania's friendship and to negotiate for the release of prisoners. In contrast to the New England frontier, the Ohio Valley Indians returned to their villages with their captives and traded relatively few to their French allies. A majority of these captives were women and young children, who could more easily be assimilated into native society.⁶⁸ The large number of women and children who were held in captivity is supported by Le Roy and Leininger's narrative. Of the fifty-two prisoners they had seen, thirty-four were children and fourteen were women, including six mothers with children of their own.⁶⁹

After meeting with the Delaware leaders, Beaver, Shingas and Delaware George, Post observed "they appeared very much pleased at every thing, till I came to that part respecting the prisoners. This they disliked; for, they say, it appears very odd and unreasonable that we should demand prisoners before there is an established peace; such an unreasonable demand makes us appear as if we wanted brains."⁷⁰ Although Le Roy and Leininger were encouraged by Post's appearance, he was forbidden to speak with the captives. He noted

in his journal that "they said, if they [the Indians] knew I had wrote about the prisoners, they would not let me go out of the town."⁷¹ The negotiations for the release of the captives were central to Post's diplomatic mission to the Ohio Indians, yet as both Le Roy and Leinginger's narrative and Post's observations make clear the redemption of the captives would prove to be extremely difficult. Le Roy and Leininger explained that Post treated the captives with "reserve," indicating "that this was not the time to talk over our afflictions." At the same time the captives were "greatly alarmed" for Post's safety. The French had told them "that, if they caught him, they would roast him alive for five days, and many Indians declared that it was impossible for him to get safely through, that he was destined for death."⁷²

The Indians' intransigence in even discussing the return of captives before peace was established stemmed from two main reasons: the captives were adopted kin, whom the Indians were reluctant to part with and they were also prisoners of war. The captivity of Hugh Gibson suggests the porous boundaries between adopted kin and prisoner. Like Le Roy and Leininger, Gibson was present at Kittanning after Armstrong's attack on the town and witnessed the torture and death of the captive woman who had attempted to escape. "All the prisoners in the neighborhood," he recalled, "were collected to be spectators of the cruel death of a poor unhappy woman, a prisoner, amongst which number I was."⁷³ Although Gibson had been adopted into an Indian family, he still referred to himself as a "prisoner." Gibson was only fourteen years old at the time of his capture and he was relatively well treated, yet his comment reflects his self-perception as a prisoner and an outsider. This is particularly evident in his description of the torture of the female captive; he described the Indians as "ruthless barbarians" and "hellish fiends" who were deaf "to her agonizing shrieks and prayers."⁷⁴ Moreover, like Le Roy and Leininger, he escaped and eventually returned to his white family after five years and four months in captivity.⁷⁵

In contrast to James Smith, who retained respect for Indian culture and affection for his native family, even after his return to white society, Gibson's response to his captors and his rejection of Indian culture demonstrate that the acculturation of white captives could vary considerably, from respect and acceptance to repulsion and rejection.⁷⁶ If the narratives of Gibson and Le Roy and Leininger suggest we should be cautious in assessing the Ohio Indians' acculturation of their young white captives, the narrative of John M'Cullough shows that the Ohio Indians' motives for captive taking not only varied, they could shift from adoption to ransom. M'Cullough was adopted into an Indian

family; however, when his white father learned that he was still alive, his Indian father agreed to return him for a price. When the young M'Cullough learned the purpose of his white father's visit he "wept bitterly, all to no purpose; my father was ready to start; they laid hold of me and set me on a horse, I threw myself off; they set me on again, and tied my legs under the horse's belly, and started away for Pittsburgh." M'Cullough eventually escaped and returned to his Indian family where he remained until the British demanded the return of all English captives in 1764.⁷⁷ M'Cullough's narrative also reveals that not all Ohio Indians were eager to embrace white captives as kin. He recalled that a brother of his adopted Indian uncle, "a most barbarous inhuman old wretch," mistreated two female prisoners, "whom he had taken and kept as slaves; for he never would consent to have any of the white people adopted into his own family."⁷⁸ Presumably this sentiment was rare among the Ohio Valley Indians, who for the most part continued to adopt white captives into their families, yet it suggests the ways in which the Indians' motives for captive taking could change as war or peace altered their attitude toward white Pennsylvanians.

