

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Miller's Tale of Captivity, Ransom, and Remembrance, 1758–1811

The narratives of Richard Bard's captivity referenced in this essay are available online. We include links to these sources below (included also in the first footnote for each source) and invite our readers to consult them as they read through this essay.

Pennsylvania Gazette, May 11, 1758, reprinted in *New York Mercury*, May 15, 1758: http://digitallibrary.hsp.org/index.php/Detail/Object/Show/object_id/11052

Richard Baird's Deposition, 1758: http://digitallibrary.hsp.org/index.php/Detail/Object/Show/object_id/11030

Nathaniel Holland to Israel Pemberton, May 20, 1758: <http://tritych.brynmawr.edu/cdm/ref/collection/HCFriendly/id/2357>

An Account of the Captivity of Richard Bard, Esquire: http://digitallibrary.hsp.org/index.php/Detail/Object/Show/object_id/11029

These primary sources provide an excellent teaching opportunity, allowing students to discover for themselves that such sources must be read critically and that accounts of a single event may vary greatly depending on when, why, and by whom they were created and tell us as much about the authors as about the events recounted. [The Editors]

RICHARD BARD, OR BAIRD, (1736–99) was one of 1,054 captives and prisoners of war taken in Pennsylvania during a generation of Anglo-French and Indian conflict (1744–65). Of course, captives were not chosen for their ability to write, and only twenty-seven of them

left depositions, accounts, or memoirs of their experiences.¹ Two narratives that were not printed until two generations after their authors' captivities, those of Mary Jemison and James Smith, have rightly become classics of early American literature and major sources for understanding life among the Indians of the upper Ohio Valley.² Richard Bard's captivity has not received such attention, even though his account is inherently interesting, was promptly reported, and is uniquely revealing in other ways. First, Richard's private ransom of his wife, Ketty (Katherine, née Poe, 1737–1811), directly from the Delawares was the only successful negotiation of that sort during the uneasy truce of 1759–62. Second, Richard's story evolved rapidly through the three separate parts or versions he offered to different audiences and the long poem he wrote two years later. Third, Richard's son assembled a family remembrance of his parents' captivity and his mother's ransom half a century later. These various accounts hint at some of the factors that shaped and reshaped captivity narratives, those early American literary icons.³

At twenty-two, Richard Bard was a prosperous Quaker mill owner living with his twenty-one-year-old wife and their infant son in compara-

The author thanks Herta Steele, Professors George Emery and Thomas Guinsburg, the anonymous readers for the journal, and Tamara Gaskell and Rachel Moloshok at the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for many improvements in this article.

¹ The author's forthcoming book, *Setting All the Captives Free: Capture, Adjustment, and Recollection in Allegheny Country* (Montreal and Kingston, 2013), undertakes a systematic study of individuals captured in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia between 1745 and 1765 and their narratives. See also Matthew C. Ward, "Redeeming the Captives: Pennsylvania Captives among the Ohio Indians, 1755–1765," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 125 (2001): 161–89.

² *A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison*, ed. James Everett Seaver (Canandaigua, NY, 1824). A recent edition is James E. Seaver, *A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison*, ed. June Namias (Norman, OK, 1992). James Smith, *An Account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Colonel James Smith during His Captivity with the Indians, 1755–1759* (Lexington, KY, 1799).

³ There is a vast literature concerning captivity narratives. Annette Kolodny provides a thoughtful overview in "Among the Indians: The Uses of Captivity," *New York Times Books Review*, Jan. 31, 1993. See also: Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola and James Arthur Levernier, *The Indian Captivity Narrative, 1550–1900* (New York, 1993); June Namias, *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1993); Christopher Castiglia, *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst* (Chicago, 1996); Pauline Turner Strong, *Captive Selves, Captivating Others: The Politics and Poetics of Colonial American Captivity Narratives* (Boulder, CO, 1999); Joe Snader, *Caught between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction* (Lexington, KY, 2000); Linda Colley, *Captives* (New York, 2002); and Lisa Voigt, *Writing Captivity in the Early Modern Atlantic: Circulation of Knowledge and Authority in the Iberian and English Imperial Worlds* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2009).

