CAPTIVES OF THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WARS 1676-1763: ENGLISH SLAVERY IN CANADA

By

Elaine L. Letki, B.A.
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania

A Thesis Submitted in Partial fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in History
To the Office of Graduate and Extended Studies of
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania

December 14, 2019

SIGNATURE/APPROVAL PAGE

The signed approval page for this thesis was intentionally removed from the online copy by an authorized administrator at Kemp Library.

The final approved signature page for this thesis is on file with the Office of Graduate and Extended Studies. Please contact Theses@esu.edu with any questions.

ABSTRACT

A Thesis submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in History to the Office of Graduate and Extended Studies of
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania

Student's Name: Elaine L. Letki

Title: Captives of the French and Indian Wars 1676-1763: English Slavery in Canada

Date of Graduation: December 14, 2019

Thesis Chair: Dr. Michael Gray, Ph.D.

Thesis Member: Dr. Shannon Frystak, Ph.D.

Abstract

The work necessary to develop New France into a viable colony during the 17th and 18th centuries posed a significant challenge to France and to seigneurs who received land grants in North America. Various strategies to increase the population and workforce of New France failed. At the same time, French and native militaristic raids produced a steady stream of English captives between 1675 and 1763 who were purchased and forced preform difficult labors.

Native tribes learned that the selling of captives was a lucrative business. It is well documented that the natives kept slaves and literature on the subject has applied that characterization correctly. Equivalent labor and lifestyle demands made of native slaves were required of many English kept by the French; however, the classification of slave for those people has never been fully recognized. The correct historical conclusion from an analysis of a wide range of sources is that the French kept English slaves in 17th and 18th century Canada.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest appreciation for the outstanding instruction and guidance from all of my professors at East Stroudsburg University. A great debt is owed to my thesis committee, Dr. Michael Gray and Dr. Shannon Frystak for their outstanding critical analysis and editing of my work. Dr. Gray's unwavering support for my research on the topic of slavery in Canada gave me the confidence to pursue it. I would like to thank Susan Bachor who advised me from the native people's point of view. I am grateful to the professors in the Genealogical Research department at Boston University who helped me begin my research with repository documentation.

There are not enough words of thanks to give my parents who always sacrificed for and supported my education. John and Claire Conlin not only monetarily invested in my traditional instruction but continually made learning part of my life outside of the walls of academia. The ability to write this thesis would not be possible without the support of my family. Alexandra and Stephanie supported me, carried my books when I could not, and edited my work at home. Every step I have taken academically, they have been there with me. I want to thank Christian for his patience and understanding waiting for me to finish one of my dreams.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES..iv

INTRODUCTION..v

I. POPULATION PROBLEMS IN NEW FRANCE 1628-1763: THE NEED FOR LABOR..1

II. THE TRIANGULATION OF FRENCH MILITARY, RELIGIOUS, AND ECONOMIC STRATEGIES: 1676-1763..24

III. ENGLISH CAPTIVITY, REDEMPTION, AND SLAVERY: 1676-1763..53

APPENDIX...76

BIBLIOGRAPHY..78

List of Figures

Figure

1. Fort Niagara Main Building……………………..……………………………76

2. Ensign John Sheldon's front door after the Deefield, Massachusetts attack 1704……………………..………………………………………………77

INTRODUCTION

For thousands of years, civilizations supplemented their slave populations to complete extensive public works projects that demanded enormous human effort. The Chinese added slaves for construction of the Great Wall of China and the building of their Grand Canal.[1] Similarly, plantation owners in the American South used millions of slaves of African descent during the 18th and 19th century to facilitate the agricultural industries. Comparative labor needs confronted the first colonists of New France as they struggled to develop territory north of the St. Lawrence River. Exhaustive endeavors such as clearing the rocky and frozen landscape proved to be unattainable without additional workers.

Quebecois people had previously relied heavily on indentured servants from France to preform necessary and grueling tasks in the new colony. However, indentured Frenchmen were no longer available for service in New France because they were needed

[1] Pamela Kyle Crossley, "Slavery in Early Modern China," in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, ed. Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 190, accessed October 15, 2016, http://www.cambridge.org.

as soldiers for European wars fought during the late 17th and early18th centuries. To meet the demands required to establish their colony, early French Canadian settlers purchased citizens of the English colonies who had been captured forcibly during the French and Indian wars.[2]

English who were seized by the natives and taken captive were forced to travel hundreds of miles in the wilderness. Many prisoners made this journey in the middle of winter, walking through snow that was as high as an adult's knees. Native culture demanded tremendous physical endurance, the ability to adapt to harsh outdoor exposure, and a diet of primitive, indigestible food. Adjusting quickly to a much different lifestyle proved to be too challenging for many captives and thus they were killed. The threat of death was omnipresent; being burned alive, tortured, or hit with a weapon threatened the captives at every moment.

Reverend John Williams chronicled such horrors that occurred during Queen Anne's War, 1703-1713 in, *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion*. Williams stated that prisoners who could not keep up the rapid pace of the group were immediately and brutally killed.[3] Mary Rowlandson also detailed her hardships during King Philip's War 1675-1676 in, *The Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*.[4] Similar captivity experiences of Williams and Rowlandson were echoed by William Pote in, *The Journal of Captain William Pote Jr.* written about his captivity during King

---

[2] Peter Moogk, "Reluctant Exiles: Emigrants from France in Canada before 1760," *William and Mary Quarterly* 46, no.3 (July 1989): 463-505, accessed September 23, 2016, http://www.jstor.org.

[3] John Williams, *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966), 17-22.

[4] Mary Rowlandson, *The Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930), 21.

George's War 1744-1748. Mary Jemison revealed a lifetime of painful hardships in, *A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison*. Mary spent most of her life with the Seneca Indians after her capture from western Pennsylvania in 1758.[5] All of the captives' journals and narratives provide a valuable first-hand account into the day to day events of forced imprisonment.

In 1925 photographer and researcher Emma Lewis Coleman wrote a comprehensive history, *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760: During the French and Indian Wars*. Coleman worked with historian Charlotte Alice Baker who published, *True Stories of New England Captives Carried to Canada During the Old French and Indian Wars*. Both Coleman and Baker's works are dated, but contain valuable primary documents such as letters from captives to their families, governmental correspondence concerning English citizens in New France, and religious papers recorded during the French and Indian wars. Coleman's text is cited as a source in virtually every other monograph on the subject of English captivity and the French and Indian wars. Coleman emphasized that vulnerable young English children were targeted because they were easily naturalized. The adoption, renaming, and deracination process occurred without consent of the captives' families and while they were actively seeking their family member's return through diplomatic channels.[6]

---

[5] William Pote, *The Journal of Captain William Pote, Jr. During His Captivity in the French and Indian War From May 1745 to August 1747* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1895); James E. Seaver, *A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992; Seaver, *A Narrative*, xiii.

[6] Emma Lewis Coleman, *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars* (Portland: The Southworth Press, 1925); Charlotte Alice Baker, *New England Captives Carried to Canada During the Old French and Indian Wars* (Greenfield: E. A. Hall & Co., 1897).

Similiarly, historian Daniel K. Richter wrote in "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience." Richter chronicles the complex mourning process of the Iroquois in which English captives played a critical role. During cultural ceremonies, the Natives of the Iroquois Confederacy took captives as part of a ritual experience. Richter emphasized that it was the native women who made decisions concerning captives because prisoners kept by the indigenous peoples would be relegated to subservient work, which native females were in charge of. English "adoptees" or slaves would no longer be put in the position of doing "men's" work even if the adoptee was a man. Emasculation steps were taken such as removing the English man's fingers used to shoot a gun or pull a bow to ensure that the adopted man would never again do man's work. Richter also explained that captives who did not make a sincere effort to assimilate and did not please the female Iroquois were ritually executed.[7]

Eric B. Schultz sought to interpret the events leading up to the first Indian War 1675-1676, in *King Philip's War: The History and Legacy of America's Forgotten Conflict*. Schultz's text interpreted King Philip's War differently than other works such as authors Emma Lewis Coleman and Charlotte Alice Baker. Schultz's research concentrates on how the natives suffered during King Philip's War rather than on the struggles of the English that they took captive. Schultz used the word "kidnapped" in his interpretation instead of "captive," which is misleading in that it implies that a ransom for all prisoners could resolve the issue which was simply untrue. "Captivity" has been used in virtually every other primary and secondary work involving the subject of forcibly taking and retaining the English prisoners. The French and Indians released English

---

[7] Daniel K. Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 1983): 528-559, accessed March 10, 2016, .http://www.ebscohost.com.

captives to other English, yet for only for high ransom payments. Contrary to the term "kidnapping" which Schultz chooses, he stated that more often than not money French paid to natives to buy the English were to be used to build a workforce, not to free them.[8]

Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney focused exclusively on the raid of Deerfield, Massachusetts in *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield.* Haefeli and Sweeney examined the different rules for war prisoners between the English, French, and Native sides in Queen Anne's War, King Philip's War, and King William's War. The most significant difference they feared was that English military only seized French soldiers, privateers, and war leaders, not French civilians. French military men and natives took English soldiers and thousands of English civilians. Further complicating the issue, English government officials had no incentive to exchange French military men for English civilian captives. According to Haefeli and Sweeny, the British colonial government was not motivated to release French soldiers in exchange for English civilians that were of no use fighting the war. In fact, just one English emissary was sent to French Canada to seek the return of civilians during all nine years of Queen Anne's War. The authors also evaluated the issue of French claims that many captives had converted voluntarily, substantiating Coleman's assertion that many conversions were forced and both Catholic baptism and marriage to French citizens made the English captives ineligible for return to New England under any circumstances.[9]

William Henry Foster wrote *The Captors' Narrative: Catholic Women and their Puritan Men on the Early American Frontier* in 2003. Foster agreed with the research

---

[8] Eric B. Schultz, *King Philip's War: The History and Legacy of America's Forgotten Conflict* (Woodstock: The Countryman Press, 1999), 1-55.

[9] Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeny, *Captors and Captives The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); Haefeli, Captors and Captives, 164-165.

done by author Daniel Richter. Foster's monograph provides unique and valuable perspective of not only the natives,' but also the French captors' justifications for converting and enslaving English captives. Foster discussed the role that both French and native women had in the captive process. Purchasing prisoners marketed by the natives was the responsibility of French women; the authority to choose the laborers was one that Quebecois and native women had in common. Foster emphasized the domestic farming economy in Canada as extremely physical, demanding work and explained that the French colonists could no longer rely on indentured servants to help with this work.[10] The ultimate goal however, was to make the captive English permanent settlers in Canada and a working, contributing part of French Canadian culture. To achieve this goal Foster agreed with others who argue that religious conversion, and eventually marriage to a French citizen, was necessary according to Foster. Many English captives were sold into a lifetime of servitude on the open market and under no circumstances did redeeming an English captive by a French settler mean freedom for that captive. Foster states, "French Canadians did not hesitate to subject newly arrived English captives to the fully array of cruelties otherwise reserved for enslaved Africans, Great Lakes, and Prairie Natives."[11]

Similiarily, Marcel Trudel in *Canada's Forgotten Slaves*, argues that African slaves and native slaves were kept by the French to fulfill labor shortage needs, but there were not enough available to make an impact on the development of the French colony. English captives were also available and in greater numbers. The English prisoners that were purchased for sale on the open market in Montreal were kept by the French in the

---

[10] William Henry Foster, *The Captors' Narrative: Catholic Women and Their Puritan Men on the Early American Frontier* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 2-3.

[11] Ibid., 15-16.

same manner as the African and native slaves. Trudel argues that, "All prisoners captured by Ameridians were slaves, that was, after all, the reason they were captured."[12]

In "Rewriting the Captivity Narrative for Contemporary Children: Speare, Bruchac, and the French and Indian War," Sara Schwebel examines the subject of English captivity during the last French and Indian War 1754-1763 in 20th and 21st century literature.[13] The author interpreted that by 2011 the horrific atrocities inflicted upon the English captives had been deceptively minimized to become the subject for a children's story. First person captivity narratives were widely read in the 18th and 19th centuries because issues with the Indian populations in America were still current events. Those journals and narratives are not widely read in the 20th and 21st centuries because issues with the natives are no longer current events. Schwebel reasoned that fictional English captive narratives such as James Fenimore Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans* and children's stories such as Elizabeth George Speare's *Calico Captive* became some of the most widely read books on the subject and left the reader with a romanticized or false understanding of historical events.[14]

Historiography on the subject of English captivity during the French and Indian wars has varied in interpretation through the years. Evidence provided by both primary and secondary sources reveal that the French colonists purchased captives from the indigenous people for the same reasons the natives kept prisoners to fill a void in their households and communities. Families and communities struggled with the costs

---

[12] Marcel Trudel, *Canada's Forgotten Slaves* (Montreal: Vehicule Press, 2009), 159.

[13] Sara L. Schwebel, "Rewriting the Captivity Narrative for Contemporary Children: Speare, Bruchac, and the French and Indian War," *New England Quarterly* 84, no. 2 (June 2011): 318-346, accessed March 10, 2016, http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.

[14] Ibid., 18-319.

involved in redeeming loved ones sold by the natives. Impoverished English frontier settlers without resources or connections had little hope of regaining custody of their loved ones if redemption was even a possibility. Captivity for some meant forced migration and conversion, loss of name, language, religion, heritage, and a lifetime of servitude.

CHAPTER 1

POPULATION PROBLEMS IN NEW FRANCE 1628-1763: THE NEED FOR LABOR

King Louis XIII of France granted a charter and patents of nobility to French men of rank in 1628. New nobility were granted land known as seigneuries in the colony of New France became known as the Company of One Hundred Associates. Cardinal Armand Jean du Plessis, Duke of Richelieu designed the Company as a system of land distribution and investment to develop the newly founded colony. The Company of One Hundred Associates ceased to exist in 1632 and became known as the Compagnie des Habitants, however the original Associates retained lands that they had been granted in the French North American colony.[1] Land owners and subsequently their heirs were guaranteed by the King of France enjoyment of the same privileges of those land grants and rents paid. Perpetual privileges in the fur trade of New France were also granted to seigneurs and their heirs for fifteen years as well as all other commerce with the exception of cod and whale fisheries. The seigneurial land distribution system in New

[1] "Extract from Charter of the Company of One Hundred Associates, April 29, 1627,"ed. William Munro, *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1627*, (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1908), 3-4; "Royal Decree Accepting the Surrender of all Rights held by the Company of One Hundred Associates, March, 1663," ed. William Munro, *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1854* (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1908), 10-12.

France which gave large tracts of eastern Canadian territory to wealthy Frenchmen required in return that the land be occupied by tenants. Land occupants cleared and farmed sections of seigneurial tracts, paid rents and taxes to the seigneur. Early Quebec land organization was commensurable to the feudal system of land ownership that had existed for centuries in Europe. The salient features of land tenure were continuous between France and their North American territories, using political land centralization with King Louis XIV in the position of absolute power.[2]

During the seventeenth century, approximately 220 seigneuries were divided amongst various men of military, religious, administrative, and new noblemen who were landless in France, but were granted land in New France. Land allocations ran north to south with each one ending at the St. Lawrence River, the only highway allowing travel access beyond the colony to each parcel. The developing colony had various struggles to overcome, most notable were attracting colonists. Primarily, the problems the colony experienced were due to colonization the prolonged bitterly cold climate in Quebec as well as the rocky land structure, which was difficult to clear. Soils in many smaller seigneuries had poorly drained property filled with swamps and sandy soils void of necessary nutrients for cultivation. Colonists could rely on hunting, but fishing was not allowed and the scarcity of food forced many to go without enough to eat before the soil produced crops to sustain their families. The St. Lawrence River also froze seasonally

---

[2] James Douglas, *Old France in the New World: Quebec in the Seventeenth Century* (London: The Burrows Brothers Company, 1906), 16-17.

closing the only port in New France, and further isolating the colonists during long winters; cutting off food supplies that moved along the river route in good weather.[3]

Able-bodied colonists and prospective additions to the work force in New France were valuable commodities. Finding men and women willing to leave the mild and amenable landscape of France to settle in the Quebec wilderness proved to be significant for both the seigneuries and the French government because there was little enthusiasm for settling in a territory that was desolate and difficult. Explorer Jacques Cartier referred to the French North American territory in his 15th century journal as "Cain's land," inferring that the land was so isolated and harsh that God had exiled Cain from paradise to Quebec, a place where nobody wanted to live. King Louis XIII and Louis XIV sent hundreds of undesirable French citizens to Quebec including indentured servants and orphaned children to expand the population of Quebec and work the seigneurial lands but the effort did not have the desired effect on enumerating the colony. New France desperately needed a work force to keep its colony growing and productive which meant using any type of labor available, including the English men, women, and children forcibly taken captive during the French and Indian wars. Economic and political dependency were intertwined for most of the seigneuries as France created a "parent" state that supported the fledgling colony and safeguarded its stability. The network of French seigneurs, their wives, and the religious and political hierarchy of the colony

---

[3] Richard Colebrook Harris, *The Seigneurial System in Early Canada: A Geographical Study* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), 33; Frances Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century: France and England in North America* (Williamstown: Corner House Publishers, 1970), 248-249.

became the buyers and "godparents" of converted English Protestants, facilitating the forced naturalization and retention of many English.[4]

The French regime was significantly concerned in the early part of the seventeenth century that Quebec was not colonizing as it should be and ideas to remedy the situation were immediately prepared by Louis XIV and French Minister of Finances Jean Baptiste Colbert. The Company of One Hundred had been given a treaty by King Louis XIII of France to operate business and make investments in the colony. Learning that the country had not been progressively populating considering the almost one hundred years of its existence, Colbert declared,

> We have recognized with regret that not only the number of inhabitants is very small but that they are every day in danger of being driven out by the Iroquois. Recognizing besides that this company of one hundred men is nearly extinct owing to the voluntary retirement of a great number, and that the few remaining are not powerful enough to maintain this country by sending forces and men necessary to swell and defend it.[5]

Seigneur of Boucherville, Pierre Boucher, sent a letter on 8 October 1663 to the French Minister Colbert and travelled to France in 1662 to address the population problem directly; Quebec remained inadequately populated. Boucher spoke to the Minister about the harsh climate and the fact that horses, which were in short supply due to recent wars in Europe, would be necessary to till the soil. The landscape of New France was extremely craggy and the numbers of workers available to remove the rocks were so few that a workforce that included animals was absolutely necessary. A dispatch from Jean Talon the First Intendent of New France to the French Minister Jean Baptiste Colbert

[4] The Canadian Encyclopedia, s.v. "Land God Gave to Cain", Last Edited March 07, 2014, accessed June 10, 2019, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca; William Henry Atherton, *Montreal Under the French Regime* 1535-1760 (Montreal: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1914), 40-42.

