Wesleyan University The Honors College

Forging New Communities: Indian Slavery and Servitude in Colonial New England, 1676 - 1776

by

Bernard J. Lillis
Class of 2012

A thesis submitted to the
faculty of Wesleyan University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts
with Departmental Honors in History

Middletown, Connecticut April, 2012

Table of Contents

Preface ii

Introduction
Re-imagining the Pequot War.....1

Chapter 1
"We Cannot Come Home Again"
Indian Captivity in the Aftermath of King Philip's War 29

Chapter 2
"A Blesseing to her Soule"
Individual Experiences of Slavery and Servitude.....72

Chapter 3
"To Prevent Indians and Negros being Rated with Horses and Hogs"
The Shift from Slavery to Indenture in the Early Eighteenth Century 98

Chapter 4
"Disorders in the Night"
Forging New Communities in Slavery and Freedom 126

Conclusion
William Apess and the Legacy of Slavery.....163

Bibliography 174

Preface

Two nagging questions led to the genesis of this thesis. The first question I asked was simple: why had I never learned about Indian slavery in colonial New England? The stories I was taught about New England's history in elementary and high school, in television, media, and movies, and even in my classes at Wesleyan, did not reserve a place for Indian slaves. In fact, they hardly had a place for Native people at all. What does the presence of Indian slaves mean for the history of a region in which the supposed extinction of Indian people occurred on a romanticized frontier, far from the centers of colonial life in Boston, Providence, and Hartford? A region in which the "frontier of exclusion" supposedly ensured that Indians and English did not mix, that the one fell before the other in a wave of inevitable conquest? Who exactly *were* these Indian slaves?

The second question was more of a nagging doubt: had historians missed something vital in their interpretations of the Pequot War? In my sophomore year at Wesleyan I wrote a paper suggesting that the historiography of the Pequot War had ignored the stories and experiences of its Indian combatants in ways that distorted the historical record. Would it be possible to write a history of the Pequot War from the perspective of the Pequot, Mohegan, and Narragansett? In the back of my mind, I suspected that it wasn't. I suspected that those histories had died with the Pequot themselves. Of course, as I soon learned, the Pequot had not died—they live right down the road, and run the largest casino in North America.

As I spent more time reading and researching, it became increasingly clear that these two questions were not, as I had thought, separate. The denial of Indian agency, influence, and even their very presence in New England runs deep, beginning in New England's earliest histories, and persisting into the present. In the end, all that was necessary to find Indian slaves and servants in New England's colonial archives was to go looking for them.

In the fall of 2011 I emerged from the Massachusetts Historical Society and Massachusetts State Archives with pages of notes, and scratchy photocopies of scratchier microfilm. As I worked to shape my research into a coherent text, I was faced with numerous editorial choices. In quotations from colonial documents I have left intact the original spelling, grammar, and punctuation, with a few notable exceptions. By the seventeenth century, the old English letter thorn (Þ), which signified "th," had been replaced by the letter "y." In the interest of intelligibility, I have replaced "y" with "th" where appropriate, and written out the following abbreviations: "ye" has been expanded to "the," "yt" to "that," and "ys" to "this." Additionally, I expanded the abbreviation "sd" to "said," and the ampersand to "and." Where appropriate, I have changed "u" to "v" and "f" to "s." Finally, in transcribing handwritten documents, I have erred on the side of modern spelling where the text was unclear. I made the same changes when working from published primary sources, although obviously I remain at the mercy of the original transcribers.

Prior to the 1750s, "old style" dates continued to be used sporadically in New England, with the new year beginning on March 25th, rather than January 1st. For the period covered by this thesis, the two new years coexisted in New England.

Consequently, I have changed "old style" dates to reflect standard years, with the exception of citations to diary entries, where I have left dates as written to aid in finding the original passage.

I use the terms Native and Indian interchangeably, however I have avoided the terms Native American, African American, and Euro-American. Without a doubt, all three groups have a claim to American identity, and Native people have as strong a claim to the word "American" as anyone. However, colonial New England was a world of Pawtucket, Massachusett, Nipmuc, Pocumtuck, Narragansett, Wangunk, Niantic, Mohegan, and Pequot; of Ninnimissinuok, Indians, Carolina Indians, and Spanish Indians; of Africans from a myriad of places, cultures, and identities; of English, Irish, Dutch, and French. Although certainly by the mid-eighteenth century African American, American Indian, and Euro-American identities were beginning to form, I have tried to avoid imposing an "American" identity on historical individuals who had no conception of themselves as Americans.