tive safety at Fairfield, on the southeast side of South Mountain in York County (now Adams County), Pennsylvania. The French and Indian War had been raging at a distance for more than two-and-a-half years, but there had been few victims from York County.⁴ The swath of scorched and deserted lands reclaimed by Indians had expanded, however, and warriors were increasingly traveling farther, facing greater risk of pursuit, and taking captive only those thought fit for the long and hurried journey back across the mountains. Early in April 1758, Shawnee and Delaware warriors made an attack in York County, killing nine and taking three captives, including the girl who would become the most famous captive of all, Mary Jemison. A week later, a Delaware war party attacked Bard's mill, taking the entire household prisoner. Five days later, Richard became the only captive from this group to escape.

Even before he arrived home from captivity, Richard told at least some of his story at Carlisle. A witness sent an account dated April 27 that was printed, at least in part, in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* on May 11. According to this initial version, Richard—mistakenly identified as Thomas Baird—together with one Thomas Potter, was surprised by five or six Delawares, who rushed the mill house door. The two defenders pushed the Indians back out of the house, but the intruders shot through the door “and broke in at the Roof.” Potter cut off three fingers of one attacker and killed another “by a Stroke on the Head.” This sparse account mentions that, after being captured, Richard's infant child and Potter were both killed. As the war party retreated through the Path Valley with their surviving captives, they spotted pursuers and immediately “fled to the mountains, killing another captive, Samuel Hunter, because he could not run fast enough.” According to the report, Richard knew some of his attackers, and one of them, James Lingonoo, inquired after some of their mutual acquaintances in the area.⁵ The newspaper

⁴ The McCullough brothers were captured in July 1756, a man was killed near Marsh Creek the next month (*Pennsylvania Journal and Weekly Advertiser*, Sept. 2, 1756), and the following summer a boy and a woman with three children were taken in separate incidents (*Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 14, 1757; *New York Mercury*, Aug. 22, 1757). The Jemisons, Mans, and Robert Buck were attacked on April 5, 1758 (*Pennsylvania Gazette*, Apr. 13, 1758); *New York Mercury*, Apr. 17, 1758); Namias, *Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison*, 67–68; John Armstrong to William Denny, Carlisle, PA, Apr. 11, 1758, James Abercromby Papers, no. 143, Huntington Library, San Marino, CA.

⁵ John Craig, captured by the Delawares in February 1756, described James Lingonoo as among the “Indians who spoke good English.” Deposition of John Craig, Mar. 30, 1756, NV-002, p. 78, ser. 9, Penn Family Papers (Collection 485A), Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

item concludes: "the Captain of the Gang told him that [he] was at one of the Indian Treaties with this Government, and shewed him a Medal he received there."⁶

We do not know how this version of Richard's story might have been bent, shortened, or misunderstood by the letter writer or by the newspaper editor. As printed, it clearly served a Pennsylvania government that had been losing a defensive war for two-and-a-half years. Pennsylvania took no Indian prisoners at all, yet denounced as savages the Indians who took many. For a government that wanted to discourage all thoughts of "going captive" rather than fighting to the death, Richard's story provided an example of heroic resistance, discredited Quakers who had put immense effort into peace negotiations, and celebrated a man who had risked death to escape from terrible captivity to return to his natal community.⁷

The day after this account was printed in Philadelphia, Richard signed a solemn Quaker affirmation before Colonel George Stevenson in York. In this document, Richard describes each of the victims in addition to himself, his wife, Katherine, their infant son, John, and Thomas Potter. On the morning of the attack, he reported, the mill house had also contained Potter's fourteen-year-old servant Frederick Ferrick, eleven-year-old Hannah McBride, and nine-year-old William White.⁸ Laborers Samuel Hunter and David McMenomy, he noted, had been working in Richard's field by seven o'clock, and they had been the first to be seized by a war party that totaled nineteen Delawares. "About six of them suddenly rushed into the house," he said, and were driven out, but then knocked the door down. Contradicting the newspaper account, Richard reported that it was Thomas Potter who had lost a finger. In Richard's affirmation, there is no mention of Potter resisting. Instead, he narrated, when they realized the number of attackers, the victims surrendered "on the promise of the Indians not to Kill any of us." After assembling and tying the hands of their captives, the Delawares ordered them to march,

⁶ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, May 11, 1758, reprinted in *New York Mercury*, May 15, 1758. http://digitallibrary.hsp.org/index.php/Detail/Object/Show/object_id/11052.