Following the British victory over the French and their Indian allies at Fort Ligonier, Le Roy and Leininger's captors moved them "about one hundred and fifty miles further west to Muskingum."⁷⁹ In February 1759 Barbara Leininger and another prisoner, David Breckenridge made plans to escape. Marie advised them to wait until spring and milder weather, at which time she agreed to accompany them. On the last day of February most of the men of the village traveled to Pittsburgh to trade skins; Le Roy and Leininger, along with the other women traveled "ten miles up the country to gather roots."⁸⁰ Despite the three and a half years the two women had spent as captives, it appears that their intentions were still suspect: two men went along as guards. Nonetheless, they hoped to seize the opportunity to escape. Barbara Leininger pretended to be menstruating in order that she might have a hut to herself.⁸¹ On the fourteenth of March Barbara left her hut and visited a German woman living near Muskingum. The woman had planned to accompany Le Roy and Leininger, but illness prevented her from leaving. However, she gave Barbara the provisions she had collected for the journey: two pounds of dried meat, a quart of corn, and four pounds of sugar, as well as pelts for moccasins. She also convinced a young Englishman, Owen Gibson to leave with Le Roy, Leininger and David Breckenridge. On the evening of March sixteenth Gibson arrived at Leininger's hut, and at ten o'clock Le Roy and Leininger, accompanied by the two Englishmen, left Muskingum.⁸²

The portions of the narrative describing their preparations for flight reveal Le Roy and Leininger's firm resolve and their careful attention to practical details, yet it is not told entirely in the first person. Instead, the narrative voice shifts back and forth from first to third person. The reemergence of the narrator obscures the women's voices and undermines the autonomy of their actions. "Barbara Leininger," wrote the narrator, "agreed with an Englishmen, named David Breckenreach (Breckenridge), to escape."⁸³ Throughout their captivity, both Barbara and Marie had remained resolute in their intention to escape; in fact, Barbara had attempted to flee after only two days in captivity. Yet in this passage, the absence of Barbara's voice transformed her initiative into acquiescence. Despite this editorial strategy, the actions of the two young women reflect their sense of purpose and determination. Their escape plan was well thought out and carefully executed, revealing a belief in themselves and their ability to endure the journey. At the same time it required courage—both Barbara and Marie knew they would be pursued when their absence was discovered and they had seen the fate of both women and men who failed to successfully escape. The appropriation of the women's bold escape by a male authorial voice reveals an inherent tension in female captivity narratives: editors faced the challenge of endorsing female captives' rejection of Indian life while also diminishing the agency of women themselves in their own survival.

After their escape, the narrative continues to move from first to third person, however, the tone of the narrative shifts sharply. The paragraph immediately following their departure begins, "It is hard to describe the anxious fears of a poor woman under such circumstances."⁸⁴ Is this the language of two determined young women? Or is it the insertion of an editor attempting to shape the reader's interpretation and understanding of Le Roy and Leininger's successful escape? "Under such circumstances," the narrative continues, "to depend upon one's own sagacity would be the worst of follies."⁸⁵ Yet Barbara and Marie had depended on their own sagacity throughout their time in captivity, from Barbara's first unsuccessful attempt to escape to their decision not to remain with the French at Fort Duquesne. However, this passage emphasizes feminine helplessness: "how would we ever succeed in passing through the wilderness, unacquainted with a single path or trail, without a guide, and helpless, half naked...the season wet and cold, and many rivers and streams to cross?"⁸⁶ Although their situation was frightening and they must have harbored doubts as to their ability to make their escape, they had nonetheless chosen to take the risk knowing the possible consequences; they must have

believed they could do it. The interpretative frame provided by the editor served to contain the challenge to appropriate gender behavior by directing the reader to understand the narrative as an expression of feminine dependence rather than an assertion of feminine autonomy.⁸⁷