Where possible, I have tried to situate my history in both English and Native conceptions of the New England landscape. I have tried to remember that before the ground I stand on was Middletown, it was Mattabesset. I believe that the history of Native people in New England has radical consequences in the present, and although I have not focused on them in the thesis that follows, I hope that my readers do not hesitate to extrapolate the arguments I make about freedom and bondage, identity, indigeneity, settler anxiety and settler colonialism into the present.

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support of numerous individuals. First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis adviser, Christian Gonzales. His comments, suggestions, and questions pushed this thesis further than I ever imagined it going. Perhaps more importantly, his support and his belief in me were invaluable.

Professor Ann Wightman has taught me an innumerable amount, but more importantly has given me the tools to teach myself infinitely more. This thesis is deeply indebted to her. In truth, it is also indebted to everyone enrolled in the seminar Subject Peoples in the fall of 2009. That seminar instilled in me a moral and ethical relationship between the historian and the historical subject which recognizes the full humanity, autonomy, agency, and unknowability of past peoples, and struggles always to remember those who are in danger of being forgotten. In writing this thesis, I have tried to never forget that I am writing about human beings who lived.

Thanks are due to Professor Vijay Pinch for stepping in at the last minute, Professor Claire Potter for her well-timed words of support, Professor Duffield White for trusting me when I needed it, and Professor J. Kehaulani Kauanui and all of my friends and colleagues in the seminar Affective Sovereignties, for challenging me again and again to ask difficult questions about indigeneity, sexuality, power, and colonialism. Finally, I owe a tremendous debt to all the professors, far too many to name, who have challenged and encouraged me in my time at Wesleyan. Thanks also to Laura Borhman at the Center for the Americas, for saying hello to me every time I walk into the building.

This thesis could not exist without archives and libraries, and thanks are due to everyone at the Massachusetts State Archives and the Massachusetts Historical Society, including the many historians who talked to me about their research, and encouraged me in my own. Thanks also to Carole Morse at First Congregational Church, John Fahey at Braintree Historical Society, and Patricia Niles for generously sharing with me their efforts to find and digitize the Reverend Samuel Niles diary. Thanks to Wesleyan Special Collections and Archives, and to all the staff at Olin library. And thanks to the Davenport Committee for the financial support which made this archival research possible.

Needless to say, all remaining errors and shortcomings are entirely my own.

Thanks to Lira for her boundless love and support.

Thanks to Miranda for being the best friend in the world, even if ze is an ocean away. Just knowing ze exists lightens my heart.

Thanks to Allegra, Jen, Lindsey, and Emma for putting up with me, and making 37 Home a joyful home to return to each day, to Laura and Seth for being amazing, and for talking through the early stages of this project with me, and to all of my friends at Wesleyan and beyond.

Thanks to Asha for being truly wonderful, a blessing unto my life every day.

And finally, thanks to my parents for their love and support, and for proofreading this thesis. I couldn't have done it without you—any of it.

Introduction

Re-imagining the Pequot War

On May 15, 1637, Captain John Mason and ninety English soldiers set sail down the Connecticut River from Hartford to attack the Pequot. "Onkos [Uncas] an Indian Sachem living at Mohegan, who was newly revolted from the Pequots" and his soldiers "accompanied" Mason, although in fact the Mohegan travelled separately, being "impatient of Delays."[1] English histories suggest that the Connecticut colonists attacked the Pequot from a position of power, and the traditional historiography of New England paints English victory in the Pequot War (1637-1638) as the starting point of a pattern of English conquest culminating in King Philip's War (1675-1676).[2] In fact, the English attacked the Pequot from a point of considerable weakness, utterly reliant on their Native allies. Reimagining the Pequot War as a conflict in Native space primarily between Native peoples is crucial to understanding the context in which the English began the rhetorical, political, and economic project of capturing and enslaving Native peoples in New England.[3]

---

[1] John Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War: Especially of the memorable Taking of their Fort at Mistick in Connecticut in 1637* (written and printed in part 1637, first printed in full 1736) in *History of the Pequot War,* Charles Orr, Ed., (Cleveland, OH: The Helman Taylor Company, 1897). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=iE4TAAAAYAAJ (accessed March 28, 2011), 20.