⁷ On the economic interests and political caution of printers, see Stephen Botein, "Meer Mechanics' and an Open Press: The Business and Political Strategies of Colonial American Printers," *Perspectives in American History* 9 (1975): 125–225.

⁸ Hannah was the daughter of James McBride; she was returned at Pittsburgh in December 1761. "Journal of James Kenny, 1761–1763," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 37 (1913): 25–26.

with Richard in the lead. Before long, Richard saw the scalp of his infant son, a pathetic trophy for a warrior who somehow expected to display it without being ridiculed. Had the nine-month-old been crying loud enough to alert pursuers to the location of the captors and captives?

Richard reported seeing another scalp, which he knew to be Thomas Potter's. If, as was first reported but not mentioned in the deposition, Potter had killed one Delaware and wounded another, a warrior's wish for revenge could well have overcome his group's promise not to kill captives. In his careful catalogue of the victims, Richard mentioned that Samuel Hunter had been killed the following day on North Mountain. If Hunter was killed because he could not keep up, as first reported, and was captured before the negotiations that included a promise not to kill captives, Richard did not affirm these attenuating details before the magistrate. From his testimony we learn that on the fifth evening of his captivity, being sent to bring water for his captors, Richard escaped. The deposition explains that he survived for nine days on snakes, buds, and roots and became lost before three Cherokees found him, cut a staff for him, and "piloted" him to Fort Lyttleton.

Perhaps it was on prompting that Richard added that his captors had all been Delawares, most of whom spoke English, and that "one spoke as good English as I can." Richard ended his affirmation by noting that the captain of the war party had been to Philadelphia for peace talks in 1757, but that he "went away and left them."⁹ Thus, in the first two versions of his story, the Delawares are portrayed as having negotiated in bad faith; by implication, those Quaker leaders who had sponsored the peace negotiations to date had been duped. For these Quakers, who had been politically marginalized by the war, a prompt peace with the Indians was a major priority.¹⁰ Neither Richard nor his questioners distinguished between the Delawares of the North Branch of the Susquehanna, who had suspended hostilities as a result of those negotiations, and the Ohio Delawares, who had not yet negotiated at all.¹¹

⁹ "Richard Baird's Deposition, 1758," *Pennsylvania Archives*, ed. Samuel Hazard et al. (Philadelphia and Harrisburg, PA, 1852–1949), 1st ser., 3:396–97. http://digitallibrary.hsp.org/index.php/Detail/Object/Show/object_id/11030.

¹⁰ See Theodore Thayer, "The Friendly Association," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 67 (1943): 356–76; and Robert Daiutolo Jr., "The Role of Quakers in Indian Affairs during the French and Indian War," *Quaker History* 77 (1988): 1–30.

¹¹ Matthew C. Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754–1765* (Pittsburgh, 2003), 133–41, 150–55; and Anthony F. C. Wallace, *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung, 1700–1763* (Philadelphia, 1949), 103–60.

With this second account, Richard provided details about all the missing persons, information that perhaps could serve a legal purpose. The captors' promise not to kill any of those who surrendered is first mentioned in this affirmation, and the three killings are all represented as violations of that promise. The deposition avoids any mention of Potter's resistance, though he was not a Quaker like Richard. According to both of these initial versions of the story, Richard himself did nothing more aggressive than help push people out of his door.