The narrator further reinforced Le Roy and Leininger's helplessness and passivity by emphasizing their dependence on God's assistance in escaping from their captors: "If one could not believe that there is a God, who helps and saves one from death, one had better let running away alone."⁸⁸ This passive reliance on Divine Providence, however, is absent from the earlier sections of Le Roy and Leininger's text. Although they had acquired a Bible early in their captivity, their narrative lacks both biblical and religious references until this passage. Admittedly, it is not possible to know whether this passage reflects the women's own spiritual beliefs or the sentiments of the editor, but it is important to note its difference in tone and emphasis from the preceding sections and those that follow. Although the language of the narrator presented Le Roy and Leininger's escape as an ordeal of suffering, emphasizing their passive dependence on God, the actions of the women themselves tell a story of courage and survival. Paradoxically, the experiences of captivity granted female captives an opportunity to exercise an independent agency, demonstrate skills and express attitudes that would have been impossible in their home society.⁸⁹ In attributing their survival to divine deliverance rather than to the women themselves, the editor was able to reconcile Le Roy and Leininger's self-determination and independent actions with socially prescribed feminine behavior.

Like Le Roy and Leininger, Mary Rowlandson had to resist and assert herself to survive in captivity, rejecting the passive subservience that had been required of her as a Puritan woman.⁹⁰ At the same time, she had to reconcile her self-assertion and will to live with conventional Puritan beliefs. Thus, she consistently attributed her ability to survive and endure not to her own strength and resolve, but rather to God's mercy and goodness: "God was with me in a wonderful manner, carrying me along and bearing up my spirit that it did not quite fail...the Lord renewed my strength still and carried me along."⁹¹ Similarly, upon reaching Fort Pitt, Le Roy and Leininger "thank God in heaven for all the mercy which he showed us, for His gracious support in our weary captivity."⁹²

The emphasis on divine deliverance stands in sharp contrast to the following portion of the narrative, which underscores human initiative. After crossing the Muskingum and drifting down river for almost a mile, they asserted:

"There our journey began in good earnest." Owen Gibson had fired at a bear, when he "ran with his tomahawk to kill it, it jumped up and bit him in the feet...We all hastened to his assistance. The bear escaped into narrow holes among the rocks, where we could not follow." They traveled over one hundred miles in four days to reach the Ohio River. After crossing the Ohio they wrote that after "a brief consultation we resolved, heedless of path or trail to travel straight toward the rising of the sun."⁹³ Is it possible that in four days Le Roy and Leininger had grown so confident? Or does the earlier section, which portrayed the women as hesitant, helpless and pious, reflect the efforts of an editor determined to reconcile the events described in the narrative with appropriate feminine behavior?

After a series of further mishaps—Barbara Leininger was nearly drowned while crossing Little Beaver Creek and Owen Gibson lost his flint and steel—the party eventually reached the Monongahela River.⁹⁴ They called across the river to the fort for help and Colonel Mercer sent a boat to bring them to the fort. "The crew created many difficulties about taking us on board. They thought we were Indians."⁹⁵ After three and half years in captivity and fifteen days of traveling through the woods the party of escaped captives looked more like Indians than Englishmen. Despite the narrative's consistent emphasis on Le Roy and Leininger's desire to return to white society and their rejection of Indian culture, this passage suggests an ambivalence about their identities: not only did they look like Indians, Barbara could also "speak good Indian."⁹⁶ The women's reception by the soldiers reveals the discomfort and confusion that returned captives could provoke in their home society.