[2] I view May 15, 1637 as the beginning of the Pequot War, and the signing of the Treaty of Hartford between the English, Mohegan, and Narragansett in September 1638 as its end. The dates for King Philip's War refer to southern New England only, in northern New England the conflict continued well into 1678.

[3] The standard scholarly history of the Pequot War is Alfred A. Cave, *The Pequot War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996). Cave's history is focussed on the motives of the colonists, and he does not question the traditional depiction of the war as a conflict between the English and Pequot which paved the way for English hegemony in New England. A radical rewriting of the Pequot War is David Wagner and Jack Dempsey, *Mystic Fiasco: How the Indians Won the Pequot War* (Scituate, MA: Digital Scanning Inc., 2010). Although Wagner and Dempsey's history is thought provoking, and their book pushed me to question traditional histories of the Pequot War, their central argument that the Pequot won the war by allying with the Mohegan is divorced from reality.

English settlement in the Connecticut River Valley was less than two years old when the Pequot War began, and regardless of the diverse religious, political, and economic motivations of the English settlers, the English were to prove a deeply disruptive presence in what had previously been largely Native space. Prior to 1637 the Pequot controlled the coast of present-day Connecticut from the Niantic River to Narragansett, and they used their military power and their geographic position to establish themselves as a lynchpin of the fur trade in the Northeast. In *The Common Pot: the Recovery of Native Space in New England,* Lisa Brooks describes how this trade functioned: the Pequot took in large amounts of Wampum as tribute from surrounding tribes, which they traded to the Dutch at Fort Good Hope, a trading outpost near present-day Hartford. The Pequot distributed the European goods which they received from the Dutch to neighboring communities, cementing their power in the region. Meanwhile, the Dutch carried the wampum west to the Hudson River Valley, where they traded it to the powerful Mohican and Mohawk for furs.[4]

By 1637 the Pequot had been significantly weakened by epidemics in 1616 and 1633, which reduced their population from as many as 16,000 individuals to about 3,000.[5] In the wake of these epidemics, the Pequot split in two, and the sachem Uncas moved with his followers to the west side of the Pequot River.[6] Uncas named his new social and political entity Mohegan, reclaiming an older name for the Pequot

---

[4] Lisa L. Brooks, *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 56.

[5] Dean R. Snow and Kim M. Lanphear, "European Contact and Indian Depopulation in the Northeast: The Timing of the First Epidemics." *Ethnohistory,* Vol. 35, No. 1 (Winter, 1988): 15-33. http://www.jstor.org/stable/482431 (accessed Feb. 2, 2012), 24.

[6] The Pequot River is also known as the Thames River.

people.[7] By this time the Pequot had alienated many of their tributaries, including the powerful Narragansett, who also had access to wampum production. But as historian Neal Salisbury explains:

> So long as the Dutch were the sole source of trade goods and so long as they supplied those goods only to the Pequot . . . there was no alternative to Pequot hegemony. A large measure of the system's success . . . lay in the absence of a European rival to the Dutch with whom disaffected Indians could trade.[8]

Here lie the true motivations for the Pequot War, and while the presence of the English as a source of European trade goods may have been necessary to Narragansett willingness to oppose the Pequot, it was not the English who controlled the situation, but the Narragansett and the breakaway Mohegan under Uncas.[9]

The English moved into this violent and contested Native space in 1635, when a group of Englishmen under the informal leadership of John Hooker began migrating to the Connecticut River Valley, establishing three towns in the vicinity of Fort Good Hope: Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield.[10] Settlement on the Connecticut River was made possible by the epidemic of 1633: in the words of Governor John Winthrop

---

[7] Brooks, *The Common Pot*, 58. Neal Salisbury sees the Pequot/Mohegan split as more deeply rooted, arguing that the 1626 marriage of the Pequot sachem Tatobem's daughter to Uncas, son of the Mohegan sachem, created an alliance between the Mohegan and the Pequot. However, Salisbury cites Uncas's own account of the split, which would have had an interest in substantiating the legitimacy of the Pequot and Mohegan as separate peoples. Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 150.

[8] Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence,* 204.

[9] Although Salisbury's history gives the English a significant role in the sparking of the conflict, it is just as likely that the Narragansett saw an English alliance as a potential edge, but not as the decisive factor in their decision to oppose the Pequot. The split of the Pequot-Mohegan into competing tribes may have been a more important instigator. Roger Williams's letters contain references to Narragansett versus Pequot wars predating English arrival. For example, on July 11, 1637 Williams mentions a Pequot soldier who "hath long since been theirs [the Narragansett's], fallen to them, and done good service in their wars against the Pequots." Williams to John Winthrop, July 11, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams, 1632-1682,* ed. John Russell Bartlett (Providence, RI: The Narragansett Club, 1874), 46.