Within a few days of the newspaper story and his solemn declaration, Richard had a Quaker visitor who was anxious to check some disturbing details, especially those regarding the Delawares who seemed to have duplicitously broken their truce with the Pennsylvania government. A. D. Conaughy (or McConaughy) reported on his conversation with Richard to Quaker agent Nathaniel Holland at Shamokin, who then passed the information on to Israel Pemberton in Philadelphia.¹² Yes, the captors had spoken good English, and Richard suspected, but could not confirm, that the well-known James Lingonoa (Delaware Jamey) was one of the group. Richard corrected another misunderstanding perpetuated by the newspaper article by clarifying that he had seen no medals among the Delaware. This would be a relief to Quakers, like Pemberton, who were so vigorously promoting and funding peace efforts. Richard had, however, seen a decorative silver gorget or half moon that someone had received at some conference.¹³ A pursuit party of English-allied Cherokees attacked and killed four of the Delaware captors and recovered Richard's rifle, but they found none of the captives. As reported, Conaughy's questions and Richard's answers amounted to a reassuring defense of Quaker peace-making efforts.

Within two weeks of his return, then, three slightly different versions of Richard's captivity account were already circulating. Potter's killing of a Delaware was mentioned only in the first report, a Delaware promise not to kill captives had been added in the second, and the exact identity of the attackers (and who had lost his fingers) had become less certain.

¹² The handwriting on the note is clearly that of Holland, who was Isreal Pemberton's contact at Shamokin.

¹³ Nathaniel Holland to Israel Pemberton, May 20, 1758, vol. 1, Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures, Records of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Indian Committee, microfilm 824, reel 10, Haverford College Library Special Collections, Haverford, PA. <http://triptych.brynmawr.edu/cdm/ref/collection/HCFriendly/id/2357>.

Richard Bard never authored what could be called a captivity narrative, but that was not because he did not write. Two years after his escape he composed a very long verse about his experience. A half century later, his son Archibald likely balanced an interest in publicity with a sense of propriety in deciding to publish only the last 192 lines of his father's poem, beginning the tale after his father had escaped. These verses say little about Richard's decision to escape without Ketty except:

Alas! for me to go 'tis hard
 Whilst with them is my wife,
 Yet 'tis the way that God ordained
 For me to save my life.¹⁴

The surviving lines are about a starving and severely injured man who journeys through swamps and over mountains and is rescued from certain death in the woods by God and three passing Cherokees, who guide him to Fort Lyttleton. Free and safe, he remains troubled about his wife:

Oh now I may like to a dove
 In her bewildered state,
 Bemoan the loss of my dear wife,
 My true and loving mate.¹⁵

The miller's tale would change much more in the next half century before finally being frozen in print. The enterprising Carlisle printer Archibald Loudon was instrumental in eventually publishing what Archibald Bard had preserved and reconstructed of his parents' captivity. Loudon was one of the first printers to decide to assemble a book of reprinted and manuscript captivity narratives from the region, including the first-person memoirs of Hugh Gibson, John McCullough, and John Slover.¹⁶ "At very considerable pain and trouble," Loudon solicited con-

¹⁴ *An Account of the Captivity of Richard Bard, Esquire, Late of Franklin County, Deceased, with his Wife and Family and Others. Collected from his Papers by his Son Archibald Bard, in A Selection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives, of Outrages, Committed by the Indians, in Their Wars with the White People*, by Archibald Loudon, 2 vols. (Carlisle, PA, 1808–11), 2:63, http://digitallibrary.hsp.org/index.php/Detail/Object/Show/object_id/11029.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 2:70.

¹⁶ The first was *Affecting History of the Dreadful Distresses of Frederick Manheim's Family* (Exeter, NH, 1793), which was widely reprinted.

tributions for a “Collection of Indian Narratives,” initially expecting to anchor a modest volume with the already familiar narrative of James Smith as well as those hateful fantasies of Isaac Stewart and Peter Williamson that still posed as true accounts.¹⁷ In 1808 Loudon published *A Selection of Some of the Most Interesting Narratives, of Outrages Committed by the Indians, in Their Wars with the White People*, noting that some of the stories contained in the volume had not previously been published. As the title proclaimed, Loudon was not at all bashful about his purpose, which was to insist that the Indians were not the primitive innocents of “Jean Jacques Rousseau’s, and other rhapsodies,” but were “even worse than the most ferocious wolf or panther of the forest.”¹⁸ Loudon intended to celebrate white heroes and defend the expanding American empire against its critics, although much of what he published can be read differently by those who reject his assumptions. Loudon promised another volume from what he had gathered, if public interest warranted. Apparently it did, and the Bard narrative was included in the second volume that appeared, under the same title, three years later.