[5] Atherton, *Montreal*, 154-155.

concerning the progress of the colonial settlement expressed concern that the sparse population was unable to sufficiently cultivate the land, much less defend itself against a possible Iroquois attack. Talon's strategy was to blend soldiers and as many able bodied individuals together in the seigneurial tracts so that they would teach each other. Training the small population of Quebec to balance their abilities beneficially for the colony as a whole would put less responsibility on the King of France financially to send aid and French citizens to New France.[6]

The list of names of the seigneurs is synonymous with that of many of the parishes constructed in the districts of Quebec. Few seigneurs were exceedingly wealthy and most could not fulfill the double condition of providing a village mill and church. Many seigneurs were noble in name only, having been granted their lands for a nominal sum in return for fealty and homage. New nobles had to work hard to clear the land of trees and stone within the limited time frame of six months or else forfeit them. Not many owners had the capital to acquire a workforce large enough to work the sizeable sections of territory. To make a claim permanent a seigneur had to subdivide his territory between the few cultivators available who tilled that land and paid him rents. Each land owner was required by the terms of his grant not only to build a mill and a church, but also pay a priest and a miller adding to the financial burden of each seigneur.[7]

---

[6] "Despatch of Talon to the Minister Concerning the Progress of the Colonial Settlement, October 27, 1667," ed. William Munro, *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 158-1854* (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1908), 28-30.

[7] "Title-Deed of Seigneury of Beauport granted to Robert Giffard, January 15, 1634," ed. William Munro, *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1854* (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1908), 7-9; Thomas Guerin, Temple *Feudal Canada: The Story of the Seigneuries of New France* (Montreal: Steven Books, 1926), 34.

In 1675 complaints arose from land owners that tenants on seigneurial lands were not clearing territory or building homes, putting the advancement of the colony in jeopardy. However, adjoining lands, which had already been cleared and tilled, became unproductive as shadows cast from uncleared trees spoiled the vegetation growth on cleared land where crops had been planted. Colonization was considered an "outstanding failure" in New France. Failure to develop the colony or the population of the colony satisfactorily was attributed to the fact that land had been granted to absentee nobles and favorites who had no interest in developing their foreign territory. All settlement attempts had been inadequate as of 1662 and the King of France was very anxious to remedy the situation. Efforts to encourage permanent population increases were redoubled. French girls barely in their teens were pulled from orphanages and sent to Quebec to marry and add to the residents of the colony; unattached soldiers were ordered to marry one of the orphaned girls within fifteen days of their arrival in the port of New France. Frequently, marriage ceremonies were conducted thirty at a time to expedite the process. From 1669 to 1672 the King of France sent French military adding to the number of soldiers that had been sent in 1671 and 1672. In 1673 the official report of Governor Frontenac claimed a population of only 6,705, considerably less than expected compared to the colonies in America, causing the French Minister to express displeasure with the results. French census reporters documented a population of only 7,833 in 1675 and led to the conclusion that the returns on colonization efforts were still too deficient. Clearly the myriad of individuals sent by the French government to the colony were not strong, able bodied men and women suitable to withstand the environment they would encounter in the New World. For example, France sent 4,312 citizens to Canada in 1667; only 1,566 of whom

were capable of bearing arms in defense of the colony and a mere 88 men were single and available for marriage.[8]

Although the population had grown to approximately 20,000 inhabitants of New France by 1715, the division of the Canadian population noted a great preponderance of the population lived on seigneuries that had towns and thousands more lived on the more important seigneuries. Only eight thousand individuals were spread between the 180 less important seigneuries which if mathematically divided equally, meant there would have been only 7 to 8 families available to settle, farm, and pay rents on each of the other seigneuries. New France needed an influx of people if it intended to be successful because the Quebecois people were not filling that need and the enduring population problem would ensure that the colony was a failure.[9]

The labor problem led to great hardships for New France as there were not enough bodies to do the work necessary for the colony to be successful. Governor Louis de Baude de Frontenac reported the desperate need for a workforce,

> What with fighting and hardship, our troops and militia are wasting away. The Enemy is upon us by sea and by land. Send us a thousand men by next Spring, If You want the country to be saved. We are perishing by inches; the people are in the
> depth of poverty; the war had doubled prices, so that nobody can live; many families are without bread. The inhabitants desert the country and crowd the cities.[10]

Seigneurs anxious to clear their land and fulfill their obligations necessary to maintain both title and lands became "godparents" to thousands of English prisoners brought and sold in Quebec during the French and Indian wars. Captives provided a workforce that

---

[8] Douglas, *Old France in the New World*, 380-381; Atherton, Montreal, 175-179.

[9] Harris, *The Seigneurial System in Early Canada*, 35.

[10] Atherton, *Montreal*, 186- 246.

the property owners in the French colony were desperate to acquire. The greatest resource that noble seigneurs had at their disposal was war, which was used to raid and loot the American frontier. Native warriors arriving in Quebec with captured men, women, and children encountered crowds of Montreal wealthy that were eager to inspect and purchase the various humans available for sale. Children were especially valuable because they were alone, easily exploited, and vulnerable making religious conversion and, subsequent release of prior identity, easier. The only protection from living under the threat of Indian treatment for the captured English was to stay in the good favor of their French purchasers and in a French home. Religious conversion and a life of perpetual servitude would have been preferable to what many young prisoners had witnessed during their forced migration at the hands of the natives. Captives were routinely exposed to violent tortures, beatings, and deaths of both relatives and neighbors. Many were forced to endure a gauntlet of beatings, weak or sick migrators were slaughtered because they were no longer valuable to the natives. The possibility of being tortured or burned alive at the stake was also very real.[11]

Once captives from the English colonies had been stripped of their Protestant heritage, given a Catholic baptism and renamed in the French style, the Quebec government claimed them as their own naturalized citizens. French leadership refused to turn its naturalized citizens over to the English government and return them to the British colonies in America. Unredeemed English men, women, and children thus became the workforce the colony desperately needed as well as colonizers of a territory that not even

[11] "Royal Arret Concerning Seigniorial Mills, June 4, 1686, " ed. William Munro, *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1854* (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1908), 61-62; Haefeli and Sweeney, *Captors and Captives*, 151.

the French wanted to settle. Additionally, seigneurs had been granted the right to lower, middle, and upper justice in all cases that were not already specified in the rules and regulations of the "Coutume de Paris." Land owners held the power to impose fines, create order, decide guilt, and imprison those that they wished, allowing the judicial ability to retain captives they had purchased. Prominent Quebecois whose investments and fortunes depended on the success of the fledgling colony became the "godparents" to its newest settlers and workforce ensuring population growth through forced migration and citizenship.[12]

Jacques LeBer de Sennenville, a prominent seigneurial landowner and fur trader became a key figure in the development of the French colony in North America using his wealth and influence during the early French and Indian wars. An edict presented by the French King in 1715 had suppressed all titles accorded after 1689 which put the title of nobility granted to Jacques LeBer in 1696 at risk. Services of merit were required from the seigneur and his sons during the 17th and 18th century wars to retain that title. The Seigneur de Sennenville participated in a military assault in 1693 designed to claim dominance and ownership of land integral to the beaver fur trade that LeBer was heavily invested in. By the late 17th century the landowner and trader had become one of the wealthiest businessmen in Quebec.[13] LeBer protected his investment, added to his workforce, and paid service to his King by utilizing the stolen workforce sold to him by the natives. Seigneur de Sennenville was documented on many 17th century and early 18th century Canadian Catholic baptismal records as the godfather of English prisoners

[12] Guerin, *Feudal Canada*, 85-115.

[13] Atherton, Montreal, 343; Yves Zoltvany, "Jacques LeBer," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol.2 (1982): accessed: 3 January, 2019, http://www.biographi.ca.

brought to New France and subsequently stripped of their heritage through religious ceremony. For example, Anne Batson and her children, taken during a French and Indian raid in 1721 from Cape Porpoise, Massachusetts Bay Colony were brought to Quebec and purchased from the natives. Batson's three children were presented in baptism by other prominent and influential men and women in New France although it was noted on their baptismal records that Anne Batson could not write and therefore could not sign her consent for their baptism and subsequent renaming. Batson was presented for baptism and renaming by her godfather Jacques LeBer and godmother Marguerite Pascaud the wife of Antoine Pascaud, another wealthy merchant and trader in Quebec. Anne's baptismal record curiously contains her signature although it had been previously noted on her children's baptismal records that she was unable to give written permission for baptism because she could not write. The Batson children were renamed Marie Marguerite, Jean Claude, and Clement through baptism essentially erasing their English names and heritage. Clement who was born in Quebec, was first given a secular baptism immediately after birth, before being baptized Catholic, confirming that Anne Batson did not want herself or her children to become Catholic and thus French citizens. The services of godmother were also required of Dame Francoise LeMaitre de la Moille wife of Jacques LeBer who is listed on the baptismal record of Freedom French, daughter of Protestant Deacon Thomas French. Freedom was taken from a raid in Deerfield, Massachusetts, and brought to Quebec where she was renamed Marie Francoise; she would never return to her Protestant family although they continually petitioned to reclaim her.[14]

---

[14] Coleman, New England Captives, 7-9; Marie Francoise , Basilique Notre Dame (Montreal, Canada) baptism, page 5,digital images, *Quebec, Vital and Church Records Drouin Collection, 1621-1967*,

Louis-Thomas Chabert de Joncaire, also referred to as Sononchiez by the Iroquois, served as godfather to Freedom French. Joncaire who had lived among the Seneca in captivity, learned their language and thus gained their respect. The relationship that developed between the Iroquois and Joncaire put the cavalry sergeant in the unique position serving as interpreter and able to negotiate matters between the French and natives. Because of his negotiating abilities, the French were allowed to build a fort, presently known as Fort Niagara in a strategic position in Seneca territory on the Great Lakes. King Louis XV of France rewarded Joncaire by granting him command of Fort Niagara due to his assistance to France and New France. The interpreter negotiator turned commander was now personally and financially invested in the success of the French colony. Joncaire served as a godparent, which ensured the growth of the population, further securing that investment. It was during his negotiations with the natives, Joncaire gained a reputation for being an unscrupulous in his dealings. The Seneca Indians had approved a house to be built for their son Sononchiez, which is why Fort Niagara resembles a typical stone French Chateau; the military fort was disguised as a home. Religious conversions of captive individuals were just another way for Joncaire to serve both his King and further his own interests.[15]

Martha French, sister of Freedom, was eight years old when she was purchased by the Sisters of the Congregation of Notre Dame of Villemarie in Quebec. The godmother listed on the French Catholic baptismal record for Martha French was Damoiselle Marguerite Bouat Pascaud, wife of Monsieur Antoine Pascaud, an extremely wealthy

---

accessed 1 June, 2019, https://ancestry.com.

[15] Yves. F. Zoltvany, Louis-Thomas Cabert de Joncaire, *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982): accessed January 11, 2019, http://www.biographi.ca.

merchant and trader. Antoine Pascaud was integral to the founding of the Compagnie de la Colonie and the French monopoly on the beaver trade. Thus, like Joncaire, Pascaud was personally and financially invested in the success of the colony of Quebec. Marguerite Bouat Pascaud is documented as the godmother of Samuel Williams, son of Protestant Reverend John Williams, who were both taken captive in Deerfield, Massachusetts in 1701. Samuel Williams was redeemed after being with the French for years and returned to the English colonies. Free from the French, Williams revealed that his baptism was coerced; he was threatened with a whipping if he did not convert to Catholicism. English Protestant children were commonly converted through baptism without the consent of their English parents. Separated from their parents, and too young to fight conversion, children were easy victims. Parents of captive children who had been sold petitioned to regain possession of their sons and daughters but were routinely denied by the French government. For example, Mary Rawlins petitioned for the redemption of her children after an attack on Exeter, New Hampshire in 1723. Although Rawlins had petitioned to redeem her children, she was unable to secure a loan of 400 livres required for each child. A fourteen year old Rawlins male was purchased by Mr. Jeremie Bourgois, baptized and renamed Charles Guillaume. The Rawlins male now a naturalized French citizen worked as a servant in the home of Monsieur Bourgois in perpetual slavery.[16]

Merchants were not the only prestigious Quebecois who were compelled to add to the population and workforce. Louis de La Porte De Louvigny, the King's lieutenant in Canada, Captain of the French colonial troops, sub-lieutenant of the Navy, knight of the

---

[16] Williams, *The Redeemed Captive*, 64-89; Coleman, *New England Captives*, 154-156.

order of Saint Louis, and commander of the back country also served the King and his own interests by converting English citizens. Louvigny led the French troops during several incursions with the Iroquois and was a devoted to the service of New France. The military leader served as one of Governor Pierre de Rigaud, de Cavagnial, Marquis de Vaudreuil's closest advisors and helped to shape political policy. Lieutenant Louvigny is listed as the godfather on the certificates of many captives brought to Quebec such as Mary Oakman who became Marie Louise Hocman after Catholic baptism.[17] Furthermore, records reveal that French military leaders did not adhere to proper prisoner exchanges during times of peace and agreed to in both the Treaty of Ryswick and the Treaty of Utrecht.[18]

Jean Bouillet de la Chassaigne was also a military man of noble descent and married into the prestigious Le Moyne family who were similarly of noble descent. Chassaigne served as a knight of the Order of Saint-Louis, a naval sub-lieutenant, and Captain in the Regiment de Conde in command French colonial troops in Canada. The military career advancement of Jean Chassaigne was dependent upon his good favor with the King of France which made his service to the King integral to his success. Population advancement and the success of the colony was a major concern for King Louis XIV. Chassaigne signed as the godfather on the French Catholic baptismal record of dozens of English sold in Quebec.[19]

---

[17] Yves Zolwany, Louis de La Porte de Louvigny, *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol.2 (1982): accessed January 18, 2019, http://www.biographi.ca; Coleman, New England Captives, 24-25.

[18] Louis XIV, King of France, *Treaty of Utrecht* (1713), accessed March 20, 2018, http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/utrecht.

[19] Ulric Levesque, "Jean Bouillet de la Chassaigne," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982): accessed January 11, 2019, http://www.biographi.ca.

Thomas Hust, a captive taken from Deerfield, Massachusetts in 1704 was one of those sold by the natives in the Montreal town square. Hust was bought from the natives by the Gentlemen of the Seminary in Quebec when he was just a child and then naturalized through baptism. As an adult of marriageable age the Seminary released him of his work obligation to them if he agreed to a marriage with a French woman. Conditions were placed on the marriage, listed in the contract, by the religious seminarians that made Hust a prisoner in Quebec for the rest of his life. The contract stated, "On condition of his remaining in this country. For surety of which they hold a mortgage from this day on all the property, present and future of the future husband." If Hust had left New France to go back to the Massachusetts colony or to England then his lifetime work obligation to the Gentlemen of the Seminary transferred to his wife and children. The marriage contract that stated those conditions were not unique and was used as a tool to successfully keep English captives from trying to escape Quebec and return to their families in the English colonies. Essentially the mortgage on the services of Hust illustrated the commodification of captives, as they were bought and managed as a commodity, objects of economic value and not as human beings altruistically taken in to the fold of the Catholic religion and as part of French families.[20] Allowing marriage to a purchased individual made sense because the marriage would produce children who would add to the population of the colony of New France which was the primary objective.

Francois Clairambault D'Aigremont, a naval commissary and intendent of justice and finances in New France, provided a great service to King Louis XIV dealing with

[20] Coleman, *New England Captives*, 93- 94.

administration problems in Domaine d'Occident. The King of France rewarded D'Aigremont for his loyalty with an estates grant on Saint-Domingue on the Iles d'Amerique as well as Comptroller of the Marine in Canada. D'Aigremont's merit and service to the King was how he retained his title and supported his lifestyle. To further serve the King, the Comptroller became godfather to captive men, women, and children sold to Quebecois. The baptismal record of Mary Cole, the daughter of Sara Cole both taken captive in Saco, Maine contained the signature of godfather Francois Clairbault D'Aigremont. Mary Cole was renamed Marie Therese without consent of her mother Sara, who was still living in captivity in New France at the time of her children's naturalization through baptism.[21]

Charles Le Moyne de Longueil, a French baron, was granted the seigneury of Longueil by the King of France and became governor of Trois-Riveres and Montreal. The positions bestowed upon Le Moyne were due to his merit and service to King Louis XIV as soldier and interpreter during the French and Indian wars. Le Moyne had earned the respect of the Onondaga Indians, who ceremonially adopted him as part of peace negotiations with the Iroquois. Serving the French government in various ways led to the success of the Le Moyne family, whose lifestyle depended a great deal on the good favor of the French crown. Charles Le Moyne's children, Nicholas Le Moyne and Damoiselle Elizabeth Le Moyne both became godparents and marriage witnesses to captive individuals. Damoiselle Le Moyne was documented as both the godmother to Elizabeth Price renamed Marie Praisse, and witness to her marriage contract. Price was purchased

---

[21] Etienne Taillemite, "Francois Clairambault D'aigremont," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982): accessed January 11, 2019; Marie Therese Cole, Basilique Notre Dame (Montreal, Canada) baptism, 1703, page 254, digital images, Quebec, *Vital and Church Records Drouin Collection*, 1621-1967, accessed May 10, 2019.

from captivity by the Sisters of the Congregation at Ville-Marie where she served the religious order until her marriage to Frenchman Jean Fourneau released her from that work obligation. Author Emma Coleman noted that the signature of Praisse on the original marriage contract appears coarse and as if it was guided by another hand.[22] Religious ceremony was used in 17th and 18th century Canada as a means to both naturalize and then trap individuals using threats of physical labor and debt to their future familial ties.