[10] Harold J. Bingham, *History of Connecticut, vol. I,* (New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1962), 30.

of Massachusetts, "God's hand hath so pursued them, as for 300 miles space, the greatest parts of them are swept awaye by the small poxe . . . God hath hereby cleared our title to this place."[11] Meanwhile, in July of 1635, Governor Winthrop received news that the Dutch were planning to build a fort at the mouth of the Connecticut River, and sent 70 men to build an English military outpost there, which they named Saybrook.[12] These communities did not formally unite together and call a General Court until May 1st, 1637; the first order of business of the new colony of Connecticut was the prosecution of the Pequot War.[13]

The four English narratives of the Pequot War produced in the seventeenth century centered English soldiers and English viewpoints in deeply misleading ways.[14] These narratives worked hard to establish the legitimacy of English settlement in Connecticut by negating the role of the Narragansett and Mohegan in the conflict. In fact, to the 90 Connecticut men who set sail from Hartford in May, 1637, "Pequod Country" was utterly unknown. Furthermore, the colony of Connecticut only consisted of about 250 men, women, and children, plus the handful of soldiers posted at Saybrook. The 90 men who accompanied Mason represented a significant percentage of the colony's population.[15]

---

[11] John Winthrop, *Winthrop Papers vol. 3,* edited by Allan Bailey Forbes (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1943), 200. Cited in Bingham, *History of Connecticut,* 22.
[12] Hon. Dwight Loomis and Gilbert Calhoun, *The Judicial and Civil History of Connecticut* (Boston: The Boston History Company, 1895), 7.
[13] Bingham, *History of Connecticut,* 30.
[14] The four narratives are John Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War,* John Underhill, *News from America, or a late and experimental discovery of New England* (1638), Philip Vincent, *A True Relation of the Late Batell fought in New England, between the English and the Pequet Salvages* (1638), and Gardner, Lion, *Leift Lion Gardner his relation of the Pequot Warres* (1660, first printed 1833). These narratives have been collected together in *History of the Pequot War,* Charles Orr, Ed., (Cleveland, OH: The Helman Taylor Company, 1897). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=iE4TAAAAYAAJ (accessed March 28, 2011).
[15] Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War,* 18. The insecurity of the English about their ability to maintain and defend their settlement in Connecticut, and the extent to which Mason's 90 men

Not only was the land unfamiliar, but the English soldiers could not actually tell a Pequot from a Mohegan from a Narragansett. This is dramatically expressed in Captain John Mason's narrative, towards the end of the conflict, when 40 of Mason's men accompanied by Uncas and some Mohegans are plundering abandoned Pequot settlements for corn:

> Coming down to the Water Side to our Pinnace [boat] with half of Onkos's his Men, the rest being plundering the Wigwams; we looked towards a Hill not far remote, we espyed about sixty Indians running towards us; we supposing they were our absent Men, the Moheags that were with us not speaking one word, nor moving towards them until the other came within thirty or forty paces of them; they then run and met them and fell on pell mell striking and cutting with Bows, Hatchets, Knives, &c. after their feeble Manner.[16]

The utter dependence of the English forces on their Mohegan allies is perfectly clear; without indigenous knowledge and indigenous support, not only would 40 English soldiers have been hard pressed to hold off an attack of 60 Indians, but they wouldn't even have known they were being attacked.[17] And yet the English could not understand why Indian warfare was so much less lethal than their own. The idea that Native peoples *wanted* to avoid unnecessary death was incomprehensible.

Mason presents each decision which the English make as their own, outlining their reasoning as they move from Saybrook to Narragansett, and then inland to the Pequot stronghold at Mystic swamp. He attributes English success in tracking the Pequot along "an uncoath and unknown path" to "the finger of God . . . by his special

---

represented the entirety of their military strength, is demonstrated by the decision to send 20 men back to Hartford when they were joined by 19 soldiers at Saybrook: soldiers could barely be spared; better to put 20 extra men in service defending and maintaining the colony then to increase the size of the fighting force.

[16] Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War,* 41.