Loudon now included “An Account of the Captivity of RICHARD BARD, Esquire, late of Franklin County, deceased, with his wife and family and others. Collected from his papers by his son ARCHIBALD BARD.” For a publication dedicated to proving the savagery of the Indians, the middle-aged son had assembled a detailed account of his parents’ captivities, which had ended five years before he had been born. Archibald would have learned about these fascinating events from his mother, who lived until the book was published, and from his father’s papers, which have not survived.¹⁹ These records may not have included either the initial newspaper account or Richard’s legal affirmation, and they would not have included Holland’s report of the Conaughy interview.

In this—now the fifth—account, Archibald Bard identifies Thomas Potter as kin of Katherine Bard and a militia lieutenant. Potter now is said

¹⁷ Isaac Stewart’s fantasy, “A True and Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Captivity and Remarkable Deliverance of Captain Isaac Stewart,” was first printed in *A True and Wonderful Narrative of the Surprising Captivity and Remarkable Deliverance of Mrs. Frances Scott* (Boston, 1786). Peter Williamson’s *French and Indian Cruelty: Exemplified in the Life and Various Vicissitudes of Fortune, of Peter Williamson*, first appeared in York, England, in 1757.

¹⁸ Preface to Loudon, *Selection*, 1:iii–vii. Quotes vi, v.

¹⁹ Archibald’s account may have been submitted in 1808. Katherine Bard died at age seventy-four on August 31, 1811. Biographical information for Richard Bard accessed Mar. 15, 2009, <http://www.familysearch.org>. Record no longer available.

to have grabbed a cutlass from an Indian, intending to kill his attacker, but to have succeeded only in using it to cut off its owner's fingers. Richard Bard is portrayed as having attempted to use un-Quakerly violence with a "horseman's pistol," which misfired. The initial resistance, Archibald Bard writes, drove the surprised Delawares out, and the door was secured. In this version, the negotiations to save lives occur while the Delawares are back outside, after the defenders realize that they had no powder or ball and that the woodpiles around the walls of this thatched sawmill could easily be set alight, as was done after the captures. In this retelling, the infant tomahawked soon after capture is not Archibald's older brother, as his father had testified, but an unnamed child who had come with Thomas Potter. It is noted that Samuel Hunter was killed after the flight from a pursuit party, but there is no mention here of his inability to keep up. The killing is terror without explanation: "they reached the top of the Tuskarora mountain, and had all sat down to rest, when an Indian, without any previous warning, sunk a tomahawk into the forehead of Samuel Hunter, who was seated by my father."²⁰

Archibald Bard's account seems deliberately constructed to answer what may have been a nagging family question of why Richard left his beloved wife captive among supposedly murderous Delawares to escape by himself. Archibald is the first to claim that his father had been beaten mercilessly with a gun on the third day of captivity and "almost disabled from travelling any further." This intensifying of the reported brutality does not help much; it only aggravates the charge of deserting his wife amid seeming brutes. In another twist, Archibald writes that Richard's head was shaven and painted half red and half black, thought to indicate a council divided on his survival. According to Archibald, his captive parents were permitted to pluck a wild turkey together, during which "the design of escaping was communicated to my mother."²¹ As he tells it, Ketty even helped distract the Indians later that evening when Richard escaped. Although he gained only a hundred yards before the alarm was sounded, the battered and crippled Richard managed to elude Delaware warriors, who spent two days in fruitless pursuit. The newly added details of Richard attempting to use a pistol, being beaten with a gun, having his head painted, and conspiring with his wife may have come from lines of

²⁰ Loudon, *Selection*, 2:59.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 2:59–60.

Richard's verse that were not printed, from later retellings by Richard or Ketty, or from Archibald Bard's own efforts to disguise his Quaker origins or make a good story even better.