When the captive James Smith returned home to Conococheague in 1760, he observed that his people "received me with great joy, but were surprized to see me so much like an Indian, both in my gait and gesture."⁹⁷ Returned captives with their Indian-like appearance and dress were frequently greeted with curiosity and interest when they returned to their former homes. Moving between two cultures, white captives retained elements of both. They challenged the white cultural notion of a distinct and immutable difference between white and Indian, and they destabilized conceptions of racial and gendered identities as innate and unchanging.⁹⁸

In crossing cultural boundaries, white captives encountered different languages, rituals, and institutions, suggesting the possibility that identity was fluid and unstable, and not the product of inherent and fixed racial differences. Le Roy and Leininger's captivity does not end simply by their escape from their captors, it ends by the reinscription of white gender identity. "The

Colonel," they explained, "ordered for each of us a new chemise, a petticoat, a pair stockings, and garters."⁹⁹ Although Le Roy and Leininger had been mistaken for Indians and transgressed the boundaries of prescribed white female behavior during their captivity, their resumption of appropriate feminine dress signaled their affirmation of Euro-American cultural values and their rejection of Indian culture. At the same time, the reader can identify with the women's escape and their resistance to "Indianization."

The narrative concludes with a justification of why Le Roy and Leininger have published their story: "And now we come to the chief reason why we have given the foregoing narrative to the public. It is not done in order to render our own sufferings and humble history famous, but rather in order to serve the inhabitants of this country, by making them acquainted with the names and circumstances of those prisoners whom we met...in the course of our captivity."¹⁰⁰ Mary Rowlandson's narrative contains a similar justification for the publication of her text. She is described in the preface as a "Gentlewoman [whose] modesty would not thrust [her narrative] into the Press, yet her gratitude unto God made her not hardly perswadable to let it pass, that god might have his due glory, and others benefit by it as well as her self."¹⁰¹ Like the captives from Pennsylvania, she did not publish her experiences to celebrate her own achievements, but to benefit others. Both Rowlandson's and Le Roy and Leininger's narratives were deemed worthy to appear in print for the service they might provide for the larger community. In other words, the women's experiences were not considered interesting and valuable in themselves, they were important only in so far as they might prove useful to others.

Although Le Roy and Leininger's captivity experience, like the New England captive, encompassed extreme physical hardship and imposed labor, their interpretation of those experiences differed from the Puritan account in a significant way. Rowlandson's suffering in captivity was understood as both a physical ordeal and a spiritual test. For the Puritans, the horror and destruction of King Philip's War were interpreted as God's retribution; the Indians had become the agents of God's punishment against a sinful people and captivity became a compelling demonstration of divine retribution for the sinful and miraculous deliverance for the godly.¹⁰² In contrast, Le Roy and Leininger's narrative is predominantly secular in tone and their declared purpose in writing was secular: to acquaint their neighbors with the "circumstances" of their fellow captives. Captivity is not interpreted as a punishment for impiety and Indian-white relations are not understood as a manifestation of divine judgment. More important, Le Roy and Leininger placed their hopes for

liberation in human agency, not divine intervention: they looked to the diplomatic negotiations between the Ohio Indians and the Pennsylvania authorities, the military efforts of the Pennsylvania militia, and ultimately, themselves.

Although captivity for white Pennsylvanians could mean torture and death, for the most part, the primary goal of captive taking for the Ohio Valley Indians remained adoption and integration into native society. However, this essay has also shown that the social and economic integration of captives into native society did not necessarily mean full acceptance of Indian life and culture. While Indian culture claimed the loyalty of some captives, particularly the young, the narratives of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger and other Pennsylvanians suggest we should be cautious in assessing the Indians' acculturation of their captives. Individual responses to cultural contact spanned a wide spectrum from nearly total acceptance to total rejection.¹⁰³ Moreover, while most captives continued to be adopted, captives were also held for ransom, worked as slaves, or sold to the French and other native allies. The porous boundaries between these categories could shift as political and diplomatic circumstances required, blurring the lines between adopted kin and prisoner of war, altering both the experience of captivity and the Indians' attitudes towards their captives.

Between 1758 and 1765 the return of the captives became a key issue in the wartime negotiations between the Pennsylvania authorities and the Ohio Valley Indians.¹⁰³ By locating Le Roy and Leininger's captivity and the attack on Penn's Creek in the context of the heightened Indian-white conflict over land sparked by the Seven Years' War we can more fully understand what captivity meant to both the white settlers and the native peoples of Pennsylvania. The Delawares and Shawnees' attacks on specific white settlements and the taking of captives were not random acts of violence, they were deliberate acts of resistance to Iroquois hegemony and the land sales between the Six Nations and the Pennsylvania government.