Charles Juchereau de Saint-Denys, referred to in documents as Sieur de Beaumarchais was a lieutenant and captain of colonial troops in the colony of New France. Juchereau was heavily invested in the fur trade and acquired the title of Receiver of Beaver for the Compagnie de la Colonie. The title of Receiver of Beaver and position as leader among those invested in the fur trade meant policing the trade routes along not only in Quebec, but also along the Mississippi River and other strategic trade routes including the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio Rivers for illicit trade with the English. The French wished to stop any Anglo-French contact and solidify native relations in those areas. Settlements were encouraged along frequented trade routes, spreading the French influence in those critical areas, which would ultimately become assets to the French colony. Juchereau de Saint-Denys was certainly a man of great influence in 17th century Quebec and also dependent on the favor of the King of France to retain both his titles and position. Juchereau's wife, Dame Therese Migeon served the French colony

---

[22] William Munro,"Letters-Patent Creating Barony of Longueil in Favor of Charles Le Moyne Sieur de Longueil, January 26, 1700," *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1854* (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1908), 66-69; Coleman, *New England Captives*, 114.

and her family's interests as godmother to English men, women, and children adding citizens to the population of the seigneurial lands.[23]

Etienne Rocbert de la Morandiere became the king's Garde-Magazin or store keeper in Montreal, an advantageous administrative position that paid well. Although Morandiere was not a seigneur, the administrator married Elisabeth Duverger, who belonged to the prestegious Saint-Ours family, which had been granted a substantial seigneury in New France. King Louis XIV came to the aid of Rocbert de la Morandiere when the Garde-Magazin was imprisoned for an altercation that occurred in the streets of Quebec. The need to pledge fealty, homage, and serve the King of France in every way possible was necessary for Moraniere. Service would certainly be personally advantageous to the Garde-Magazin, who became the godfather to Margaret Huggins taken during a French and Indian raid of Stony Brook, Connecticut, in 1686 and purchased by the Marquis de Crisafy. Huggins, who served in Crisafy's home for twenty years until 1706, was the daughter of John Huggins and Experience Jones both living and pursuing their daughters return at the time of Huggins Catholic baptism and naturalization.[24]

The French elite in Canada also used extreme proselyting to exploit helpless men, women, and young children who they bought out of captivity. Seigneurs, merchants, government officials, French military, and their wives networked together to prevent the

---

[23] Etienne Taillemite, "Francois Clairambault D'aigremont," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982): accessed January 11, 2019; Marie Therese Cole, Basilique Notre Dame (Montreal, Canada) baptism, 1703, page 254, digital images, *Quebec, Vital and Church Records Drouin Collection, 1621-1967*, accessed May10, 2019; Coleman, *New England Captives*, 13.

[24] Donald J. Horton, "Etienne Rocbert de la Morandiere," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol.2 (1982): accessed July 3, 2019, https://www.biographi.ca.

parents of captive children from coming to New France to ransom their children. Quebecois needed laborers to work their seigneuries and strong young individuals were more valuable to keep than a few pounds sterling that parents offered to redeem them. The rites of Catholic baptism were performed on English children purchased in the French colony without proper legal consent. Quebecois purchasers claimed in records that English parents were unknown, although documents show evidence that the legal parents made repeated attempts to retrieve their children. For example, Marie Ursule Elaine was given her name in a Catholic baptism and the certificate simply stated that she was a little English girl whose parents are living in New England and unknown. Claiming that parents of a young child were unknown was the only justification needed to bypass parental permission and keep a child. The baptismal document further stated that Elaine was bought and belonged to Monsieur Saint Ange. Solomon Mitchell, a young man taken from North Yarmouth, Maine in 1751 was baptized Catholic before his father sent messengers to retrieve his sons. Upon the elder Mitchell's arrival in Quebec to regain custody of his child, Sieur Des Pins and Baron de Longueuil sent notification that Solomon would not be allowed to leave Quebec because it would be against the boy's will. Documents show that at the time of his baptism, Solomon was working as a servant in the home of Sieur Des Pins. Governor Duquesne let the elder Mitchell speak to Solomon but emphasized that the English captive men, women, and children were "slaves fairly sold."[25]

Governor Philippe de Marquis de Vaudreuil, Rigaud de Vaudreuil immigrated to the colony of New France in 1687. Although the Vaudreuils had been a wealthy

---

[25] Coleman, *New England Captives*, 254-267.

aristocratic family in France, Arnaud, the eldest Vaudreuil male, was the singular benefactor of property and monetary inheritance. Early in his career Philippe Vaudreuil struggled due to lack of funding; the traditional aristocratic military career path was not possible to attain because commissions required payment for all positions above the title of lieutenant. With no other options available, the impoverished aristocrat accepted the position of Commander of Troops in Canada. The success of Vaudreuil's military campaigns defending Quebec against the Iroquois distinguished him as a leader with merit. Influential Sulpician seigneurs supported Vaudreuil for the position of Governor of Montreal when the position became available in 1701 and Louis XIV generously granted it. Governor Vaudreuil's new position and wealth were tied to the success of the colony of New France and the good favor of King Louis XIV. To increase a workforce in Quebec Vaudreuil supported the French King's conversion and naturalization process of English prisoners, carried out by the Sulpician priests through Catholic baptism. Major John Stoddard and Reverend John Williams traveled to Quebec in 1714, after the signing of the Peace of Utrecht, to seek the return of English prisoners held captive in the French colony. Vaudreuil refused to return the agreed to list of prisoners declaring, "Prisoners whom the King after divers objections, had naturalized could not, of course, return." Stoddard and Williams then requested that the Governor keep the Sulpician priests from preforming their religious work with the English held in the French colony, Vaudreuil stated, "That he could as easily alter the course of the waters as prevent the priests' endeavors."[26] Governor Vaudreuil carried out the directives of Louis XIV and French religious leaders, legally facilitating the permanent retention of prisoners of war.

[26] Yves F. Zoltvany, "Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, Marquis de Vaudreuil," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982): accessed August 8, 2019, http://www.biographi.ca; Coleman, *New*

In return for military protection and shared religious values and traditions, the settlers of New France pledged fidelity to the "Most Christian King," a title given to Louis XIV of France by the Pope in recognition of his religious dedication.[27] To further his religious mission in North America, the French King gave the Jesuits priests the highly prized and centrally located seigneury of Ville Marie, also known as Montreal in 1642. The seigneurial gift was to ensure the continuation of the evangelizing efforts assigned to them. A seminary and convent were built on the seigneury of Ville Marie prior to any colonial population, demonstrating the importance of Catholicism for the colony. Religious orders in Quebec held power because their mission was also the mission of King Louis XIII and Louis XIV, which was designed to convert as many people as possible to Catholicism in the New World. The Jesuits and Sulpician priests had religious and thus political power to watch and strictly guide all members of the colony including the elite toward their religious obligations.[28]

The Sulpicians took over the seigneury of Ville Marie and the power granted with it, twenty-five years after the Jesuits received it also bringing the first Bishop to New France. English prisoners became the workforce staffing both the seminary and convent. Sulpicians were economically invested in the advancement of the colony because they did not take vows of poverty, thus retaining the wealth of the land that they owned.[29]

England Captives, 94-96.

[27] Louis XIV, *The declaration of the most Christian King of France and Navarre against the most horrid prodeedings of a rebellious party of Parliament-men and souldiers in England, against their king and country*, translated by P.B., Paris, 2 January, 1649, accessed: 3 August, 2019, https://www.quod.lib.umich.edu.

[28] Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America*, 249-259.

[29] Christopher Kauffman, "The Sulpician Presence," *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 75, no. 44 (Oct, 1989): 677-695.

Sulpician Bishop Francoise de Laval belonged to the noble Montmorency family that had more than a thousand years serving the King of France or Gaul. The Montmorencys had contributed six constables, twelve marshals, four admirals, generals, cardinals, and military officers to the service of France. When Laval arrived in Quebec in 1659 the colony was numerically weak in population, recording less than 2,000 citizens. Bishop Laval and Sulpician priest Father Paul Le Jeune added to the workforce at the seminary, using native boys and enslaved Africans, baptizing and renaming each worker. The French colony utilized extensive slave trading, baptizing native children they had acquired, renaming them, and putting them to work. King Louis XIV agreed to adopt the system of slavery in New France as a way to address the problem of a much needed workforce.[30] English captives were given the same treatment and terms of labor as both natives and Africans purchased by the Seminary. Daniel Belding, a captive taken from Deerfield, Massachusetts was recorded in the journal of Stephen Williams as sold to the French and working as a servant, waiting on the priests, cutting wood, building fires, and tending to the seminary garden. Submit and Mary Phipps were first purchased and placed in the Ursuline convent by the Jeanne-Charlotte de Fleury Deschambault the wife governor Vaudreuil, and converted to Catholicism despite their mother, Jemima Sawtelle's efforts to regain custody of them.[31]

---

[30] Andre Vachon, "Francois de Laval," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982): accessed August 4, 2019, http://www. biographi.ca; Craig Steven Wilder, *Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013), 19-20.

[31] Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney, *Captive Histories: English, French and Native Narratives of the 1704 Raid on Deerfield* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), 59; James Axtell, Jemima Sawtelle, *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 5 (1983): accessed August 5, 2019, http://www.biographi.ca.

Sulpician priest, Henri-Antoine Meriel de Meulan carried out the mission of the King of France using evangelizing persuasion and force to oversee the conversion of hundreds of English Puritans to Catholicism. Meriel arrived in Montreal July 1690 with the ability to speak and write the English language. Knowledge of the English language added to Meriel's ability to coerce protestant prisoners into abjuration. Debates over the errors of the Protestant faith were more effective to an English prisoner in their own language. The skilled priest convinced vulnerable captives that if one error was found in the Protestant faith it was enough to find the entire faith false. Meriel had the ability to compose letters in English that prisoners were forced to copy and send to their families in the American colonies, claiming rejection of the Protestant faith and acceptance of the Roman Catholic faith. False correspondence was routinely used as a stratagem of persuasion to gain the trust of other English held in New France and advance Catholic conversions. Frequently numerous letters of Protestant rejection surfaced just after a captive's death and could not be challenged by the deceased. Captive Samuel Williams, explained his letter of abjuration and the abjuration of Abigail Turbet and Esther Jones to his father John Williams in 1706 stating, "It was a letter I transcribed for Mr. Meriel: and for what he saith Abigail Turbet and Esther Jones, nobody heard them but he, as I understand."[32] In December 1705, the rites of baptism for Samuel Williams was held at the Chapel of the Sisters of the Congregation and attended by Messire Francois le Vachon de Balmont, Grand Vicar and Bishop of Quebec. The baptism and conversion of Samuel Williams was a grander and more public occasion because he was the son of well-known Protestant Minister John Williams, which made the ceremony useful in

---

[32] C.J. Russ, "Henri-Antoine Meriel," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982): accessed August 6, 2019, http://www.biographi.ca; Williams, *The Redeemed Captive*, 78-82.

convincing the minds of other English captives.[33] Younger children were extremely vulnerable to the efforts of Meriel because they were not knowledgeable enough in the Protestant faith and did not realize that a Catholic baptism meant permanent separation from their English families and heritage.

The Canadian northeast posed a formidable challenge to the few French colonizers who settled in New France. A significant workforce population was required to make the seigneuries and the colony successful, enabling France to gain a strong foothold in the North American continent. Decades of anemic population growth made the desperate network of ambitious Quebecois elite use their positions to exploit English captives, buying and forcibly retaining many of them as workers. Religious rites such as baptism and marriage were used to solidify the French claim on an individual and their ability to produce manual labor in perpetuity. Seigneurs, their wives, and other elites in New France became part of the proselytizing process becoming godfathers and godmothers to the converted English they purchased from native raiding parties forming a network of slavery facilitators.

---

[33] Coleman, *New England Captives*, 50.

CHAPTER 2

THE TRIANGULATION OF FRENCH MILITARY, RELIGIOUS, AND ECONOMIC STRATEGIES: 1676-1763

The overarching issue for the duration of the 17th and throughout the first half of the 18th centuries in North America was whether France or England would control the territory. Continually, the two European powers collided in both in the New and Old Worlds, leading to early wars in America such as King Williams War, Queen Anne's War, King George's War, additionally there were smaller conflicts like Drummer's War, and ultimately, the Seven Years War. Seemingly countless savage and bloody French and Indian raids on isolated frontier settlements throughout the colonies occurred concurrently during those wars. The Massachusetts Bay Colony alone reported a substantial number of massacres in towns such as Lancaster, Dunstable, Haverhill, Deerfield, York, Springfield, Groton, Wells, and Pemaquid. Seizure of thousands of men, women and children taken from outpost communities to be ransomed or sold led to a new economy in human trafficking for the invaders. The American colonies struggled with an unorganized and anemic defense against French and Native American attacks. In contrast, the French had a synthesized military, religious, and economic strategy to

dominate the North American landscape. English prisoners taken from the French and Indian wars were the embodiment of those three objectives: taken in war, exploited for economic gain and many religiously converted.

European imperialism that led to Spain's seizure of western and southern territories in the Americas also propelled the surge of English and French claims in north and eastern regions. The French laid claim to economically strategic areas, building forts, trading posts, settlements, and religious buildings surrounding the St. Lawrence Seaway, the northern river systems of the Kennebec, Merrimack, and Connecticut, the Ohio River Valley, the Great lakes, and along the Mississippi. Lands around those waterways were vital for fur trapping and trading, a critical component of New France's economy. England's settlements began compressed against the Atlantic coastline from what is now present-day Maine to Georgia. Colonies in the New World boasted a flourishing population; Massachusetts Bay Colony, for example, increased from one thousand to eleven thousand citizens in just eight years between 1630 and 1638 due to a "Great Migration" coming from the British Isles. At the turn of the seventeenth and into the eighteenth century, the population of New England stood at approximately 91,000. The Hudson Valley alone claimed a population of 30,000 during that same time period. Just fifty years later, the population had risen exponentially to a million and a half English who called the British North

American colonies home by the middle of the eighteenth century.[1] Ships coming from

[1] Robert Steven Grumet, *Historic Contact: Indian People and Colonists in Today's Northeastern United States in the Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 62-64.

England carried families whereas most French ships sailing to New France carried single men interested in the fur trade, creating a great imbalance between the two populations.

Those that made the trip across the Atlantic wanted land, increasingly pushing the need for settlement expansions and driving colonists to establish communities in areas where ownership was disputed by the natives who claimed it as ancestral territory.[2] English colonists theorized for their own purposes, that land would be put to better use if it was farmed and that the nomadic use by the indigenous peoples were inadequate to establish claims to it. Settlers bargaining with the natives employed exemplary "Christian behavior" obtaining the rights to large tracts with some meager payment. The Puritans justified divine right as a seventeen and eighteenth century manifest destiny, when removing the natives from their lands. According to England's law, all territories were an inheritance from God to his Christian followers. Since the indigenous peoples did not worship God, they had no right to the land as God's heirs. Many colonial charters including the Charter of Massachusetts Bay, Charter of 1629, specifically stated that the lands were not, "possessed or inhabited by any other Christian Prince or State." Faithless and landless were interchangeable terms. Beyond a religious claim to encroach on Indian lands, English settlers cited the 1606 and 1609 "Virginia Charters" under King James I which claimed American lands, from "sea to sea."[3] "The Charter of New England 1620" not only rejoices in the diminishment of the native population due to disease and war, but

---

[2] Herbert Collins Parsons, *A Puritan Outpost: A History of the Town and People of Northfield, Massachusetts* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937), 134.

[3] The Charter of Massachusetts Bay: 1629, Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library, Avalon Project, Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy, accessed September 30, 2017, http://www.avalon.law.yale.edu; King James I, *The Second Charter of Virginia*, 1609, Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library, Avalon Project, Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy, accessed October 20, 2017, http://avalon.law.yale.edu.

also notes that the native population decline left territory deserted and therefore available for English possession and those land claims were unlikely to be challenged. The charter specifically states that,

> God's Visitation reigned a wonderfull Plague, together with many horrible Slaugthers, and Murthers, committed amoungst the Sauages and brutish People there, heertofore inhabiting, in a Manner to the utter Destruction, Deuastacion, and Depopulacion of that whole Territorye, so that there is not left for many Leagues together in a Manner, any that doe claime or challenge any Kind of Interests therein nor any other Superiour Lord or Souveraigne to make Claime hereunto, whereby We in our Judgment are persuaded and satisfied that the appointed Time is come in which Almighty God in his great Goodness and Bountie towards Us and our People, hath thought fitt and determined, that those large and goodly Territoryes, deserted as it were by their naturall Inhabitants, should be possessed and enjoyed by such of our Subjects and People.[4]

Archaeological evidence indicates that as more Europeans came, and indigenous peoples died from warfare and disease, the remaining native people merged together to form larger and compact settlements. Surviving natives were deceived or forced out of ancestral lands but attempted to negotiate the process. Some frustrating attempts at diplomacy over oppressive policies are evident in a letter from the Eastern Natives to the Governor of Massachusetts concerning the fur trade, stating that the natives were not agreeing to the regulation of their fur trade and the Massachusetts government had gone against previous agreements denying access to lands and much needed provisions. The Mohegan Natives went so far as to petition the King of England regarding a land dispute in 1738, arguing that the Connecticut government worked to "Deprive us of our Lands, Surreptitiously & in an Arbitrary manner detained from us- Which has left us in a Most

---

[4] King James I, *The New England Charter, 1620*, Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library, Avalon Project, Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy, accessed October 20, 2017, http://avalon.law.yale.edu.