Archibald Bard's narrative provides the only surviving account of his mother's much longer captivity. He writes that Ketty and the other surviving prisoners were taken to Fort Duquesne, to a nearby town where she was severely beaten, and then on to Kuskusky. There she and even the child captives supposedly were beaten and had their hair pulled and faces scratched. Ketty did not see the fatal torture of Daniel McMenomy (McManimy), the second laborer captured before the family's negotiated surrender, but Bard joins in the spirit of Loudon's volume by providing details of McMenomy being beaten, tied to a stake, scalped, and tortured with red-hot gun barrels and bayonets. Ketty had supposedly gathered these gruesome details later, perhaps in circumstances that included her being warned not to attempt to escape. Amid her own initial terror, Ketty was reassured by another captive that the belt of wampum put around Ketty's neck meant that she would be adopted. Although adopted and well treated, Ketty may have later complained, as her son recalled, about fatiguing travel, boiled corn, and sleeping on the ground. She saw the scalped and unburied body of one dead captive who had tried to escape, and she criticized a captured acquaintance for marrying a Delaware and bearing his child. The supposed reply was that once they knew the Delaware language, captive women had to marry one of the Delaware or die. Archibald preserves his mother's virtue and white identity by implausibly insisting that she learned no Delaware whatsoever in the two years and five months of her captivity. He offers very little about his mother's memories of that time, and we cannot tell whether the reticence was hers, his, or a mixture of the two. For all of that, Archibald repeats the familiar chorus of so many captivity narratives: "She was treated during this time, by her adopted relations with much kindness; even more than she had reason to expect."²²

The Bard family remembrance then shifts to Richard's persistent preoccupation with ransoming Ketty. Richard travelled to Fort Pitt, where in vain he asked returning captives about Ketty and was warned that his own escape had marked him for death if he ever ventured west to inquire further or negotiate. His verses of 1760 insisted:

²² Ibid., 2:63.

Were all things of this spacious globe
 Offered to ease my mind,
 Alas! all would abortive prove
 Whilst Ketty is confined.²³

The family memoir emphasizes that Richard went on to risk his life in venturing westward with a party of Delaware negotiators, led by Coquetagehton (White Eyes), who were drinking too much whiskey and soon attempted to murder him.²⁴ Richard fled, but had evidently learned where Ketty was being held.

The ransom of Ketty Bard began with Richard somehow sending a letter promising to pay an extravagant forty pounds ransom for her return.²⁵ Hearing nothing for a time, he hired an Indian to help her to escape, but that person had second thoughts and declined the task. Richard then went to Shamokin himself and headed west, more likely by previous arrangement than by chance. He soon met a party, led by Delaware John James, bringing Ketty and members of her adoptive family with them.²⁶ Richard's proposal, that they all proceed to Fort Augusta, where he had prudently left the ransom money, was understandably rejected. Richard then offered to stay with James's party as a hostage while Ketty went to the fort and brought the ransom money. This arrangement was accepted, and the ransom was apparently completed in good humor. The tensions and distrust evident here, as well as the number of coincidences involved, help us in understanding why this was the only successful private ransom achieved in the region during the effective truce between 1758 and 1762.²⁷ The Bards apparently rebuilt their life

²³ Ibid., 2:70.

²⁴ Ibid., 2:63–72.

²⁵ This amount, about £25.7.6. sterling, was the second highest of sixteen known ransom prices paid in this region between 1745 and 1765.

²⁶ In his letter to Israel Pemberton of April 16, 1761, Nathaniel Holland mentions that John James brought in Katherine Bard. Vol. 4, Friendly Association for Regaining and Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures, Records of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Indian Committee, microfilm 824, reel 11.