[17] By June at least, a partial solution for this problem was worked out, and the Mohegan wore yellow marks on their heads to distinguish themselves from the Pequot in battle, however the English continued to accidentally kill allied Indians: "the Connecticut English had yellow but not enough." Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, June 2, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 30.

Providence to lead us along in the Way we should go."[18] In fact, Mason and his Englishmen were making no decisions at all: they were following a plan laid out by the Narragansett sachem Miantonomo to Roger Williams, and conveyed in a letter to Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts. This plan laid out the exact path that the English should follow into Pequot country, including a map, and precise directions for laying out and accomplishing the assault on the Pequot fort at Ohomowauke (Mystic), including the directive "that it would be pleasing to all natives, that women and children be spared."[19]

One of the reasons that Mason was able to ascribe so much of the English success in the war to the English themselves, was that the English probably didn't realize that their every move had already been scripted. When, the day before they arrived at the Pequot fort, the Narragansett who had been accompanying them broke off, Mason ascribed it to the Narragansett's fear of the Pequot. Mason asks Uncas what he thinks the Indians will do, and Uncas replies "the Narragansetts would all leave us, but as for Himself He would never leave us." And yet, Roger Williams's letter to John Winthrop makes it clear that Miantonomo had no intention that the Narragansett would accompany the English in battle, stipulating only that the English should launch their attack from the Narragansett stronghold at Aquedneck, and that they should follow the directions of two Pequot guides "who have lived these three or four years with the Narragansetts, and know every pass and passage amongst them."[20]

---

[18] Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War,* 45.
[19] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, May, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 17-19.
[20] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, May, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 19. The Narragansett's willingness to supply the English with a plan should not be confused with unquestioning support for the English. The English fretted constantly about the loyalty of their Indian allies, and particularly the Narragansett. For example, in a July 6, 1637 letter to Governor Winthrop, the English Captain Daniel Patrick warned that the Narragansett were not allies in good faith, and that

Even without the Narragansett the Mohegan outnumbered the English 3 to 1 in the force that attacked the Pequot. Given that Native peoples were making the strategic decisions as well, it is a bit of a stretch to call the Pequot War an English war at all.

Based on Mason's narrative, the English followed virtually every aspect of Miantonomo's plan precisely, with the tragic exception of the directive to spare the lives of women and children. Both the decision to attack the Pequot at Ohomowauke swamp, and the understanding that this would represent a significant blow to Pequot power, came directly from the Narragansett, and, as is rarely the case with Native political decisions, survive as such directly in English archives. The only English innovation was the slaughter itself—as the Pequot fled their burning fort, the English cut off both exits, and "down fell men, women, and children" at "the point of the sword."[21] This stands in sharp contrast to Captain Underhill's description of a battle between the Pequot, Mohegan, and Narragansett that did not involve the English. Underhill observed "the Pequeats, Narragansets, and Mohigeners changing a few arrows together after such a manner, as I dare boldly affirm, they might fight seven years and not kill seven men."[22] The English's Mohegan allies would later say of the English manner of fighting, "Mach it, mach it; that is, It is naught, it is naught, because it is too furious, and slays too many men."[23]

---

the English must be wary of allowing them too much authority. It was probably only the careful diplomacy and persistent friendship of Roger Williams which kept the Narragansett on the English side and made the Pequot campaign possible. Daniel Patrick to John Winthrop, July 6, 1637, in *Winthrop Papers, vol. 3,* edited by Allan Bailey Forbes (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1943), 441.

[21] Underhill, *News from America,* 81.

[22] Underhill, *News from America,* 82.

[23] Underhill, *News from America,* 84. It is worth noting that although the Mystic Massacre put the Pequot on the defensive, it was not a decisive victory. The war was not won until the Mohegan and Narragansett succeeded in rounding up the body of the Pequot and their leadership towards the end of July, 1637. Roger Williams still fretted in July, 1637 that "the body of the Pequot Men yet live, and are only removed from their dens." Williams was terrified that the Pequot would join with the feared

By the end of the Pequot War, the English, with the crucial aid of the Narragansett and Mohegan, had captured about 300 Pequot.[24] The English immediately set about constructing and debating a rhetoric of Indian slavery. English commanders took for granted that Indian captives would be part of the spoils of war. When Israel Staughton wrote to Governor Winthrop in late June that he was sending 48 women and children to Boston, he sought permission for a number of particularly chosen women and children to be kept as spoils for his soldiers, including "the fairest and largest that I saw amongst them to whom I have given a coate to cloath her: it is my desire to have her for a servant."[25]