Deplorable & Miserable situation of Life & Exposed to the Utmost Limits of Poverty & Want, by being denied Justice, or the benefit of your Majesties Commission."[5]

A reasonable assumption was that the English strategy sought to remove and eradicate the population; it was never to blend with them. Although official bans of intermarriage with the natives began in the mid seventeenth century, intermarriage previous to that was rare. The colony of Virginia for example, introduced the Virginia Miscegenation Law in 1691 which made it unlawful for English to mix with negroes, mulattoes, and indigenous. If an unlawful marriage did take place, the woman or man, "within three months after such marriage be banished and removed from this dominion forever."[6] A few reasons for the absence of intermarriage even while it was legal included English ethnocentrism and Puritan religious injunctions which made it difficult. For example, Reverend Cotton Mather's repugnant description of the natives in 1702 declared partiality toward ethnic separation: "Their way of living, is infinitely Barbarous: The Men are most abominably slothful, making their poor Squaws, or Wives, to plant and dress, and barn, and beat their Corn, and build their Wigwams for them...to think on raising a Number of these hideous Creatures, unto the Elevations of our Holy Religion."[7] English superiority had been used previously to ban marriage for centuries, similarly, the

---

[5] Eastern Indians, "Letter from the Eastern Indians to the Governor of Massachusetts, February 11, 1742", in *The Northern Colonial Frontier*: *1607-1763* by Douglas Leach (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), 122-148; Mohegan Indians, "Petition the King in Their Dispute with the Colonial Government of Connecticut," *Major Problems in American Colonial History*, edited by Karen Ordahl Kupperman (Boston: Wadsworth, 2013), 35.

[6] *Virginia Miscegenation Law 1691*, Georgetown University Law Library, accessed October 24, 2017, http:// law.georgetown.edu/library/collections.

[7] Cotton Mather, "Cotton Mather Describes the Indians of Massachusetts and John Eliot's Mission to Them, 1702," *Major Problems in American Colonial History*, edited by Karen Ordahl Kupperman (Boston: Wadsworth, 2013), 123.

1366 Statute of Kilkenny made marriage between the English and Irish illegal as well as adopting any type of Irish culture including language, names, and music.[8] Refusal of the English colonists to live among, blend with, or tolerate the natives in any way left them vulnerable, with fewer options, and at greater disadvantage when warfare necessitated a cooperative front.

The coalescence of the native and French peoples was a stratagem from the earliest exploration of New France. In 1536, young natives from the Stadacona tribe near Hochelaga, present day Montreal, were brought back from New France by Jacques Cartier and regarded as curiosities in the French court of King Francis I. Multilinguistic natives were also prized language learners, for the idea that the young natives would learn the French language and accompany Cartier on subsequent voyages. Those who could speak several dialects served as interpreters between the numerous Canadian tribes and the French explorers who lived among them. For centuries thereafter, the French settlers adopted various aspects of the Amerindian culture and intermarried with them, "Though Many nations imitate the French customs, I observed on the contrary, that the French in Canada in many respects follow the customs of the Indians with whom they have constant relations."[9]

In 1608 French explorer Samuel de Champlain sent Etienne Brule, a member of his sailing crew, to live with the Huron and learn their language. Brule, the first of the coureur du bois emerged from the woods dressed, painted, and spoke fluent Algonquin,

---

[8] Josef L. Altholz, *Selected Documents in Irish History* (New York: Routledge, 2015) 19-22.

[9] Hiram B. Stephens, *Jacques Cartier and His Four Voyages to Canada; With Historical, Explanatory and Philological Notes* (Montreal: W. Drysdale, 1890), 85, accessed September 26, 2017, https://archive.org/stream/; Allen Greer, *The People of New France* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 84.

transferring critical geographic and political information of the indigenous peoples to Champlain. Brule returned to live amongst the Huron and with the natives that had accompanied him to visit Champlain. The independent French fur traders of seventeenth century New France followed Brule's example, les Coureur du bois, also known as runners of the woods, lived and intermarried with the Indians in the pays d'en haute, the vast interior country including the Great Lakes. Coureur du bois adopted their Amerindian culture and various languages. By 1680, the life of a Coureur du bois had become so attractive to young French men that approximately 800 independent intermediaries were counted among a population of less than 10,000. The religious and governmental authorities of New France were unable to prevent the spread of such a free lifestyle, Governor Frontenac declared, "I cannot tell you how attractive this life is to all of our youth. It consists in doing nothing, caring nothing, following every inclination, and getting out of the way of all restraint."[10]

Native women who kept company with the renegade men taught difficult languages including syntax and accents. Communication abilities were particularly important as there were tribes that had separate languages for different environmental circumstances; the Montagnais Indians for example, spoke one language on land and another on the water. Physically the backwoods men were conditioned to endure the severe environmental conditions necessary to live exposed in the cold Canadian climate. Although many French officials considered the coureur du bois to be wild renegades, their position between cultures was remarkably advantageous, supplying an essential

---

[10] France and the Americas: Culture, Politics, and History a Multidisciplinary Encyclopedia, vol. 1 ed. Bill Marshall (Oxford: ABC-CLIO Inc.), 311; William Bennett Munro, *Crusaders of New France: A Chronicle of the Fleur-De-Lis in the Wilderness* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918), 162.

intermediary link between the natives and the French government.[11] When it became necessary in war, the independent French woodsmen could easily assemble forces loyal through bloodlines. According to Canadian military historian Peter Moogk, "official approval of intermarriage between the two races is proof that French officials had no racial prejudice against native peoples."[12] The assumption of the government of New France however, was that the population that resulted from mixing two cultures would be Catholic and French speaking.

The English colonies in North America had no equivalent to the coureur du bois. There were no mediators to turn to who could prevent powerful, mixed raiding parties from descending on remote, unsecured English settlements. French militia and natives used terror to drive the men, women, and children from their occupied land. According to those who witnessed the attacks, "all the horrors of savage warfare would be loosed upon the English frontiersmen, for whenever those two breeds were brought together as a combat team in the wilderness, the restraints of civilization quickly gave way."[13] The bloody massacres benefitted the attackers strategically by freeing the land vital to the indigenous people's subsistence and the French fur trade from English occupation. Additionally, those taken captive in raids continued to benefit their French and native captors economically, being used or sold as a labor force in native villages and New France. Those who were not exploited for their labor were ransomed for economic gain.

---

[11] James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 304; Greer, *The People of New France*, 77-78.

[12] Peter N. Moogk, *La Nouvelle France: The Making of French Canada: A Cultural History* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2000), 21.

[13] Leach, *The Northern Colonial Frontier*, 111.

Militant Jesuits and other religious figures played a crucial triumvirate role in New France, economically, religiously, and militarily because of the faith based influence they had over the native population. Missionaries went alone into the wilderness believing in the ultramontane and a faith based reward system, characterized by physically and spiritually intense trials. The more intense suffering placed upon the tortured the greater reward received for moral valor. Priests spent extended periods of time enduring harsh conditions in the wilderness to baptize and minister to the natives in the Catholic faith. The natives were not drawn to the Christian religion because of the idea of peaceful, eternal life in heaven; it was the fear of everlasting torment in hell, skillfully detailed by zealous priests compelling them to baptism. In 1636, Father Charles Garnier, using the Huron Indian language stunned native audiences with paintings depicting a tormented human being bound at the feet, roasting, and being devoured by devils. Attempts at converting indigenous peoples to Christianity were not always successful, some, including Father Nöel Chabanel, were murdered by those who rejected the powerful appeals of the priests.[14]

Father Louis Hennepin is one example of a religious man accompanying both natives and French soldiers adventuring into the vast interior lands of North America. In 1678, fifty-two-year-old Franciscan priest Louis Hennepin braved the winter wilderness as one of the earliest Europeans investigating all of the Great Lakes, reached the upper Mississippi Valley, and documenting the great site of Niagara Falls a sight of which

[14] Stuart Trueman, *The Ordeal of John Gyles: Being an Account of His Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances as a Slave of the Maliseets* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966), 116-117; Moogk, *La Nouvelle France*, 34-35.

Hennepin remarked, "there is no parallel in the universe."[15] According to Hennepin's account, the savages at Niagara were the most numerous he had ever encountered, yet priests facilitated agreements between the two races. For example when the French wanted to construct a fort at Niagara, and the Indians occupying the land were reluctant thus missionaries, disguising its intended purpose, convinced the natives that the building would be a just a storehouse for supplies. Multilinguistic French men understood and spoke the language of the Tsonnontouans, also known as the Senecas, gaining French favor among the natives who allowed the construction of the fort/storehouse.[16]

Mass was performed for the Abenaki, Saco, Maliseet, Micmac, Saco, Penobscot, Androscoggin, Kennebec, and various other tribes in makeshift worship houses. Missionaries learned the native languages; endeavored to understand native customs, "The missionary never forgot however, that he was also a sentinel doing outpost duty for his own race. Apostle he was, but patriot too." Religious authority was then used as a tool to keep the natives from engaging in trade with Dutch or English, diverting the commercial trade of furs to Montreal, and prompting trade exclusively with the French fur traders. With the aid of their native counterparts the French were able to control the major arteries in and out of the richest beaver territory, the Ottawa and Mattawa river systems.[17]

---

[15] John H. Conlin, "Father Hennepin at Niagara Falls," *Western New York Heritage Magazine* 6, no. 1 (Winter 2003): 33.

[16] Louis Hennepin, *A New Discovery of a Vast Country in America* (Chicago: A.C. McClung & Co., 1903), 80.

[17] Munro, *Crusaders of New France*, 157-158.

Governor Louis Frontenac referred to the missionaries as "Machevellian" plotters with a multilayered, disguised strategy. Frontenac observed that the Jesuits real motivation was not spirituality but to amass beaver pelts and other valuable beaver products, generating money for the church. Wearing beaver had been a symbol of social status in Europe for nearly 300 years before North America became a source of the fur. Geoffrey Chaucer referred to beaver hats of wealthy men in *The Canterbury Tales*, in 1387. Beaver fur was so desired that both the European and Eurasian species had been hunted almost to extinction when the New World became a new source for the hat making material. The construction of one hat took one adult beaver, stripped of its guard hairs for the softer parchment pelt beneath, which then went through a long process where it was mixed with other materials to become a soft, waterproof product. Additionally, castoreum, a powerful liquid produced in the groin sacs of beaver was valued for medicinal purposes, alleviating fevers and aches due to its concentration of salicylic acid, an ingredient common in aspirin.[18]

Missionary Jesuits immediately sought to baptize native populations and thus used religious allegiances to compel Christianized natives to wage war using both brutality and terror as weapons, forcing English settlers from the land and abducting humans as a saleable commodity. Cooperation by the priests indicates that not only were they invested in furthering matters of the church, but also the crown. The French were resolute in their actions to save New France from England and to control the fur trade in the New World; the dark threat and reputation for merciless acts that natives employed was a useful tool for that purpose. Like the Coureur du bois, Jesuits had become

---

[18] Jay Atkinson, *Massacre on the Merrimack: Hannah Duston's Captivity and Revenge in Colonial America* (Guilford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 92-94.

acclimated to the harsh outdoor environment thus were more than physically prepared to take long and arduous journeys with Indian warriors hundreds of miles from Quebec. Living among the tribes, learning the languages and habits, Jesuits could recognize and interpret inter-tribal politics. Transferring essential information via religious personnel to government authorities in Quebec made, "every mission post thus an embassy."[19]

Father Sébastien Râle gained both notoriety among the natives and New Englanders as a fearsome leader. The religious leader guided his Christianized Abenaki followers to war, forming partnership so powerful that the English Puritans saw it as a "satanic alliance," due to the death and destruction that followed it. Râle was so feared by the American colonists for his ferocity that an attempt to kidnap the priest by Commander William Drummer in 1722 sent the Abenaki to burn Brunswick, Massachusetts. The colony of Massachusetts then declared war on the Eastern Indians beginning what is known as Drummer's War or Father Râle's War, 1722-1725.[20]

Father Louis-Pierre Thury was another equally militant Jesuit, talented in coercion and routinely working with Governor Villebon of Quebec to persuade the Abenaki not only to break treaties with the English but to attack settlements in the colonies. During the 1694, Oyster River, New Hampshire raid, Father Thury mustered not only more than a hundred of his own Christianized warriors, but also a number of Kennebecs which doubled the number set to attack. For several miles homes and buildings were burned, more than a hundred settlers were killed and scalped, and

---

[19]Atkinson, *Massacre on the Merrimack*, 59; Stuart Trueman, *The Ordeal of John Gyles*, 119.

[20]Armstrong Starkey, *European and Native American Warfare: 1675-1815* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998), 86; Leach, *The Northern Colonial Frontier*, 132.

survivors taken captive. Father Thury apparently unaffected by the bloodshed paused to say mass and celebrate victory amidst the dead and dying.[21]

Religious men were not the only facilitators of the French strategy. The Sisters of the Gray Robe belonging to the Congregation of Notre-Dame and the Grey sisters under Marguerite d'Youville both purchased English captives and exploited them for labor in religious communities that had work force shortages. The abducted men and women performed strenuous tasks such as drawing water with yoked buckets, harvesting crops, snow removal, and cutting and hauling firewood. John Gillette, a prisoner taken October 9, 1696 from an early Deerfield, Massachusetts, raid was responsible for many tasks including the maintenance of animals kept by the religious order requiring him to sleep outdoors in freezing temperatures.[22]

In an effort to prevent attacks, communities fortified homes and built reinforced walls around isolated villages without government assistance. Leaving property issued to settlers by colonial authorities for the safety of a more populated area was not an easy decision to make. Any lengthy abandonment of allotted territory meant the forfeiture of that land back to the government. The Right of Escheat, an English law also used in Colonial America, stated that land left vacant or land a settler failed to plant and seat, was forfeited. The Minutes of the North Carolina Governor's Council from August 1720 documented, "the Petition of William Grey shewing that William Browne in the year 1712 obtained a patent for 600 Acres of Land lying on Moratock which is Lapsed for

---

[21] Atkinson, *Massacre on the Merrimack*, 63- 64.

[22] William Henry Foster, *The Captors' Narrative: Catholic Women and Their Puritan Man on the Early American Frontier* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 39-102.

want of seating and planting as the Lawe directing praying a Lapse patent may be granted to him for the same."[23]

Towns that were in danger of attack formed small militias made up of men and boys from the community. Males between the ages of sixteen and sixty were trained on a regular basis regarding the usage of guns and duties of patrol. The positions of Leftenant and other commanders were filled by appointments through the town committees and not by military experience. Construction of strong blockhouses or garrison houses became a customary defense on the colonial frontier. Protective houses were typically two rooms with a center chimney. The walls were constructed using a heavy timber such as hackmatack, a pine commonly used for ship building and snow shoes because of its durability and decay resistance. Wall pieces were cut at least seven inches thick and tenoned at the edges adding to the building's strength. Typically, frontier towns were not fortunate enough to have a clay bank, a trained brick maker, brick kiln, or enough bricks to build structures that were both strong and fireproof. Out in the fields, farmers were vulnerable because it was impossible to carry both farm tools and a musket to the fields at the same time. The French and native attackers, aware that the land could not sit idle for long, used this knowledge to attack unsuspecting farmers at work in the fields.[24]

Some fortunate outpost garrisons were provided provincial regulars to fend off assailants, but for the most part colonial regiments and militia men were farmers or other tradesmen whom were not experienced or well trained. According to one recent

---

[23] *Minutes of the North Carolina Governor's Council*, North Carolina, August 04, 1720-August 12, 1720, vol. 2, 389-392, accessed October 1, 2017, http://docsouth.unc.edu/csr/index.php/document/csr02-0199.

[24] Parsons, *A Puritan Outpost*, 108-109; Lisa C. Mullins, *Early American Community Structures* (Morgantown: National Historical Society, 1987), 69-143.

investigation, "sustaining a presence of British Regulars was unrealistic because of the enormous cost involved, combined with the distance between King and colonists. Therefore, each British colony except Pennsylvania organized some form of militia system for their own defense." However, the American colonists modeled the English militia system which was not effective against the guerilla warfare techniques used by the French and Indians.[25] The problem of an insufficient militia was compounded when families abandoned property and lessened the number of men and boys in the ranks available for protection. In 1757, Lieutenant Dinwiddle charged the men of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania with cowardice and proclaimed 928 of their farms forfeit. The abandonment diminished the men trained and bearing arms from 3,000 to a mere 100.[26] During times of anticipated crisis, colonists gathered together in the defensive buildings that had been fortified, yet even with the extra measures those structures were not usually effective against large raiding parties full of natives skilled in guerrilla warfare and adept at hunting prey.

French combatants had fully adapted to the indigenous peoples way of making war and the attackers modified their tactics to take advantage of the changes that isolated colonial communities had made. One of those adjustments in strategy was for the raiders to lie down in the fields between farms and fortifications to catch men, women, and children that they correctly predicted would be running toward the garrison houses. According to Daniel Gookin, an Englishman taken in King Phillip's War, the natives

---

[25] Jason R. Kluk, "Character and Discipline: A Comparative Study of Civil War Militia from the States of Ohio and New York" (master's thesis, East Stroudsburg University, 2016), 2-4.

[26] Ian Kenneth Steele, *Setting All the Captives Free: Capture, Adjustment, and Recollection in Allegheny Country* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013), 98-99.