²⁷ While the British army leaders denounced ransom, the army paid for expensive gifts given to Indians attending frequent conferences with Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs George Croghan between 1758 and 1762. Indians brought in at least seven hundred captives as their part of these gift exchanges, creating a ransom system that neither officers nor sachems wanted to describe as such. See George Croghan, "George Croghan's Journal, April 3, 1759, to April [30], 1763," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 71 (1947): 305–444. For the well-funded and organized Quaker efforts, which freed a few captives, see Friendly Association for Regaining and

successfully and went on to have ten more children, including Archibald.²⁸

In his narrative, Archibald adds what at first seems a sensitive and engaging sequel. In a parting gesture, he tells us, Richard invited Ketty's adoptive Delaware brother to visit them "if ever he came down amongst the white people." This brother later (probably in 1762) came for an extended visit during which he once accompanied Richard to a tavern, where they both "became somewhat intoxicated." Indians and whites still drank together in taverns after the war, though we learn of it only through accounts of inebriated violence that sometimes followed.²⁹ According to Archibald, a man named Newgen, a villain later executed at Carlisle for horse stealing, attacked the Delaware visitor in the tavern, leaving him with a serious knife wound in the throat. Newgen fled to escape "the law [that] would have been put in force against him." The Delaware's wound was "sowed up" by a surgeon, and the man stayed with the Bards until he recovered. Likely during the Anglo-Indian war of 1763–64, this unnamed Delaware "returned to his own people who put him to death, on the pretext of his having as they said joined the white people."³⁰

In case this conclusion would not completely satisfy the purposes of Loudon and his readers, Archibald Bard adds an unrelated concluding paragraph. He ends his family's account with the notorious killings of schoolmaster Enoch Brown and nine (ten, according to Archibald) of his pupils in Cumberland County in 1764 based on the weak narrative link that Archibald's father had seen a party set out in unsuccessful pursuit of the killers.³¹

The surviving pieces of the Bard story are reminders that captives could misread evidence, exaggerate, forget, and remember differently at

Preserving Peace with the Indians by Pacific Measures, Records of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting Indian Committee, microfilm 824, reel 10; Thayer, "Friendly Association"; and Daiutolo, "Role of Quakers."

²⁸ The ten children were born between 1762 and 1778. Richard died at age sixty-three in Fairfield, where he had been born. Biographical information for Richard Bard accessed Mar. 15, 2009, <http://www.familysearch.org>. Record no longer available.

²⁹ Loudon, *Selection*, 2:73–74. In 1761 Tom Quick killed and robbed an Indian named Maudlin after they drank and threatened each other in a New Jersey tavern near the forks of the Delaware. Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York, 2007), 126–27.

³⁰ Loudon, *Selection*, 2:74.

³¹ *Pennsylvania Gazette*, Aug. 9 and 30, 1764; *New York Mercury*, Aug. 13, 1764; C. Hale Sipe, *The Indian Wars of Pennsylvania* (Harrisburg, PA, 1929), 473–74.

different times. Those who reported their stories could do the same, and editors could prompt, shorten, or alter accounts to support the war effort. A Quaker interviewer could gather evidence that supported Quaker interpretations. Half a century later, a dutiful son could retell the story to emphasize the brutality and fear he thought justified a man leaving his wife in a frightful captivity. Richard had certainly been more troubled by his escape than was his son. Archibald devoted much more attention to his father's 5-day captivity than to the 977 days of his mother's captivity, which would have been of more interest to readers then and now. Archibald Bard, caught in his time and circumstances, was probably anxious to exonerate his father and avoid the culturally compromising story of his mother's years in a Delaware family where she was treated well enough to have at least one enduring personal connection. The narrative that was not the work of either of his captive parents is the only one that has been readily available ever since.

The remembering, forgetting, or inventing by captives, their descendants, and others can be accidental or deliberate. Accounts assembled half a century after the events, even in the celebrated cases of James Smith and Mary Jemison, were colored by intervening events and changing attitudes. Scholars interested in the immense popularity of captivity narratives as American "instruments of cultural self-definition" are right in claiming that such popularity went far beyond any desire to know what actually happened to captives.³² Those dispossessing the Indians and confining them as captives on reservations found some justification in the earlier suffering of white captives. In that context, the challenging task of sorting the authentic from the invented is seen as both impossible and unnecessary; the tales told had much more power than the true events. Historians, in search of what did happen, rightly want to begin by parsing what the captives themselves chose to tell at the time, while recognizing that their stories and those of their families were purposeful and that those purposes varied and changed over time.

Western University, Emeritus

IAN K. STEELE

³² The phrase is from Jane Tompkins, *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790–1860* (New York, 1985), xvi.