Yet if Le Roy and Leininger's captivity experience was forged in part by the military and diplomatic dimensions of the Seven Years' War in Pennsylvania, their narrative of that experience also shares an important element with earlier captivity narratives of Euro-American women: the appropriation of the female authorial voice by a male editor. Although female captivity narratives challenged prevailing conceptions of white womanhood and afforded women the opportunity to transgress socially prescribed gender roles, the interpretative frame provided by male editors reaffirmed prevailing gender conventions.

Le Roy and Leininger's text, like many narratives of female captivity, reveals an inherent tension between the male editor's attempt to valorize their resistance to "Indianization" and their rejection of Indian culture, while at the same time, obscuring the agency of the women themselves in their own survival.

NOTES

1. James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 225. The Six Nations, or the Iroquois League, originally included five nations, the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas and the Senecas who spoke related languages and inhabited what is now Upstate New York. In the early eighteenth century they were joined by a sixth nation, the Tuscaroras, speakers of a related Iroquoian language who emigrated from what is today North Carolina. For more information, see: Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 1.
2. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," in John B. Linn and William Hegle, eds., *Pennsylvania Archives*, 2d series., 19 vols., (Philadelphia and Harrisburg, 1874–90), 7: 429. The Indians who attacked the Pennsylvania frontier came from the Ohio Valley and the Great Lakes region; they included Hurons, Ottawas, and Miamis while the largest number of raiders came from the upper Ohio Valley and consisted of Delawares and Shawnees. For more information, see: Matthew C. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives: Pennsylvania Captives among the Ohio Indians, 1755–1765," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July 2001): 162.
3. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 161–2. Ward contends that the large number of white captives in relation to a relatively small number of Ohio Indians made them important agents of cultural change.
4. Richard VanDerBeets, ed., *Held Captive by Indians, Selected Narratives 1642–1836* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973), Introduction, xi. For an analysis of Iroquois captive taking for the purpose of adoption, see Daniel K. Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," *William and Mary Quarterly* XL (1983): 538–559. Although Richter is primarily concerned with the Iroquois, many Indian cultures turned to the institution known as the "mourning-war" to repopulate their communities, ensure social continuity and deal with death.
5. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 162. According to Ward, between 1758 and 1765 the return of the captives became central to the diplomatic relations between the Pennsylvania authorities and the Ohio Indians.
6. Christopher Castiglia, *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 8, 14. My analysis of Le Roy and Leininger's narrative draws on many of Castiglia's insights. In his study of female captivity narratives he shows that although women's captivity narratives challenged ideologies about white womanhood, the interpretative frame provided by male editors reaffirmed female subjectivity by diminishing female agency and self-determination.
7. For Indian-white relations on the Pennsylvania frontier in the mid-eighteenth century, see Jane Merritt, *At the Crossroads: Indians & Empires on a Mid-Atlantic Frontier, 1700–1763* (Chapel Hill: The University