"apparel themselves from the waist upwards with green boughs, that our Englishmen could not readily discern them from the natural bushes; this manner of fighting our men had little experience of and hence were under great disadvantage."[27] Natives preferred to use edged weapons such as knives and tomahawks which were silent as they attacked from hidden positions. Those settlers who made it into safe structures were still vulnerable because the assailants knew a large number of people were gathered in one place. Despite the use of sand or ash on the floor of garrisons and special timber used to make those buildings less prone to fire, aggressive and repeated attempts to set fire to buildings were usually successful, sending occupants running from the structure. Tortured bodies of those colonists who tried to escape were commonly hung from trees and heads placed on stakes along the road as a silent deterrent for rescuers.[28]

Surprise was the key tactic most French militia and native warriors relied on, and they took great pains to retain that element. Cold camping, which meant sleeping without the utilization of fire for warmth, was a strategy frequently used by attackers en route to the targeted settlements to lessen the possibility of detection. The advancing war parties hunted with only bows and arrows along the way to keep movements as covert as possible. Native warriors did not permit hunting close to the area of attack, leaving no chance of evidence from a freshly killed or wounded animal. French and Indian assailants traveled long distances, sometimes 500 to 600 miles in total and approximately 50 miles each day, leaving provisional kits well-hidden along the way to fall back on. Typically

[27] Starkey, *European and Native American Warfare*, 73.

[28] Steele, *Setting All the Captives Free*, 78-79; Parsons, *A Puritan Outpost*, 45.

attacks came in the middle of the night and when possible, during snowstorms when it was assumed that nobody would be moving about outdoors.[29]

The attack on Deerfield, Massachusetts, came while it was dark and just after a snow storm. Although the town had twenty soldiers positioned within the newly strengthened palisade walls and reinforcement modifications to the garrison had been made, the snowdrifts that came to the top of the outside palisade wall had not been removed. French commanding officer, Jean Baptiste Hertel de Rouville, forty-eight French coureur du bois, 200 Abenaki, Caughnawagas (Mohawks), and Hurons journeyed over 300 miles through the Green Mountains and slept without fires across the river from the unsuspecting village in February 1704. The neglected snowdrifts and undisciplined guards were no challenge to the combatants who climbed over the stockade and opened the north gate providing access to a large French and native army. Reverend John Williams wrote in his personal account of that night, "not long before break of day, the enemy came in like a flood upon us, our watch being unfaithful; an evil, whose awful effects in a suprisal of our fort, should bespeak all watchmen to avoid, as they would not bring the charge of blood upon themselves."[30]

The attack on Dover, New Hampshire, also known as the Cochecho Massacre, came in June 1689 after years were spent on the defenses of the town (see Appendix figure #). Five houses were fortified as garrisons with thick walls and second stories that protruded over the first to make use of machicolations, or openings between corbels, to

---

[29] José António Brandão, *Your Fyre Shall Burn No More: Iroquois Policy Toward New France and Its Native Allies to 1701* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 34.

[30] Cormac O'Brien, *The Forgotten History of America: Little Known Conflicts of Lasting Importance from the Earliest Colonists to the Eve of the Revolution* (Beverly: Fair Winds Press, 2008), 171-173; John Williams, *The Redeemed Captive*, 44.

attack the enemy from above. Burning coals, oil or water could be poured through openings in the upper story of a building and onto an assailant, a tactic used since the medieval time period. Each garrison house was also encircled by an eight-foot-high protective stockade with a barred and bolted gate. The entire settlement was protected by a militia and Major Richard Waldron, who boasted that he could have another one-hundred soldiers at his disposal by just lifting a finger to request them. Safety features that were carefully planned failed to be effective because the settlers of Dover were untrained about native tactics and no watch was put in place the night of June 27, 1689. Old native squaws looking for a place to rest for the night were let into each of the garrison houses except one. In the middle of the night the squaws unbolted and unbarred the gate of each stockade allowing a flood of Penacook Indians, led by Father Louis Pierre Thury, to raid the village, killing dozens, and abducting others. Major Waldron was tortured, bound naked to a chair, and repeatedly slashed across his body; his nose and ears were cut off and forced down his throat before being impaled to death by his attackers.[31]

In 1675, a population of approximately 6,000 people were scattered in settlements throughout the territory presently known as Maine. The vulnerable forts at Pemaquid and Casco, located closest to the French border in Quebec, were attacked in 1689, demonstrating the neglectful policies of colonial authorities. English colonial governments consistently failed to properly supply and protect frontier towns against a cunning enemy. Unsuccessful defenses resulted in the mass murder, capture, and exploitation of English colonists. Borderland areas in what is now northern Maine had

[31] Atkinson, *Massacre on the Merrimack*, 35-37.

been disputed by France and England for years because its waterways were valuable to trade. King Louis XIV of France however, decided that the English forts and settlements were too close to the border to New France must be destroyed.

The territory of Maine, including the wooden redoubt known as Fort Charles, belonged to New York until 1686, when King James II of England turned it over to Governor Edmund Andros of Massachusetts. Upkeep of the fort became neglected by the council and governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony for some time after the turnover. According to Herbert Sylvester, an expert on Maine pioneer settlements, the court of Massachusetts resisted sending money. Sylvester argued, "When it came to depleting of its treasury for the maintenance of a sufficient force to protect its frontier interests, its machinery moved with exceeding slowness, and generally not at all."[32]

Leftenant James Weems, the commanding officer of Fort Charles, in Pemaquid wrote to the Massachusetts Council in 1689 requesting replacements for the companies of soldiers that had been withdrawn. Those few military men who were left to guard Fort Charles objected to the enormous risks of exposure placed on them and by July of 1689 began to make defiant remarks regardless of previous pledges of commitment. The garrison at Pemaquid was weak and Weems knew that it would not withstand an attack. The recent attack in Dover, New Hampshire, which had occurred two months before, left the people in a heightened state of alert. Instead of sending reinforcements, on July 2nd the Massachusetts Council voted to offer scalp bounties for the Abenaki and Maliseet Natives living in the area surrounding Fort Charles. That decision further inflamed the already tense relations between the colonists in the area and the indigenous peoples. Ten

---

[32] Herbert Milton Sylvester, *Maine Pioneer Settlements* (Boston: W.B. Clarke Co., 1909), 63-65.

days before the August 1689 attack, Leftenant Weems again requested more men because all but thirty had deserted him fearing for their lives.[33]

The French and natives used the cover of abandoned fishing huts on the Maine sea coast sending out two spies to gather information on the routines of settlers; layout of the town and fort before raiding both. Only twenty-nine women and children made it to the relative safety of Fort Charles after the August 4, 1689 raid, where Leftenant Weems surrendered after negotiating for the lives of those under his immediate protection. Bargaining agreements during war were rare because it was seen as weak by the natives; vulnerability usually received the most vicious responses because there was no honor in it. Native boys were trained from birth to exact the power of will and learned that death was better than showing fear. An honorable death was quick but a dishonorable demise was much worse as described by Lieutenant Lion Gardener stationed at Fort Saybrook on the Connecticut River in 1637. Gardiner watched as an English trader paid with his life for simply trespassing in Pequot territory recalling, "Tilly was flayed, dismembered, and mutilated for three days before succumbing to the attentions of his Pequot captors, who proudly wore his fingers and toes as hat bands." A dishonorable death among the natives could be brutal and drawn out. The Mohegans, for example, were known to tie a prisoner's leg to a pole and tie the other leg with rope, pulling as a group until the victim was literally ripped apart.[34]

---

[33] Victor Hugo Paltsits, *The Depredation at Pemaquid in August 1689 and the Events That Led Up to It* (Portland: Press of LeFavor-Tower Company, 1905), 1-16.

[34] Robert L Bradley, *The Forts of Pemaquid, Maine: An Archaeological and Historical Study* (Augusta: Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 1994), 1-8; Cormac O'Brien, *The Forgotten History of America*, 48.

In many native tribal cultures, part of the process of becoming a man was to prove the power of domination over both mind and body. One way to demonstrate the ability of self-discipline was for native boys to "stand in a group where they would insert burning embers into their armpits, holding them there as sort of a contest. Any native boy who cried out or ran away was deemed unfit to become a warrior." Indigenous peoples did not understand the English idea of fighting first and then asking for mercy when the battle was lost, because losing meant death. Natives considered it honorable to show an indifference to pain and the brutal termination of one's life was simply an opportunity to express that ability. Even elderly natives remained stoic and acted with honor while being tortured at the stake. European chroniclers of Onondaga history noted the torture of an eighty-year-old half blind warrior who had not submitted to French and missionary native command. The Red hot irons used to pierce an aged warrior's skin only prompted the native to proclaim, "learn from me, you dogs of Frenchmen, how to endure pain."[35]

Pemaquid's attack was so successful for the French and natives that Father Thury who led the assault, speculated if more warriors and French were present there would be no obstacles to conquering all the towns between Maine and Boston. Lessons about the need for better defenses and to maintain security and investments on frontier settlements should have been learned from the events in Maine, but that did not happen. When Fort William Henry was constructed in 1692 to replace Fort Charles, inferior materials were used to construct it which led to its defeat again in 1694 after a second French and Indian attack. Reasons for the fort's structural failure in the bombardment were described by Colonel Romer in 1699: "The French have entirely demolished the Fort of Pemaquid,

---

[35]Atkinson, *Massacre on the Merrimack*, 44-90.

which seems to have been extremely ill built and not defensible. There was no order observed in building it; its walls were made of clay mixed with sand brought from the sea-shore, instead of lime."[36]

In contrast, the French built stone forts along northern waterways that were vital to trade such as the one erected at the juncture between the west end of Lake Ontario and the mouth of the Niagara River known as Fort Niagara. The natural triangular plateau jutting out between the two waterways was a logical position to place a fort. Fort Niagara gave the French an extremely strong foothold where traders travelled in and out of the Great Lakes and along the Niagara River. Stone was used not only for the exterior of the building but also for the heavy interior walls and floors to make the building not only strong but fireproof. The fort was built so well that it was still being used by the United States military as an active base of operations in 1927. According to architectural historian John Conlin, "Fort Niagara contains the most complete collection of extant 18th century military architecture in the U.S., including the unique stone chateau of 1726, which is the oldest masonry structure in the entire Great Lakes Basin."[37]

Using geometry to craft unique designs for individual fortifications tailored to the building site, French military master architects and engineers such as, Sébastien Le Prestre de Vauban and Jacques Levasseur de Néré, led the world in military engineering during the 17th and 18th centuries. Some of Vauban and Levasseur's principles, which were applied to the construction of forts in France, were also incorporated in the

---

[36] Bradley, *The Forts of Pemaquid, Maine*, 40.

[37] John H. Conlin, "Sketch Map of Old Fort Niagara National Historic Landmark," United States Department of the Interior, *National Register of Historic Places-Nomination,* 1986, 26; John H. Conlin, "National Register of Historic Places-Nomination: Fort Niagara," *United States Department of Interior*, 1986, 3.

engineering of fortifications in Canada during the 18th century. Fort Niagara and Fort Frontenac for example, "included geometrically precise earthen outer works and the use of projections called half-bastions at the Fort's corners. The strategic architectural elements protected the Fort's garrison from incoming artillery and musket fire. They also exposed the attackers to numerous physical barriers that could be raked with fire from multiple sides."[38]

Governor and Lieutenant General of New France, Marquis de Vaudreuil, became aware that the English were building forts on the Eastern end of Lake Ontario. Just a few years after the French had established Fort Niagara on the western end of the lake, in 12 the English built Fort Oswego on the eastern end with an outwork known as Fort George or Fort Rascal and began work on several other forts in that area including Fort Ontario. Governor Vaudreuil knew that the new English fortifications could possibly be used by the English colonies as a base to supply an attack on the French forts Niagara and Frontenac in 1756. The government of New France took steps to prevent the Great Lakes trade system from falling into English control.[39]

Vaudreuil sent General Louis-Joseph de Montcalm and a mixed army of several thousand French and natives to take the forts from the English and regain control of the Great Lakes region. The strategy adopted by the French and natives was to sever the connection between the English forts. To accomplish this, thousands of French and natives swam across the Oswego River, close to the mouth of Lake Ontario where there is

---

[38] Old Fort Niagara State Park, *French Heritage Day at Fort Niagara Teacher's Kit*, page 4-11, accessed November 1, 2017, www.oldfortniagara.org/documents/.

[39] Peter Williamson, *French and Indian Cruelty: Exemplified in the Life and Various Vicissitudes of Fortune* (Bristol: Thoemmes, 1996), 74-75.

a deep, swift, northerly flowing current pulled by the force the Great Lakes waterway system. Once the Canadian forces were across the river and maintained a presence at all forts in the area, a battle for control began and the forces of Montcalm not only achieved victory, but also took both lives and captives to ransom or sell for profit in Canada. Peter Williamson, a captive taken by the natives in New York described the attack in his journal,

> About ten o'clock, the enemy's battery was ready to play; at which time, all our places of defence, were either enfiladed, or ruined by the constant fire of their cannon; fort George, in particular, having at that time no guns, and scarce in a condition to defend itself against small arms; with 2500 irregulars on our backs, ready to storm us on that side and 2000 of their regulars as ready to land in our front. Fort Rascal might have been made a very defensible fortress, lying on a hill and the ascent to it so steep that had an enemy been ever so numerous, they must have suffered greatly in an attempt to storm it. Why it was not in a better state, it becomes not me to say, but matters were so.[40]

To maintain the geographic strangle-hold on the fur trade economy, the French had built and protected strategically placed forts and military like establishments all along the northern water routes and channels. Fort Frontenac was placed at Cataraqui, close to where the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario come together, in 1674 protecting the route that connects the Atlantic Ocean to the Five Great Lakes. Fort Niagara was built to guard the trade routes going from Lake Ontario to Lake Erie, and a post called Baye des Puants was constructed at Detroit, where the Detroit River connects the western end of Lake flowing into Lake St. Clair and then on to Lake Huron. Fort Michilimackinac, located on the straits between Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, protected the trade routes moving through the upper Lakes region. An establishment built in 1668, both missionary and military, was maintained at the straits between Lake Superior and Lake Huron named

---

[40] Ibid., 74-80.

Sault Sainte Marie. Fort Sainte Croix was built on the far western end of Lake Superior, Fort Sainte Antoine and Fort Sainte Nicholas both built in 1686, protected the French trade interests along the river systems south and west of the Great Lakes including the upper Mississippi.[41]

A commercial empire, based on furs, was the core of the French economic system in the New World during the 17th and 18th centuries. Although New France was agriculturally based, a flourishing agriculture economy did not exist there as it did in the English colonies; the brutally cold climate was not conducive to bringing in settlers and laborers to work the land. The price for a single musket at Albany was two beavers and at Montreal, five beavers; eight pounds of powder was worth one beaver in Albany and four beavers in Montreal, thus it was important for the French, who were charging higher prices, to keep control of the trade. Monetary ranking for beaver pelts was broken down into categories of soft, half-soft, green, half-green, wet, and dry then priced accordingly.[42] According to historian William Bennett Munro, "pelts that were of good quality paid two to four livres per pound, and they averaged a little more than two pounds each. The normal cargo of a large canoe was forty packs of skins, each pack weighing about fifty pounds."[43]

---

[41] Munro, *Crusaders of New France*, 158; United States Department of Commerce, "Map of the Great Lakes," *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration*, accessed November 1, 2017, https://www.glerl.noaa.gov/res/glcfs/currents/.

[42] Soft, half-soft, green, half-green, and wet, are names given to the different stages of processing beaver pelts for sale.

[43] John Romeyn Brodhead, *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York*, edited by E. B. O'Callaghan, Vol. 9, p. 408-409, (Albany: Weed Parsons and Company, 1856) comparative table of prices at Fort Orange (Albany) and at Montreal in 1689; Munro, *Crusaders of New France*, 169.

Quebecois had an economy separate from furs that provided settlers of New France with the work force that it lacked to maintain farms, bring in harvests, and provided the Catholic religious communities with followers and workers. Cash flows from the English colonies to pay for redemptions added to the value of the strategy. The alternate economy was in human trafficking; English colonists taken by the French and Indians during 17th and 18th century raids were forced to migrate to Canada to be sold. Susannah Johnson recalled the abduction of her family from Northfield, Massachusetts, in 1754 when she was nine months pregnant and forced to give birth in the wilderness. At the sight of the newborn baby, Johnson's captor exclaimed, "two monies for me, two monies for me!" Mary Rowlandson, taken in a raid on the town of Lancaster, Massachusetts, during King Phillips War in 1676 was one of approximately two dozen men, women and children ransomed for £4-20 each. The price of redemption depended on the condition and usefulness of the captive. Almost hundred years later in 1774, the average income of a colonial farmer was recorded as approximately £15 a year, illustrating what an enormous amount that £20 was for a settler to pay for ransom, especially when many had multiple family members taken at one time.[44]

Indigenous peoples treated English settlers who were captured during warfare and brought to Quebec exclusively as merchandise to be sold in the marketplace or to be peddled door to door. Hundreds of captives were not ransomed, but instead sold because the English colonial government had a policy of not providing ransoms for prisoners, explaining that they did not want to set a price on human beings. It was difficult for

---

[44] Rowlandson, *The Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration*, 56-73; Peter H. Lindert and Jeffery G. Williamson, *American Colonial Incomes, 1650-1774*, National Bureau of Economic Research, accessed November 2, 2017, http://www.nber.org/papers/w19861.

families of the abducted to quickly raise the funds necessary for ransoming hundreds of people at one time, so a great number of people were left unrecovered. For example, in 1677 to pay for the recovery of the citizens of Hatfield and Deerfield required, "the effort of forty-six towns."[45] Raids were continuous and grew more numerous between the late 17th to the early 18th centuries. The task of retrieving all of the abducted individuals was simply too monumental and expensive. Only lucky citizens who had family with money and resources were retrieved quickly upon arrival in Canada. It was not uncommon for entire family units to be captured and marched north without any family left in the English colonies to attempt a ransom.[46]

The French crown had provided money for the passage of its undesirable citizens, most of whom where criminals convicted of crimes such as pouching or smuggling, to sail to French Canada and in return, work off their debt with approximately three years of hard labor. Indentured servants stopped coming to Canada as France entered into wars in Europe. The men who would have been sent to Quebec for labor purposes were needed in France as soldiers to fight in the European wars. It was also expensive to pay the passage for so many men as France was forced to allocate that money for the numerous wars it found itself entangled in. Cost estimations ran approximately 25,000 livres per shipment of indentured individuals to be sent to the New World. In 1666 no indentured servants

---

[45] Allan Greer, *The People of New France* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 89; Emma Lewis Coleman, *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars* (Portland: The Southworth Press, 1925), 70.