Roger Williams struggled with the enslavement of Pequots, both morally and politically, as he attempted to justify enslavement before God and to the Narragansett. In a July 15th letter to Winthrop, Williams referenced 2 Kings 14:5-6: "The fathers shal not be put to death for the children, nor the children be put to death for the fathers: but every man shall be put to death for his owne sinne."[26] To which Williams added, "I fear that some innocent blood cries at Connecticut."[27] By July 31, Williams had reconsidered his concerns:

Mohawk, who Williams described in *A Key into the Language of America* as "Men-eaters" who "set no corn, but live on the bark of Chestnut and Walnut" eaten "with the fat of Beasts, and somtimes of men." Given the key role played by the Mohawk in the collapsing Dutch-Pequot hegemony over the Wampum trade, these fears, stoked by the Narragansett, were probably not unfounded. They demonstrate unequivocally that "English" victory was not inevitable, and that Native decisions made in Native spaces were the deciding factor in every aspect of the Pequot War. Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, July 15, 1637, and Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, July 21, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 48, 51, and Roger Williams, *A Key Into the Language of America* (1643), (New York: Cosimo Classics, 2009), 13.

[24] Michael L. Fickes, "'They Could Not Endure That Yoke:' The Captivity of Pequot Women and Children after the War of 1637." *The New England Quarterly,* Vol. 73, No. 1 (Mar., 2000): 58-81. http://www.jstor.org/stable/366745 (accessed July 13, 2011), 61.

[25] Israel Staughton to Winthrop, June 28, 1637, in *Winthrop Papers,* 435.

[26] 2 Kings 14:5-6 (King James Bible, 1611 edition).

[27] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, July 15, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 47.

> Sir, concerning captives . . . the scripture is full of mystery and the old Testament of types . . . I doubt not that the enemy may lawfully be weakened and despoiled of all comfort of wife and children, &c., but I beseech you well weigh it after a due time of training up to labor, and restraint, they ought not to be set free: yet so as without danger of adjoining to the enemy.[28]

In this quote Roger Williams sets the stage for the next hundred years of English rhetoric over slavery: were Indians, like English servants, to be indentured, receiving their liberty after a set time, or were they, like Africans, to serve in perpetual chattel slavery? In the end, Williams himself took a Pequot captive as servant, writing: "I am bold . . . to request the keeping and bring up of one of the children. I have fixed mine eye on this little one with the red about his neck."[29]

Williams's about-face on the subject of Pequot slavery required that he negotiate these new terms with his Narragansett allies. On June 21, 1637, Williams wrote that "I understand it would be very greatful to our nieghbors, that such Pequots as fall to them be not enslaved, like those which are taken in war: but (as they say is their general custom) be used kindly, have houses and goods, and fields given them."[30] However, Roger Williams deliberately misled the Narragansett about the fate of Pequot captives. Williams recounts his conversation with Miantonomo, and it is worth quoting in its entirety:

> In the disposing of them [Pequot captives], I propounded what if Mr. Governor [Winthrop] did desire to send for some of them into the [Massachusetts] Bay; leave some at the Narragansett, and so scatter and disperse them: this he liked well, that they should live with the English and themselves as slaves. I then propounded that if they lived amonst the English or themselves, they might hereafter be false to the English, &c., and what if therefore they were appointed and limited to

[28] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, July 31, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 54-55
[29] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, July 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 35.
[30] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, June 24, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 34.

> live upon Nayantacawnick or some other Island: this he thought also well of, if not best, because they were most of them families."[31]

Williams begins by suggesting that some of the Pequot captives should live with the English, and others with the Narragansett. This would have made perfect sense to Miantonomo, in light of the general Native practice, particularly following the devastating epidemics of the early seventeenth century, of fully incorporating captives into Native kinship networks and communities. Williams then proposes that, given the danger that the Pequot might be "false" to the English, it would be best of they be settled on some Island, using an Island which Miantonomo would have been familiar with off the coast of New England as an example. The islands which Williams must have had in mind, and where, in fact, a number of Pequot captives were sent, were the British slave colonies in the Caribbean: Bermuda or the short lived Puritan slave colony of Providence Island. This makes Miantonomo's agreement on the basis that shipping slaves out of New England would prevent them from having to break up their families tragically ironic. By the end of July at least one shipment of seventeen Pequot captives had been sent to the West Indies on the ship Desire.[32] In 1638 the Desire returned after a seven month voyage, bringing Cotton, tobacco, salt, and African slaves.[33]