THE PENN'S CREEK MASSACRE AND THE CAPTIVITY

- of North Carolina Press, 2003); Merrell, *Into the American Woods*; William A. Starna, "The Diplomatic Career of Canasatego," Stephen C. Harper, "Delawares and Pennsylvanians after the Walking Purchase," and David L. Preston, "Squatters, Indians, Proprietary Government, and Land in the Susquehanna Valley," in William A. Pencak and Daniel K. Richter, eds., *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004).
8. Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 4, 5.
 9. Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 169–197.
 10. Paul A. W. Wallace, *Conrad Weiser, 1696–1760, friend of colonist and Mohawk* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945), 351.
 11. Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 351.
 12. Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 173.
 13. Quoted in Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 173.
 14. Stephen C. Harper, "Delawares and Pennsylvanians after the Walking Purchase," 167–169; and David L. Preston, "Squatters, Indians, Proprietary Government, and Land in the Susquehanna Valley," 180–200.
 15. Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 182.
 16. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 427. The narrative was printed in 1759 in the German Printing Office in Philadelphia.
 17. The Le Roy family sailed from Rotterdam on the *Phoenix*. They reached Pennsylvania in 1752. Shortly after his arrival, Marie's father, Jean Jaques took the Pennsylvania Oath of Allegiance. From 1727 until 1775 all male immigrants over the age of 16 were required to take the oath and declare their loyalty to the king. (<http://www.ancestry.com> accessed March 10, 2005). Unfortunately the narrative does not indicate Le Roy or Leininger's ages and I have been unable to find their dates of birth, however, their actions and behavior seem to suggest that they are teenagers.
 18. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 429.
 19. Mary Rowlandson was taken captive on February 20, 1676 when a party of Narragansetts attacked Lancaster, Massachusetts during King Philip's War. Her narrative, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* was published in 1682.
 20. From the Preface to the first edition of *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, quoted in Rebecca Blevins Faery, *Cartographies of Desire: Captivity, Race & Sex in the Shaping of an American Nation* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 42.
 21. Merrell, *Into the American Woods*, 225, 227.
 22. John Bartram to Peter Collinson, Feb. 21, 1756, quoted in Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 191.
 23. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 429.
 24. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 430.
 25. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 430.
 26. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 430.
 27. For relations between white settlers and the native peoples of the Ohio Valley, see Merrell, *Into the American Woods*, 225, 227; Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 70–71; and Preston, "Squatters, Indians, Proprietary Government," 189.
 28. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 430.

29. Hugh Gibson, *An Account of the Captivity of Hugh Gibson* in Archibald Loudon ed., *A Selection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives of Outrages Committed by the Indians in Their Wars with the White People* vol. II (1811; reprint, Arno Press Inc, 1971), 181.
30. See, Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 164 and Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, 180.
31. "Two Journals of Western Tours, by Charles [sic] Frederick Post: One, to the Neighborhood of Fort DuQuesne (July-September, 1758); The Other, To the Ohio (October, 1758-January, 1759)," in Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *Early Western Travels, 1748-1846*, vol. I (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1904), 212.
32. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 164-165. Ward suggests that male captives had a greater chance of execution and torture than female captives because males were more difficult to assimilate into Indian society.
33. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 430.
34. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 167.
35. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 430.
36. John M'Cullough, *A Narrative of the Captivity of John M'Cullough, ESQ.*, in Archibald Loudon, ed., *A Selection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives of Outrages Committed by the Indians in Their Wars with the White People* vol. I (1808; reprint, Arno Press, Inc., 1971), 259.
37. James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," *William and Mary Quarterly* 32 (1975): 70.
38. James Smith, *An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Col. James Smith During his Captivity with the Indians, in the Years 1755, '56, '57, '58, & '59*, in Archibald Loudon, ed., *A Selection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives of Outrages Committed by the Indians in Their Wars with the White People* vol. I (1808; reprint, Arno Press, Inc., 1971), 123-124.
39. James Smith, *An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences*, 130.
40. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 436.
41. Although Smith spoke fondly about his Indian family, shortly after returning to his home in Pennsylvania he formed a company of rangers that fought Indians near Pittsburgh. Smith schooled his men in the tactics of Indian warfare he had learned in captivity. Despite his love and respect for individual Indians, Smith's behavior after his return suggests the ambivalent emotions and identity conflicts with which returned captives struggled.
42. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 430-432.
43. John M' Cullough, *A Narrative of the Captivity of John M'Cullough*, 295.
44. James Smith, *An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences*, 154.
45. Mary Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* in Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676-1724* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), 47. Citations from Rowlandson's narrative are from this edition unless otherwise noted.
46. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650-1750* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), 228.
47. Ulrich, *Good Wives*, 228.
48. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 432.
49. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 23, 1756.
50. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 23, 1756.