[46] Elaine Letki, "Captives of the French and Indian Wars 1676-1763: English Slavery in Canada," (Seminar II research paper, East Stroudsburg University, 2016), 1-26.

arrived and in the many years after 1670 those indentured that France did send were "little children aged twelve to fourteen, fit at most to tend cows."[47]

English captives also served the natives in their villages and were never brought to be sold in Quebec. The Iroquois Confederacy, which was composed of Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, and the Mohawk nations, made the final determination of which prisoners would not been sold in Canada. Remaining unsold captives would be executed, kept as slaves, or adopted as part of a "mourning war experience" customarily began by running prisoners through physical trials such as a gauntlet, which is also called a bastonade. The gauntlet was a purgative, ancient ritual which required captives to run between two long rows of attackers made up of the entire village population. Men suffered the gauntlet custom more than women and children. Runners were stripped of their clothing, some bound, and furiously flogged with clubs, hatchets, switches, fists, and sticks then additionally poked in sensitive areas with hot pokers and branding irons. An account of the gauntlet ritual given by captive James Smith stated that he was told his beating would wash out, "every drop of white blood" from him.[48]

The remarkable successes of the French and Indians in the early wars and the struggles of frontier Americans to survive those attacks despite the deficiencies of their outposts have been explored through various perspectives for centuries. There is no doubt that seizure of thousands of captives from the colonies led to a new economy. Humans were exchanged for either money or to fill a labor void of some kind for the invaders as

---

[47] Peter N. Moogk, "Reluctant Exiles," 463-505.

[48] Daniel K. Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience, " *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 1983): 528-559, accessed March 10, 2016, http://ebsc.ohost.com; Steele, *Setting All the Captives Free*, 205; James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 314.

well as constraining British North American expansion. Captivity journals were popular reading in the 18th century, offering a glimpse into the real and tortured lives of those led away by the natives as the ever-present danger of attack still lingered. Forgotten by time, men, women, and children who were abducted by French and natives, never recovered, did not have the chance to write personal histories documenting that struggle. For all who were left in New France and with the natives, those untold stories can be pieced together with a thorough study of narratives and documentation of that time.[49]

---

[49] Elaine Letki, "Captives of the French and Indian Wars 1676-1763", 1-26.

CHAPTER 3

ENGLISH CAPTIVITY, REDEMPTION, AND SLAVERY: 1676-1763

While the definition of slavery varies from one source to another, it does however share general similarities. The Oxford English Dictionary defines slavery as, "one who is the property of, and entirely subject to, another whether by capture, purchase or birth."[1] The Funk and Wagnalls Encyclopedia defines slavery as a, "social institution defined by law and custom as the most absolute and involuntary form of human servitude." The definition goes on to read that slaves are, "bought, sold, traded, given as a gift or pledged for a debt by their master, usually without any recourse." In 1926 the League of Nations agreed upon a definition at an International Slavery Convention, stating that slavery is, "the status or condition of a person over whom any or all of the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised."[2]

---

[1] *The Oxford English Dictionary,* 2nd ed., s.v. "slave."

[2] Norma H. Dickey, ed., *Funk and Wagnalls New Encyclopedia* (Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company, 1971), 16-17; Jean Allain and Robin Hickey, "Property and the Definition of Slavery," *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 61 no. 4 (October 2012): 915-938, accessed November 1, 2016, http:// ebsco.com.

The use of the term "slavery" has come to define all of the situations in which individuals lose various characteristics of their lives before enslavement; personal freedom, family, name, religion, language, and heritage. What all of these definitions have omitted are the various aspects that can be attributed to slavery since ancient times and continued to persist within the practice. Those characteristics include but are not limited to forced separation from family members; agonizing, forced migration to a place of servitude; binding, marking, or mutilation of individuals for ease of identification; and deracination that includes loss of culture, language, and name. For example, some have claimed that all indentured servants were slaves and though some forms of indentured servitude do meet the criteria of the definition of slavery, it does not meet all.[3] Labor may have been forced in some cases, but indentured servants, for the most part, came to that position either by agreement in exchange for passage or to make restitution for a crime committed.

English taken by French and natives from the northern colonies during the French and Indian wars between 1676 and 1763 became slaves to both native and Quebecois people. Prisoners were taken by force, all captives endured an agonizing life and death journey; some were bound, starved, tortured, mutilated, and brutally killed. All of them were separated from kin. The fortunate were redeemed by family members or others once they reached Canada, but certainly this was not the case for all. Many were sold, "adopted," forced to relinquish their name, religion, language, and heritage, sold as animals in the public square, or peddled door to door, and often required to serve a master or mistress for the rest of their lives without compensation. To be sure, Canada was not

---

[3] Don Jordan and Michael Walsh, *White Cargo: The Forgotten History of Britain's White Slaves in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2007) 1-313.

always a place that promised freedom from slavery, as it would come to be closer to the American Civil War. In the 17th and early 18th centuries, Canadians owned not only native and African slaves, but also white, English slaves as well. Captives of the French and Indians during their wars were not just prisoners they were slaves by every definition.

Natives and French militia carried out violent assaults on vulnerable English settlements between the years 1675 to 1763 that mirrored abductions of human beings for hundreds of years.[4] The raids were organized, militaristic, and designed for the sole purpose of capturing individuals to use them as an economic commodity. Throughout French and Indian wars, natives such as Iroquois, Mohawk, Abenaki, Penacook, and Macquas, attacked vulnerable settlements that lay virtually unprotected on the outskirts of the colonial American frontier.

Marauding parties, sometimes consisting of 200 to 300 attackers, successfully caught settlers who were unprepared to retaliate. The assailants used hatchets, axes, guns, knives, and war clubs to force their way into homes and brutally compel settlers to submit to their will. As William Pote recalled in his journal dated July 1746, a party of determined natives, "Tore off the roof of the house with guns and tomahawks."[5] Homes were set on fire to expose those who had kept the Indians at bay, additionally killing settlers who sought refuge by hiding in concealed cellars. These intense and brutal attacks are still evidenced today through artifacts held at the Deerfield Memorial Hall Museum in

[4] Olaudah Equiano, "The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa, the African," in *Slave Narratives,* ed., Henry Louis Gates Jr. (New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc., 2000), 65-76.

[5] Haefeli and Sweeney, *Captive Histories*, 4-6; William Pote, *The Journal of Captain William*, 93.

Deerfield, Massachusetts. The front door of Ensign John Sheldon's Deerfield home, built in 1699, has survived for three hundred and seventeen years. As residents of the town were committed to preserving it over the centuries because it represented the "sacrifices made by early Deerfield residents."[6] Dozens of deep, jagged gouge marks from The attacker's tomahawks made dozens of deep, jagged gouge marks creating an opening large enough to get an arm or rifle though (See Appendix Figure 2). Mrs. Sheldon's death was a direct result of a firearm that came through the breach in the front door. The dramatic event of Hannah Stebbins Sheldon's death is detailed at the Deerfield Memorial Hall Museum along with several musket balls dug from a wall of the Sheldon home.[7]

Colonists who retaliated or became injured as a result of assaults were immediately executed. In 1676, Mary Rowlandson vividly described the attack on her town of Lancaster, Massachusetts, as "a solemn sight to see so many Christians lying in their blood, some here, and some there, like a company of Sheep torn by Wolves."[8] Elizabeth Hanson gave a similar account in 1724, writing that when the natives attacked them at their home in Dover, New Hampshire with tomahawks and guns, "The Indians killed my four-year-old right before my eyes. I did the best I could not to scream out or appear disturbed for I did not want them to kill the other child in the same way."[9] Hanson was not physically harmed by the natives at the time her children were slaughtered,

---

[6] John Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story From Early America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 21; Susan McGowan and Amelia F. Miller, *Family & Landscape: Deerfield Homelots from 1671* (Deerfield: Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association, 1996), 26.

[7] French or Indian, Musket ball, Deerfield Memorial Hall Museum, Deerfield, Massachusetts.

[8] Mary White Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God: Together with the Faithfulness of His Promises Displayed* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1997), 68-70.

[9] Henry L. Carrigan Jr., *Boundless Faith: Early American Women's Captivity Narratives* (Brewster: Paraclete Press, 1989), 54-55.

however the psychological torture inflicted by witnessing their murder and scalping mutilation combined with the threat of the same befalling her surviving children was pervasive enough to force her to immediately comply with the natives' demands of capture.

Men and women who did not appear to be immediately physically and psychologically weakened by the brutal massacre unfolding in front of them were quickly bound at capture. Binding captives is a distinctive characteristic of abduction events. John Williams, taken from Massachusetts in 1704, wrote about the night he was captured, "by three Indians, who disarmed me, and bound me naked."[10] Adult men were most likely to be shackled for their perceived lack of weakened state of being or obedience. Resistant captives found themselves but subject to having their fingers or fingernails removed to prevent them from to loosening their bindings. According to one narrative, Mohawk natives also removed the nails of an abducted child "...no more than twelve or thirteen years old, they tore out five of his nails with their teeth."[11] The practice of removing the toes of less obedient captives was likewise used by native captors on their English prisoners to force compliancy and to hinder their ability to escape. Correspondingly, toe removal was also a common practice of Virginian slave holders to deter escape.[12]

Missing appendages were very common among the captives taken from the English colonies. The mere sight of missing fingers and toes during the French and

[10] Harriet Jacobs, "Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl," in *Slave Narratives*, ed., Henry Louis Gates, Jr., (New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc., 2000), 935; Williams, *The Redeemed Captive*, 9.

[11] Dean R. Snow, *The Iroquois* (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1996), 127; William A. Starna and Ralph Watkins, "Northern Iroquoian Slavery," *Ethnohistory* 38, no. 1 (Winter 19strategy91): 34-57, accessed September 16, 2016, http://www.jstor.org/stable/482790.

[12] Steele, *Setting All the Captives Free*, 231.

Indian wars marked that individual as a person who was currently the submissive of another or had spent time in the ownership of another. Historically, markings of some sort have been used in other slave societies so that those in servitude would be easily recognized. Skin tone for example, conveniently served as the mark of slavery for Africans living in the American South before the Civil War. Many male slaves in early modern China were marked with castration and once becoming Eunuchs, they were barred from ever reentering Chinese society as a free person. Other Chinese slaves were branded with missing appendages, a mark that caused human traffickers to add to their slave supply by kidnapping innocent people within the lower ranks of society and "lopping of a foot to convert their victims to credible merchandise."[13] Roman slaves wore distinct clothing and were forced to wear iron collars if they had attempted escape and been recaptured. African slaves held by the French in Canada who had attempted escape were branded on the shoulder with a fleur de lis; repeated escape attempts resulted in the slicing of their hamstrings and a fleur de lis on the opposite shoulder with any attempt of escape thereafter resulting in death.[14]

The only alternative to submitting to the will of the natives was death, as escape was rarely a viable solution. Slave narratives from many civilizations throughout history document slave deaths resulting from attempted escape. John Gyles, a young man taken captive from a raid in Maine, conveyed the fate of his brother who was recaptured along with another escapee: "Their noses and ears were cut off and they were made to eat them

---

[13] Crossley, "Slavery in Early Modern China," 189-190.

[14] Keith Bradley, "Resisting Slavery At Rome," in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, ed. Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 366-370, accessed October 15, 2016, http://wwww.cambridge.org; Marcel Trudel, *Canada's Forgotten Slaves: Two Centuries of Bondage*, (Montreal: Vehiclue Press, 2012), 161.

after which they were burned at the stake."[15] Many prisoners' journals specified that their captors made it clear that all of the abducted would be burned alive if even one in their group fled. Movement restrictions of captives during night time respites were also implemented by binding both hands and feet. Escapees who were successful in evading recapture by the natives were still likely to die by starvation, freezing temperatures, and scalp hunters as they attempted to travel completely unknown routes back to New England.[16]

Similarly, simply expressing a desire to return to the English was just as dangerous as attempting to escape. Natives perceived this as noncompliance and resisting their claim of ownership. Opposition of any type almost always resulted in either a swift or torturous death. Men or women who pled for mercy and requested to be freed from their abductors did not fare any better. Ann Joslin, a very pregnant captive woman taken from Lancaster, Massachusetts, begged the natives for her release only to be hit in the head and thrown into a fire along with the toddler she was holding.[17] Indiscriminate human disposal falls within the framework of ownership as individuals with property rights also have the power to dispose of that property as they see fit. Native captors clearly exerted their ownership rights in this way, feeling that they possessed absolute control over their captives' fates.

---

[15] Diana Paton, "Punishment, Crime, and the Bodies of Slaves in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica," *Journal of Social History* 34, no. 4 (2001): 923-54, accessed November 1, 2016, http://www.jstor.org; Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676-1724* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), 13.

[16] Foster, *The Captors' Narrative*, 152-153.

[17] Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 77.

A long, difficult, and treacherous journey stood between the English prisoners and their final destination in Canada or in a northern native village. Weary captives, some wounded from capture, traveled hundreds of miles and for months at a time, exposed to the harsh elements and almost always without adequate food and water needed to sustain life.[18] The type of journey that the English were forced to take parallels the experience slaves including African slaves endured on land and sea journeys to their abductors' territory. For example, Olaudah Equino a slave taken from West Africa in the mid-1700s provides a horrifying account of the miserable conditions endured by African captives on a Middle Passage ship. Describing the unbearable heat and pestilential conditions in the overcrowded cargo hold Equino stated that, "The air soon became unfit for respiration from a variety of loathsome smells, and brought on a sickness among the slaves, of which many died." Prisoners on African slave ships were often callously discarded en route to their destination, tossed overboard if ill serving as bait to draw in large fish such as shark, which was then used to feed the crew.[19]

Virtually every abducted English individual was forced to carry a heavy pack of supplies, or goods seized by the natives, on their back. Packs were often so heavy that once relieved of them, one man declared that his, "bones all seem to be misplaced."[20] Weakness, sickness, and exasperating behavior were not endured by the natives. Captives who exhibited any of these were quickly killed, with small children particularly

---

[18] Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, *New England, New France and adjoining Native areas circa 1700*, map. In the Captors' Narrative, by William Henry Foster (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 5.

[19] Olaudah Equino, *Slave Narratives*, 76; Robert Burroughs, "Eyes on the Prize: Journeys in Slave Ships Taken as Prizes by the Royal Navy," *Slavery and Abolition* 31, no. 1 (March 2010): 11-115, accessed November 2, 2016, http://www.ebscohost.com.

[20] Pote, *The Journal of Captain William Pote*, 60; Williams, *The Redeemed Captive*, 23.

susceptible to death on the journey. Women were also burdened with carrying goods, as well as any infants that may have been taken on the journey. Children who cried excessively or who made noises loud enough to give away the group's location in the wilderness were not tolerated. Quieting an infant who was scared, tired, cold, and starving was nearly impossible, therefore many small children perished. Accounts note that the heads of infants were quickly and violently smashed against a solid object, such as a tree or rock, and their bodies simply thrown aside.[21]

Forced migration in the American South herded close to one million African slaves to the Southern and Western states between 1790 and 1850.[22] Similarly, men, women, and children traversed mountains and rivers throughout the dead of winter on the journey north. Captive John Williams wrote that they traveled in "snow being knee-deep."[23] Williams was a grown man, which indicated that snow up to his knees would have been much deeper and exhausting for a woman or a young child traveling the same route. William's wife Eunice travelled the same route and fell into a freezing river so deep her head went under. Eunice's energy was so taxed from trying to escape the swift current that her extreme exhaustion became apparent; the natives deemed her too weak to continue and immediately killed her with a hatchet when she emerged from the river. Mary Jemison, a child taken from New York 1755, chronicled in her narrative that all

---

[21] Carrigan, *Boundless Faith*, 51.

[22] Edward E. Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and The Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), 2-3.

[23] Vaughan, *Puritans*, 180.

prisoners, including children, were forced to keep up the rapid pace set by abductors who whipped their backs force in them to move hastily.[24]

Environmental elements like deep snow exhausted the captives and ravaged their weakened bodies. An upper icy crust of snow posed a significant problem as it shredded the skin on their legs and ankles."[25] Men, women, and children exposed to the elements on the journey north suffered from extreme frostbite. John Gyles wrote that his feet were so frozen that his "skin came off my feet from my ankles whole like a shoe and left my toes naked without a nail and the ends of my great toe bones bare." The young man was acutely crippled by his injuries, yet the natives made it clear that if he failed to walk and carry his burden he would be killed. Resourcefulness was imperative to prisoners' survival on these long and treacherous journies. Gyles pulled himself into the woods on his bottom, gathered pine tree sap and applied enough to his wounds so that he could use his heels to walk and continue on.[26]

Starvation was an everyday reality for the English prisoners as they traveled. To be sure all slaves complained about the lack of food. French and Indian war captivity journals describe hunger so painful and crippling. In his journal Quentin Stockwell wrote that he was so starved for food that he ate touchwood, "decayed wood with fungus."[27] Finding any type of sustenance to draw energy from was of the utmost importance for

---

[24] Williams, *The Redeemed Captive*, 14; Seaver, *A Narrative*, 33.

[25] Demos, *Unredeemed Captive*, 29.

[26] Vaughan, *Puritans*, 110.