THE PENN'S CREEK MASSACRE AND THE CAPTIVITY

51. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 431.
52. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 176. Ward suggests that as the war began to turn in favor of the British and the provincial authorities placed greater emphasis on the return of the captives, the Delawares sought to keep their captives not only because they were members of their society but because they could prove useful as hostages.
53. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 175.
54. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 431.
55. Wallace, *Weiser*, 396, 403.
56. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 164.
57. Peter Williamson, *Sufferings of Peter Williamson, One of the Settlers in the Back Parts of Pennsylvania. Written by Himself* in Richard VanDerBeets, ed. *Held Captive by Indians, Selected Narratives 1642-1836* (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973), 222.
58. Merritt, *At the Crossroads*, esp. 169-197.
59. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 437.
60. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 432.
61. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 432.
62. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 169.
63. Vaughn and Clark, eds, *Puritans Among the Indians*, Introduction, 14. Although there is no evidence that northeastern Indians raped female prisoners, returned captives often felt compelled to defend their sexual conduct; "Opinions of George Croghan," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXXI (1947): 157.
64. Sakunk, outlet of the Big Beaver into the Ohio River, a well-known rendezvous for the Ohio Indians during the war.
65. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 432.
66. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 432.
67. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 432.
68. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 164, 165. Ward suggests that more men than women were taken captive on the Pennsylvania frontier, yet fewer men than women were returned when Bouquet received captives from the Delawares and Shawnees in 1764 and 1765 because men were more likely to be executed or tortured than women. Axtell also contends that the Ohio Valley Indians captured white settlers largely to replace members of their own families and traded few captives to the French, however, he suggests that women and children were more likely to be taken captive. Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," 59-60.
69. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 438.
70. "Two Journals of Western Tours, by Frederick Post," 199.
71. "Two Journals of Western Tours by Frederick Post," 226.
72. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 432-433.
73. Hugh Gibson, *An Account of the Captivity of Hugh Gibson*, 182.
74. Hugh Gibson, *An Account of the Captivity of Hugh Gibson*, 182.
75. Hugh Gibson, *An Account of the Captivity of Hugh Gibson*, 184.
76. For the variety of human responses to cultural contact, see Vaughan and Richter, "Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian*

- Society* 90 (1980/81): 87. For the view that Indian life and culture were more successful in claiming white captives' "respect and allegiance," even after their return to their home society, see Axtell, "White Indians," 75.
77. John M' Cullough, *A Narrative of the Captivity of John M'Cullough*, 277, 285.
 78. John M' Cullough, *A Narrative of the Captivity of John M'Cullough*, 293.
 79. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 433.
 80. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 433.
 81. According to captive John M'Cullough, a pregnant or menstruating woman was given a hut to herself: "When a woman is in her pregnancy, she generally provides a hut, to which she resorts, when the time of her delivery approaches—as she does also at certain other times—during which period, she has no communication with any other person, except those who carry provisions to her." John M' Cullough, *A Narrative of the Captivity of John M'Cullough*, 289–90.
 82. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 434.
 83. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 433.
 84. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 433.
 85. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 433.
 86. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 433.
 87. Castiglia, *Bound and Determined*, 14. Castiglia's analysis shows that the male editor's interpretative frame is often inconsistent with the action of the narrative itself.
 88. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 434.
 89. Castiglia, *Bound and Determined*, 4, 14.
 90. Rebecca Blevins Faery, *Cartographies of Desire: Captivity, Race & Sex in the Shaping of an American Nation* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 32.
 91. Rowlandson, *Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 37.
 92. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 436.
 93. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 435.
 94. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 435.
 95. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 435.
 96. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 436.
 97. James Smith, *An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences*, 205.
 98. Castiglia, *Bound and Determined*, 6.
 99. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 436.
 100. "The Narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger," 436.
 101. From the Preface to the first edition of *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, quoted in Blevins Faery, *Cartographies of Desire*, 42.
 102. Alden T. Vaughn and Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676–1724* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), Introduction, 1–9. My interpretation of Rowlandson's narrative draws on the analysis of her text in Vaughn and Clark's introduction.
 103. Vaughan and Richter, "Crossing the Cultural Divide," 87.
 104. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives," 162.