[27] Quentin Stockwell, "Relation of His 1677 Captivity and redemption, 1684," in *Captive Histories: English, French, and Native Narratives of the 1704 Deerfield Raid,* ed., Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), 43.

captives so that theycould continue traveling; carrying out whatever tasks the natives required of them. Still many starving men, women, and children fell and died traveling north, their remains left to be consumed by wild animals. Hannah Swarton recalled eating "moose bladder filled with maggots." Elizabeth Hanson recorded in her journal that she scraped for the "guts and garbage" of beavers her masters had feasted on.[28] Others reported eating everything from boiled horse hooves to parts of deceased humans to satisfy their intense hunger and ward off starvation.[29] The responsibility to somehow find food was up to the helpless English and not their abductors. Natives seldom shared what they hunted and gathered with their prisoners; the food that was shared was often the most undesired and unnourishing scraps. Hierarchy of diet consumption between captors and captives is an example of power, submission, and ownership similar to the relationship of an animal and its owner. Children who were still nursing and unable to consume adult food were very vulnerable as starving mothers were unable to produce milk and feed their babies. A malnourished mother recalled that her baby boy had gone twenty-six days without food and had subsisted on water only during that time. The Frenchman who purchased the starving infant along with his starving mother expected the child would die as soon as his belly had solid food in it as that frequently occurred with those suffering from hunger.[30]

---

[28] Hannah Swarton, "A Narrative of Hannah Swarton Containing Wonderful Passages Relating to Her Captivity and Deliverance Related by Cotton Mather," in Alden T. Vaughan & Edward W. Clark, ed., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676-1724* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), 150; Elizabeth Hanson, "God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty, Exemplified in the Captivity and Redemption of Elizabeth Hanson," in Alden T. Vaughan & Edward W. Clark, ed., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676-1724* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1981), 234.

[29] Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 79.

[30] Hanson, *Puritans*, 241.

Abducted English families were rarely kept together. More commonly familial ties were severed almost immediately after capture and family members disposed of individually, many of them never seeing single family member again for the duration of their lives. The practice of family separation has been a characteristic of slavery for thousands of years. Roman law stated that slaves must be sold individually as part of the Aedilician edict. Forcible family separations were also commonplace in the African slave trade in America.[31] Unfortunately many slaves found themselves in the position of being separated from their parents and siblings as a child only to grow up raise a family of their own, and then be separated again from a spouse and children.

Raids on English settlements were carried out by Indians coming from several different tribal groups who worked together merely to carry out the attack and profit from the results. Immediately after a raid the abductors divided up the English men, woman and children amongst themselves. Individual English went with and belonged to the person who captured them; many times those natives were from different tribes and headed for isolated independent tribal territories. It is easy to discern not only from French and Indian war narratives, as well often slave narratives, that forced family separation was arguably the most wrenching and painful part of a slave's ordeal.

The narrative of Jacob D. Green a slave from Kentucky includes an incident he witnessed wherein a husband named Ruben was about to be sold separately from his wife Sally and their five children. Upon the sale of her husband, Sally, overcome with "the

---

[31] Keith Bradley, "The Regular, Daily Traffic in Slaves," *The Classical Journal* 87, no. 2 (December 1991-January 1992): 125-138, accessed October 7, 2016, http://www.jstor.org; Damian Alan Pargas, "Disposing of Human Property: American Slave Families and Forced Separation in Comparative Perspective," *Journal of Family History* 34, no. 3 (July 2009): 251-274, accessed October 12, 2016, http://ebscohost.com.

anguish of her soul," broke out of the slave sale pen and threw herself at her husband's new master begging for herself and her children to be purchased by him as well. Sally was beaten in her head with the butt of a lead filled carriage whip until dead. Her husband Ruben ran to his wife after struggling free of his bindings was also shot dead on the spot.[32] Native abductors separated their prisoners so they would be less likely to rise up against them. Family members were not only removed from each other and placed under separate possession, but were also routinely unable to communicate with their kin in any way or to identify themselves as part of the same kin group while they were with their captors. One English woman reported that her family members were scattered, and even if she saw them in passing, there was no liberty to speak with them, "without danger to my life."[33]

English captives were forced to remain apart from their family members even after they were transferred into the hands of the French. Redemption only meant a change in possession, it did not mean that family members were reunited nor that their harsh treatment had ended. Ownership and control of English prisoners remained the course of action in Quebec. Visits between parents and children required special permission and were usually supervised. Any correspondence between family members in Canada or between family members in Canada and the English Colonies were first read by the French, before being delivered to the recipient. A letter dated May1725 from Nathaniel Otis, an English captive living in Quebec, to his sister Mary in Boston asked her to buy a seal so that they would know that the letters sent were between siblings and had not been

---

[32] Jacob D. Green, "Narrative of the Life," in *Slave Narratives,* ed., Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc., 2000), 979-980.

[33] Starna,"Northern Iroquoian Slavery," 40-41; Swarton, *Puritans*, 148.

read and possibly altered by the French. Otis's letter also stated that he longed to see his sister, asking for news of any of his relations as, "permission is not easily obtained," to see them.[34]

Conceivably, nothing more clearly established an individual as a slave than to be publically displayed and inspected as an animal, almost always while nude, and then sold as chattel. In Montreal's market square French purchasers came to buy the abducted English, "exposed for sale there by their Indian captors" for work in textiles or on farms. Traditionally, it was a requirement of the natives to strip their imprisoned men bare not only for the purposes of inspection and sale, but also to symbolically communicate that they were entering a much different life the same way they had entered their previous life the day they were born. [35]

Those who were kept by the natives might possibly be selected to replace a deceased Iroquois family member that had been lost due to war or disease. The selected surviving captives then went through a "requickening" ceremony where the deceased native's name and the responsibilities that he or she had were spoken loudly and at that point considered to be transferred to an appointed prisoner. Adoption as a family member did not necessarily mean that a requickened English man, woman, or child was then a full-fledged member of their adoptive tribe. For example, during her time with the Iroquois, Abigail Nims was referred to as "Kana8k8a (the slave)" by her adoptive Indian

[34] Williams, *Redeemed*, 34-35; Nathaniel Otis to his sister Mary Varney at Montreal, 1 May 1725, in *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars* by Emma Lewis Coleman (Portland: The Southworth Press, 1925), 162-163.

[35] William Henry Foster, *The Captors' Narrative,* 1-39.

mother.[36] A name change was usually the first step in a deracinating process, which effectively erased every part of an individual's previous life.

Civilizations had different naming procedures for their slaves for hundreds of years. White Athenian slaves from the time period of 300 to 500 b.c., simply referred to slaves as "andrapodon," which meant "man footed thing" evoking the idea of a slave being equal to an animal.[37] Scythians, a civilization from the ninth century Central Eurasian Steppes now located in Iran, referred to their slaves only as the "blind ones," which stemmed from the mutilation of the slaves' eyes that rendered them sightless.[38] Egyptian records from the time of Ramses II show that slaves that originated from other countries are quickly given Egyptian names. The Romans also renamed slaves in accordance to the places where they were bought, rather than where the slave came from. Similarly, French names for the English prisoners reflected French culture, and not the culture where the captive originated from.[39]

Many descendants of African slaves still bear the slave surnames given to them by their ancestors' masters as their previous identities were terminated. Those new names shared no connection to any part of African culture or origin, completely discussing the familial nomenclature, and erasing the individuals' identification with his or her ancestry. At times a slave's name changed several times as they moved from one owner to another.

---

[36] Richter,"War and Culture", 531; Coleman, *New England Captives*, 45.

[37] T. E. Rihll, "Classical Athens," in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, ed. Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 51, accessed October 15, 2016, http://www.cambridge.org.

[38] Daniel C. Snell, "Slavery in the Ancient Near East," in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, ed. Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 7, accessed October 15, 2016, http://www.cambridge.org.

[39] Rihll, "Classical Athens,"17; Ian Morris, "Archaeology and Greek Slavery," in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, ed. Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 184, accessed October 15, 2016, http://www.cambridge.org.

The Iroquois intended to keep renamed captives as one of the steps of the "mourning war" process, seeing it as a symbolic act that removed a previous identity.[40] Changing the name of a slave was not done to make them more acceptable to their owners, but was done to both destroy and deny the value of their birth names and represent only their value as the property of another.[41] The renaming of English captives and the severing of their previous ties to culture and identity was equivalent to that experience.

Thomas Edmunds, an Englishman captured in a raid on Pemaquid, Maine in 1689 and brought to Quebec was re-baptized and renamed John Baptiste Haimon as part of his new forced French and Catholic identity.[42] Edmunds new name could not be identified as English in anyway and would mislead generations of his family as to their family's true origins. Some captives were simply given the generic name of "Jean L'Anglais," which translates to John the English, a nonspecific name label used in the same way as John Doe is commonly used as placeholder name for a forgotten or anonymous person."Jean L'Anglaise" was also a name reserved for older English men who refused to comply with religious conversion. The new French name that would be bestowed upon an individual at Catholic baptism could not be applied; therefore a generic but French name filled the requisite.[43]

---

[40] Neville Smith, "Emancipation and the Great Wheel of Labour," *English in Africa* 42, no. 3 (December 2015): 78-88, accessed November 3, 2015, ebscohost.com; Starna, *Northern Iroquoian Slavery*, 41.

[41] Obiagele Lake, "Cultural Hierarchy and the Renaming of African People," *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 21, no. 4 (1997): 261-271, accessed September 17, 2016, ebscohost.com.

[42] Author's 7x Great-grandfather born in Maine 1665, captured by the Indians in the raid on Pemaquid, Maine, August, 1689.

[43] Foster, *The Captors' Narrative*, 15-16.

Eradication of Puritanism or Protestantism from the English captives' identities was as traumatic emotionally to them as the violence of capture and the subsequent journey had been to them physically. The Puritan religion was the basis of their entire culture in the colonies and they had suffered monumentally to be able to practice it freely. A long list of wars fought over religion in Europe beginning in 1524 serve as a testament to the determination that Protestants had to be able to freely to practice their religion.[44] Protestants that came to America made additional sacrifices and overcame myriad challenges embarking on a dangerous trip across the Atlantic and settling in a land that was largely uncivilized in order to be able to practice their religion freely. Protestant heritage that the captives lost meant everything to the English; it had been echoed in every aspect of their lives as a message to God.

The contrasts between Protestantism and Catholicism were enormous as each had its own distinguishing rules and patterns for life, death, and everything in between. For example, Puritans believed in predestination the belief that God had predetermined salvation before an individual was born and that predetermination could not be changed by any good works that are done on earth. Catholics believe that men and women are saved by the works that they do on earth, including sacraments. Puritans also opposed religious iconography while Catholics use many forms of religious iconography such as rosaries and holy relics. Captive John Williams wrote in his journal that the French Canadians worship the images of saints, which were forbidden to Puritans, and tried to force the English to worship the same way. Williams further reported that many English chose to be beaten rather than commit the egregious sin of conversion: "For two years all

[44] Dr. Christopher Dudley, *Reformations and the European Wars of Religion*, Fall semester 2015.

means of threats and abuse to get her to turn, they commanded she cross herself, she refused they hit her with a box on the ear, still she refused, they whipped her with branches full of knots until her hands were full of wales."[45] Conversion abuses of the English only ceased when they consented to convert to the French Catholic religion.

Protestants were not all willing participants in the conversion to Catholicism and the two religions had many differences in core beliefs. Throughout the captives' journals they repeatedly refer to the French as those of the Romanish faith or the popish faith because the Pope and Rome are the supreme power of the Catholic Church whereas only scripture is the supreme power for the Protestants on earth. Colonial English culture demanded that its followers were strictly prudent, humble, and plain in all aspects of their life including food, dress, and notably behavior. For example many religious celebrations were suppressed by the Puritans, but the observance of Christmas became illegal in Massachusetts between 1659 and 1681 with a fine of five shillings because it was too celebratory.[46]

Cultural differences between the English and French were resoundingly apparent in many aspects of their lives. English captives were commanded to dress, eat and live in the style of their captors. The plain dress of the English colonies was meant as an expression to God that they were humble before him and it was a part of the culture that the men, women, and children of the Puritan faith were forced to relinquish. French Canadian women used self-expression through clothing, which had been the trend for women in France; their dress was colorful and often times ostentatious, routinely used to

[45] Williams *The Redeemed Captive*, 57.

[46] Stephen W. Nissenbaum, "Christmas in Early New England, 1620-1820: Puritanism, Popular Culture, and the Printed Word," *American Antiquarian Society* 106, no. 1 (April 1996): 79-164.

call attention to an individual's social rank. On Sundays French women covered their legs for mass, but wore dresses that showed a great deal of their skin in a dropped neckline. An English observer wrote that the French Canadian women had "Their hair always curled even when they are at home in a dirty jacket and coarse skirt that does not reach the middle of their legs."[47] French culture was accepting of a more fashionable and colorful type of dress and behavior, completely opposite of the Puritan lifestyle who thought their attire unholy.

Deracination of the English prisoners continued with the loss of their native language and both the French Canadians and the natives demanded that the captives speak their language. As Mary Jemison, a captive of the Seneca natives wrote, "My sisters would not allow me to speak English in their hearing; but remembering the charge that my dear mother gave to me at the time I left her, whenever I chanced to be alone I made a business of repeating my prayer, catechism, or something I had learned in order that I might not forget my own language." Another young girl sold to nuns in Quebec recorded that "the nuns told her she should not be permitted to speak English anymore."[48] Identity and mother tongue were completely interwoven as speech immediately distinguished captives and their place of origin. The mandatory termination of use of the English language further robbed captives of that connection to their identity and heritage.

Another cultural distinction lost by the Protestants in captivity was the patriarchal structure of their society as was modeled for them in scripture. The male dominated culture was completely opposite from the matriarchal design of nearly all northeastern tribal nations that held and "adopted" English prisoners. Not only were the abducted men,

---

[47] Steele, *Setting All The Captives Free*, 209; Foster, *The Captors' Narrative*, 23-148.

[48] Seaver, *A Narrative*, 48; Williams, *Redeemed Captive*, 58.

women, and children forced to accept being led by females, but according to anthropologists, the male prisoners were also forced to take on the labors of females, referred to as "drudgery" which served to mentally and emotionally shame them. Some of the work required pounding corn, gathering wild food, and tending gardens. Squaws could also physically control a grown man as described in the journal of captive William Pote, who documented women captors that beat them with bloody scalps and, "standing behind us, ablige us to keep our Necks strong so as to bear their weight, then Raise themselves, their feet off ye Ground and their weight hanging by our hairs and Ears, in this manner, they thumped us in ye Back and Sides, with their knees and feet, and twitched our hair and ears to such a degree, that I am Incapable to Express it"[49] Native matriarchs controlled their prisoners not always with physical power, but also by denying them food as many were kept strong enough to do menial work, but not strong enough to attempt an escape.[50]

Though the cultural family structure was not as maternally dominated as it was for the natives, Canadian women were able to make authoritative decisions for their households as well. In the mid to late 17th century women such as Marguerite-Renee Tarieu had the ability take over all aspects of her husband's business by herself after his death. To manage this feat Tarieu purchased English captives from the natives. Quebecois females routinely made workforce purchasing decisions as well as commanded and punished the prisoners that they acquired.[51] Maternal authority exercised by both the French and native women would have been not only a cultural shock for

---

[49] Foster, *Captors' Narrative*, 7-10; Pote, *The Journal*, 57-58.

[50] Ibid., 5-58.

[51] Ibid., 9-150.

English Protestants, but would have also violated the law set down by scripture. The familiar family structure destroyed by both natives and the French was yet another part of the English Protestant heritage that they lost.

During the years of the French and Indian wars there were brief times of peace where it was agreed through treaty that all of the captured individuals should be released to their respective territories. During these times of peace the Quebecois people refused to return all of the prisoners they had purchased or "redeemed." For example, in 1698, more than a year after the drafting and signing of the Treaty of Ryswick, the English Governor Bellomont sent messengers to Quebec to retrieve their prisoners from the French. It was at that time that Governor Frontenac of Canada defiantly claimed that all of the English had been given back with the exception of those who they considered to be now naturalized citizens. French officials not only used naturalization as a way to keep the English in Canada, they also made false claims of prisoners that had left Canada and gone to Europe to work for better wages. Conveniently for the French, the newly claimed citizens were "those who have established themselves and have embraced the Catholic religion."[52] French demands of the religious conversion of all English men and woman and the forced conversions of their children too young to knowingly consent was precisely what trapped those people permanently as their captors used Catholic baptism and name changes to lay claim to them for the rest of their lives. It is clear that religious reformation was used as a tool by the French not only to demonstrate Catholicism as the more ascendant religion over English Protestantism, but also as an unscrupulous tool to maintain control of their human investments.

---

[52] Coleman, New *England Captives*, 72-121.

The practice of illegally keeping captives and claiming them to be naturalized citizens voluntarily wishing to stay in Canada still persisted for all the years of the French and Indian wars. After the wars, thirteen English petitioned the British government for clothes and money for their passage back home. The thirteen ransomed prisoners explained that all of them and their families were abducted from homes between Pennsylvania and Virginia. They were then marched to Canada by the natives who sold them, "as slaves to the French," also stating that, "they kept their children."[53]

Scholarship over time have suggested or stated that the English captives abducted from the English colonies by the natives had various purposes. Some sources referred to them as the "redeemed" or "unredeemed," which simply meant that they were or were not reclaimed. The definition of "redeemed" may fit those who reached Canada and were immediately ransomed by their families or communities and sent directly back to the colonies, but that is not what happened to the majority of English. Since it was extremely expensive for most families to raise the money needed to rescue several members of the same family quickly, and the English colonial government had a policy of not paying for the release of prisoners, the "unredeemed" were not just unclaimed, they were unavoidably left behind. Those unlucky individuals were then subjected to every variety of transgression imaginable to their person, family, culture, and labors.

It has been suggested that the abducted English men, women, and children served a contract much like an indentured servant. This was simply not true as terms for most purchased individuals were open ended for their service. The involuntary workforces were never made aware of what amount money or what amount of time would fulfill their

---

[53] Steele, *Setting All The Captives Free*, 298.

debt to repay the amount of their purchase because simply repaying the purchase amount was never the objective of their buyers. Indentured servants serve out a preset term that pays off an agreed upon amount and then they are free to embark on their own lives as they please.

English men, women, and children taken by the natives were also referred to in many texts as merely prisoners and captives. Initially that definition was fitting because they were bound and/or confined to the immediate location of their captors. Captivity continued as part of the English experience as different types of restraints were applied including involuntary naturalization. After various transferals, sales, kinship eradication, cultural destruction, and involuntary labor occurred prisoners became something else. They became part of a larger more sinister plan not just to hold onto them as merchandise but to exploit them and their labors as well.

What the English men, women, and children who were taken by the natives actually became after capture has been largely misunderstood because writers of their history have simply not made all of the connections. Several sources though have stated that the English were sold like slaves, however it is not just the fact that they were sold like chattel and preformed involuntary servitude that made them slaves. The fact that they endured every peripheral pattern and definition of slavery known from ancient times including forced abduction and migration with death as the only alternative to compliance, binding, marking, permanent separation from kin, forced deracination, involuntary and uncompensated labor made them slaves. Every abbreviated and expanded definition of the word slavery applied to their situation. The abducted and unredeemed English of the French and Indian wars were slaves.

Appendix

Fig. 1. Fort Niagara Main Building[1]

[1] Elaine L. R. Conlin, photo, Fort Niagara, personal photograph album, Youngstown, New York, July 1991.

Fig. 2. Ensign John Sheldon's front door after the Deerfield, Massachusetts attack 1704[2]

[2] Elaine L. R. Letki, photo, Fort Niagara, personal photograph album, Youngstown, New York, July 2017.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Altholz, Josef L. *Selected Documents in Irish History*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Brodhead, John Romeyn. *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of New York.* Edited by E.

Conlin, Elaine L. R. Photo, Fort Niagara. Personal photograph album. Youngstown, New York. July 1991.

Equiano, Olaudah. 2000."The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa, the African." In *Slave Narratives*, edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., 65-76. New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc.

Francoise , Marie. Basilique Notre Dame (Montreal, Canada) baptism, page 5. *Quebec, Vital and Church Records Drouin Collection, 1621-1967*. Ancestry Digital Collection. Accessed June 1, 2019. http://www.ancestry.com.

French or Indian Musket ball. Artifact. Deerfield Memorial Hall Museum. Deerfield, Massachusetts.

Green, Jacob D. 2000. "Narrative of the Life." In *Slave Narratives,* edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., 979-980. New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc.

Hanson, Elizabeth. "God's Mercy Surmounting Man's Cruelty, Exemplified in the Captivity and Redemption of Elizabeth Hanson." In *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption 1676-1724* edited by Alden T. Vaughan & Edward W. Clark. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hennepin, Louis. *A New Discovery of a Vast Country in America*. Chicago: A.C. McClung & Co., 1903.

Indians, Eastern. "Eastern Indians to the Governor of Massachusetts. 1 February 1742." In The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1607-1763, 122-148. By Douglas Leach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Indians, Mohegan. "Mohegan Indians Petition the King in Their Dispute with the Colonial Government of Connecticut." In *Major Problems in American Colonial History*, edited by Karen Ordahl Kupperman. Boston: Wadsworth, 2013.

Jacobs, Harriet. 2000. "Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl." In *Slave Narratives*, edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr., 935. New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc.

King of France, Louis XIV. 1908. "Letters-Patent Creating Barony of Longueil in Favor of Charles Le Moyne Sieur de Longueil, January 26, 1700." *In Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1854*, edited by William Munro. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

King of France, Louis XIV. 1908. "Royal Arret Concerning Seigniorial Mills, June 4, 1686." *In Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1854*, edited by William Munro. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

King of France, Louis XIV. 1908. "Royal Decree Accepting the Surrender of all Rights held by the Company of One Hundred Associates, March, 1663." *In Documents to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1854*, edited by William Munro. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

King of France, Louis XIV. "The Declaration of the Most Christian King of France and Navarre Against the Most Horrid prodeedings of a Rebellious Party of Parliament-Men and Souldiers in England, Against their King and Country," translated by P.B., Paris. 2. Accessed: 3 August, 2019. http://www.quod.lib.umich.edu.

King of France, Louis XIV. *Treaty of Utrecht* (1713). Accessed March 20, 2018. http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/utrecht.

King of England, Charles I. *The Charter of Massachusetts Bay: 1629*, Yale Law School, Avalon Project, Documents in Law, History, and Diplomacy.

King of England, James I. *The Second Charter of Virginia*, 1609. Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library, Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy. Accessed October 20, 2017. http://avalon.law.yale.edu

King of England, James I. *The New England Charter, 1620*, Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library, Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy. Accessed October 20,2017. http://avalon.law.yale.edu.

Mather, Cotton. "Cotton Mather Describes the Indians of Massachusetts and John Eliot's Mission to Them, 1702." In *Major Problems in American Colonial History*. 3rd ed. edited by Karen Ordahl Kupperman. Boston: Wadsworth, 2013.

Minutes of the North Carolina Governor's Council, North Carolina, August 04, 1720-August 12,1720. Accessed October 1, 2017. http://docsouth.unc.edu/csr/index.php/document/csr02-0199.

Nims, Marie Elisabeth. Basilique Notre Dame (Montreal, Canada) baptism, 1704, page 277. Quebec, Vital and Church Records Drouin Collection, 1621-1967. Ancestry Digital Collection. Accessed March 10, 2016. http://search.ancestry.com.

Otis, Nathaniel. Nathaniel Otis to his sister Mary Varney at Montreal. 1 May, 1725. In *NewEngland Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars*, 162-163. By Emma Lewis Coleman. Portland: Southworth Press, 1925.

Pote, William. *The Journal of Captain William Pote, Jr., During His Captivity in the French and Indian War*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1895.

Richelieu, Cardinal Armand Jean du Plessis. 1908."Extract from Charter of the Company of One Hundred Associates, April 29, 1627." In *Documents Relating to the Seigniorial Tenure in Canada 1598-1627*, edited by William Munro. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

Rowlandson, Mary. *The Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930.

Seaver, James E. *A Narrative of the Life of Mrs. Mary Jemison*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.

Sheldon, John. Artifact. Front Door of Home, ca. 1699; Deerfield Memorial Hall Museum. Deerfield, Massachusetts.

Stockwell, Quentin. "Relation of His 1677 Captivity and redemption, 1684." In *Captive Histories:English, French, and Native Narratives of the 1704 Deerfield Raid*, edited by Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Swarton, Hannah. 1981. "A Narrative of Hannah Swarton Containing Wonderful Passages Relating to Her Captivity and Deliverance Related by Cotton Mather." In *Puritans Among the Indians: of Captivity and Redemption 1676-172,* edited by Alden T. Vaughan & Edward W. Clark. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

United States Department of Commerce. "Map of the Great Lakes." National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Accessed November 1, 2017. https://www.glerl.noaa.gov/res/glcfs/currents/.

United States Department of the Interior. "Sketch Map of Old Fort Niagara National Historic Landmark." "National Register of Historic Places-Nomination Form: Fort Niagara," 1986.

Vaughan, Alden T. and Edward W. Clark. Map of New England, New France, and adjoining Native areas circa 1700. Map. In *The Captors' Narrative*, 5. By William Henry Foster. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Virginia Miscegenation Law 1691, law.georgetown.edu/library/collections.

Williams, John. *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966.

Williams, Samuel. Letter from Samuel Williams to his father John Williams at Montreal. 12 May, 1706. In *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion*, 81-82. By John Williams. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966.

Williamson Peter. *French and Indian Cruelty: Exemplified in the Life and Various Vicissitudes of Fortune.* Bristol: Thoemmes, 1996.

Secondary Sources:

Allain, Jean, and Robin Hickey. "Property and the Definition of Slavery." *International & Comparative Law Quarterly* 61, no. 4 (October 2012): 915-938. Accessed November 1, 2016. http://ebscohost.com.

Atherton, William Henry. *Montreal Under the French Regime 1535-1760.* Montreal: S.J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1914.

Atkinson, Jay. *Massacre on the Merrimack: Hannah Duston's Captivity and Revenge in Colonial America.* Guilford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.

Axtell, James. *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Axtell, James. "Jemima Sawtelle." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 5 (1983). Accessed August 5, 2019. http://www.biographi.ca.

Baker, Charlotte Alice. *True Stories of New England Captives Carried to Canada During the Old French and Indian Wars*. Greenfield: E. A. Hall & Co., 1897.

Brandão, José António. *Your Fyre Shall Burn No More: Iroquois Policy Toward New France and Its Native Allies to 1701.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Bradley, Keith. "Resisting Slavery At Rome." In *The Cambridge World History of Slavery* edited by Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge. 366-370. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Accessed October 15, 2016. http://www.cambridge.org.

Bradley, Robert L. *The Forts of Pemaquid, Maine: An Archaeological and Historical Study*. Augusta: Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 1994.

Bradley, Keith. "The Regular, Daily Traffic in Slaves." *The Classical Journal* 87, no. 2 (December 1991- January 1992): 125-138. Accessed October 7, 2016. http://www.jstor.org.

Burroughs, Robert. "Eyes on the Prize: Journeys in Slave Ships Taken as Prizes by the Royal Navy."*Slavery & Abolition* 31, no. 1 (March 2010): 99-115. Accessed November 17, 2016. http://www.ebscohost.com.

Carrigan, Henry L. Jr. *Boundless Faith: Early American Women's Captivity Narratives*. Brewster: Paraclete Press, 1989.

Coleman, Emma Lewis. *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars*. Portland: The Southworth Press, 1925.

Conlin, John H. "Father Hennepin at Niagara Falls." *Western New York Heritage Magazine* 6, no. 1 (Winter 2003).

Conlin, John H. "National Register of Historic Places-Nomination: Fort Niagara," United States Department of Interior, 1986.

Crossley, Pamela Kyle. 2010. "Slavery In Early Modern China." In *The Cambridge World History of Slavery* edited by Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge, 189-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Accessed October 15, 2016. http://www.cambridge.org.

Douglas, James. *Old France in the New World: Quebec in the Seventeenth Century*. London: The Burrows Brothers Company, 1906.

Demos, John. *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story From Early America*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Dickey, Norma H. *Funk & Wagnalls New Encyclopedia*. 28 vols. Chicago: R. R. Donnelley &. Sons Company, 1971.

Dudley, Dr. Christopher. *Reformations and the Wars of Religion*. Fall semester, 2015.

Foster, William Henry. *The Captors' Narrative: Catholic Women and Their Puritan Men on the Early American Frontier*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

France and the Americas: Culture, Politics, and History a Multidisciplinary Encyclopedia, Volume 1. Edited by Bill Marshall. Oxford: ABC-CLIO Inc.

Greer, Allan. *The People of New France*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Grumet, Robert Steven. *Historic Contact: Indian People and Colonists in Today's Northeastern United States in the Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Guerin, Thomas. *Temple Feudal Canada: The Story of the Seigneuries of New France*. Montreal: Steven Books, 1926.

Haefeli, Evan and Kevin Sweeny. *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

Haefeli, Evan and Sweeney, Kevin. *Captive Histories: English, French and Native Narratives of the 1704 Raid on Deerfield*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Harris, Richard Colebrook. *The Seigneurial System in Early Canada: A Geographical Study* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Horton, Donald, J. "Etienne Rocbert de la Morandiere," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol.2 (1982). Accessed July 3, 2019. http://www.biographi.ca.

Jordan, Don and Michael Walsh. *White Cargo: The Forgotten History of Britain's White Slaves In America*. New York: New York Press, 2007.

Kauffman, Christopher."The Sulpician Presence." *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 75, no. 44 (Oct, 1989): 677-695. Accessed March 1, 2019. http://www.jstor.org.

Kim, Tammy E. "A National Strike Against Prison Slavery." *The New Yorker*, October 3, 2016. Accessed November 20, 2016. http://www.newyorker.com.

Levesque, Ulric. "Jean Bouillet de la Chassaigne," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982). Accessed January 11, 2019. http://www.biographi.ca.

Kluk, Jason R. "Character and Discipline: A Comparative Study of Civil War Militia from the States of Ohio and New York." Masters Thesis, East Stroudsburg University, 2016.

Lake, Obiagele. "Cultural Hierarchy and the Renaming of African People." *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 21, no. 4 (1997): 261-271. Accessed September 17, 2016 http:// ebscohost.com.

Letki, Elaine. "Captives of the French and Indian Wars 1676-1763: English Slavery in Canada." Seminar II research paper, East Stroudsburg University, 2016.

McGowan, Susan and Amelia F. Miller. *Family & Landscape: Deerfield Homelots from 1671*. Deerfield: Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association, 1996.

Moogk, Peter N. "Reluctant Exiles: Emigrants from France in Canada before 1760." *William and Mary Quarterly* 46, no.3 (July 1989): 463-505. Accessed September 23, 2016. http://jstor.org.

Morris, Ian. 2010. "Archaeology and Greek Slavery," In *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, edited by Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge, 184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Accessed October 15, 2016. http://www.cambridge.org.

Mullins, Lisa C. *Early American Community Structures. Morgantown: National Historical Society*, 1987.

Munro, William Bennett. *Crusaders of New France: A Chronicle of the Fleur-De-Lis in the Wilderness*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918.

Nissenbaum, Stephen W. "Christmas in Early New England, 1620-1820: Puritanism, Popular Culture, and the Printed Word." *Proceedings Of The American Antiquarian Society* 106, no. 1 (April 1996): 79-164. Accessed November 7, 2016. http://ebscohost.com.

O'Brien, Cormac. *The Forgotten History of America: Little Known Conflicts of Lasting Importance from the Earliest Colonists to the Eve of the Revolution.* Beverly: Fair Winds Press, 2008.

Old Fort Niagara State Park. *French Heritage Day at Fort Niagara Teacher's Kit*, page 4-11. Accessed: November 1, 2017. http://www.oldfortniagara.org/documents/.

Paltsits, Victor, Hugo. *The Depredation at Pemaquid in August 1689 and the Events That Led Up to It*. Portland: Press of Lefavor-Tower Company, 1905.

Parkman, Frances. *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century: France and England in North America*. Williamstown: Corner House Publishers, 1970.

Parsons, Herbert Collins. *A Puritan Outpost: A History of the Town and People of Northfield, Massachusetts.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.

Pargas, Damian Alan. "Disposing of Human property: American Slave families and Forced Separation in Comparative Perspective." *Journal Of Family History* 34, no. 3 (July 2009): 251-274. Accessed October 12, 2016. http://ebscohost.com.

Paton, Diana. "Punishment, Crime, and the Bodies of Slaves in Eighteenth-Century Jamaica." *Journal ofSocial History* 34, no. 4 (2001): 923-54. Accessed November 1, 2016. http://www.jstor.org

Richter, Daniel K. "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40, no.4 (October 1983): 528-559. Accessed March 10, 2016. http://ebscohost.com.

Rihll, T. E. 2010. "Classical Athens." In *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, edited by Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 51. Accessed October 15, 2016. http://wwww.cambridge.org.

Russ, C.J. "Henri-Antoine Meriel." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982). Accessed August 6, 2019. http://www.biographi.ca.

Sarna,William A. and Ralph Watkins. "Northern Iroquoian Slavery." *Ethnohistory* 38, no. 1 (Winter1991): 34-57. Accessed September 16, 2016. http://www.jstor.org.

Schultz, Eric B. *King Philip's War: The History and Legacy of America's Forgotten Conflict*. Woodstock: The Countryman Press, 1999.

Schwebel, Sara L. "Rewriting the Captivity Narrative for Contemporary Children: Speare, Bruchac, and the French and Indian War." *The New England Quarterly* 84, no. 2 (June 2011): 318-346. Accessed March 10, 2016. http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.

Smith, Neville. "Emancipation and the Great Wheel of Labour." *English in Africa* 42, no. 3 (December 2015): 78-88. Accessed November 3, 2015. http:// ebscohost.com.

Snell, Daniel C. 2010. "Slavery in the Ancient Near East." In *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, edited by Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge, 4-19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 7. Accessed October 15, 2016. http://www.cambridge.org.

Snow, Dean R. *The Iroquois*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1996. Starkey, Armstrong. *European and Native American Warfare: 1675-1815*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.

Steele, Ian Kenneth. *Setting All the Captives Free: Capture, Adjustment, and Recollection in Allegheny Country*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013.

Stephens, Hiram B. *Jacques Cartier and His Four Voyages to Canada: With Historical, Explanatory and Philological Notes*. Montreal: W. Drysdale, 1890. Accessed September 26, 2017. http://archive.org/stream/cu31924103985341.

Sylvester, Herbert Milton. *Maine Pioneer Settlements.* Boston: W.B. Clarke Co., 1909.

Taillemite, Etienne."Francois Clairambault D'Aigremont." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982). Accessed January 11, 2019. http://www.biographi.ca.

Trudel, Marcel. *Canada's Forgotten Slaves: Two Centuries of Bondage*. Montreal: Vehiclue Press, 2012.

Trueman, Stuart. *The Ordeal of John Gyles: Being an Account of His Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances as a Slave of the Maliseets*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966. Captives of the French and Indian Wars 1676-1763: English Slavery in Canada.

The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1989.
Vachon, Andre. "Francois de Laval. " *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982). Accessed August 4, 2019. http://www. biographi.ca.

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

Wilder, Craig Steven. *Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2013.

Zoltvany, Yves. "Jacques LeBer." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol.2 (1982). Accessed January 3, 2019. http://www.biographi.ca.

Zoltvany, Yves. "Louis-Thomas Cabert de Joncaire." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982). Accessed January 11, 2019. http://www.biographi.ca.

Zoltvany, Yves. "Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, Marquis de Vaudreuil." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (1982) Accessed August 8, 2019. https://www.biographi.ca.