---

[31] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, July 10, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 43. Nayantacawnick is "possibly Fisher's Island or Plum Island. The word signifies— 'over against Niantic.'" Robert Alexander Douglas-Lithgow, *Dictionary of American-Indian Place and Proper Names in New England: with Many Interpretations, Etc. (*Salem MA: Salem Press, 1909), 261.
[32] John Winthrop to William Bradford, July 28, 1637, in *Winthrop Papers,* 456, and Fickes, "They Could Not Endure That Yoke," 61.
[33] Capt. George Henry Preble, U.S.N., "Notes on Early Ship-Building in Massachusetts," in *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 1, January 1871 (Boston: David Clapp & Son, 1871), 17. Preble is citing Joseph B. Felt's *Annals of Salem,* vol. 2. p. 230.

Historian Michael L. Fickes argues that the colonists expected Pequot women's labor to help them solve the problems created by the presence of far more male than female servants in the colony. Fickes estimates that in 1637 there were 1,111 male servants and 463 female servants in the New England colonies, which left colonial wives and mistresses tasked with doing the domestic work required by both their families and their male servants, with few female servants to assist them.[34] The Pequot must have seemed like a perfect solution, especially given the common English stereotype that hardworking Indian women did all the work in Indian communities—a stereotype which pulled double-duty, as it also allowed English settlers to portray Indian men as lazy, and to erase the labor which Indian men did as hunters and fishers and the claims to land and sovereignty which that labor produced.[35]

In the end, the scriptural justifications for enslavement debated by Winthrop and Williams, the hopes that Pequot women would ease the labor of Puritan wives, and the desire of Connecticut's soldiers for women as spoils of war, were all for naught. The debates over Pequot slavery in the colonial archive, like the narratives of the Pequot War written by Captains Mason and Underhill, make the assumption of English power, English knowledge, and English control—an assumption rooted in the religious belief that a supreme English God was in command of New England's destiny. None of these assumptions are grounded in reality, and in fact the English were stumbling new-comers in a well-established Native world, entirely at the mercy

[34] Fickes, "They Could Not Endure That Yoke," 64.
[35] William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, a division of Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1983), 53.

of their Indian allies, who, for the moment, found them quite useful as an alternative to the Pequot-Dutch monopoly over European trade goods.

Thus it makes perfect sense that, other than the seventeen sent to slavery in the West Indies, and the many who were murdered, the English failed to enslave the Pequot. In Mason's words: "they could not endure that Yoke; few of them continuing any considerable time with their masters."[36] Winthrop accused Miantonomo of "harbouring and withholding sevall Pecott captives fled from the English, and making proud and insolent returns when they were redemanded."[37] By April of 1638 Roger Williams reported that the Pequot were planting their old fields with the knowledge of the Mohegans, and by 1639 the Pequot had sufficiently reconstituted themselves in Connecticut that Roger Williams could write that two English boats had been cut off by the Pequots with Miantonomo's knowledge.[38]

For the Pequot captives who moved into English households, the experience must have been deeply disorienting, and it is not at all surprising that they would simply return home. Service to the English would have begun with a new name: Roger Williams, in sending for his chosen captive, asked Governor Winthrop "please to give a name to him."[39] The inability of the English to hold Pequot slaves did not lessen the initial terror: one Pequot woman expressed her anxiety "that the English would not abuse her body and that her children might not be taken from her."[40]

---

[36] Mason, *A Brief History of the Pequot War,* 39.
[37] Plymouth Records**,** 9:50, 75, in Fickes, "They Could Not Endure that Yoke," 76.
[38] Williams to Winthrop, Providence, April 16, 1638, and Williams to Winthrop, Providence, May 9, 1639, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 92, 133.
[39] Williams to Winthrop, New Providence, July 31, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 54.
[40] John Winthrop to William Bradford, June 28, 1637, in *Winthrop Papers*, 456.

In November of 1637 three Pequot captives, "allmost starved," ran away from English households and arrived in Narragansett, where Roger Williams took them in. "The biggest Mr. Coles his native complaines that she of all of the natives in Boston is used worst: is beaten with firesticks and especially by some of the Servants . . . I asked the biggest who burnt her and why, she told me, Mr. Pen, because a fellow lay with her, but she saith, for her part she refused." Her companion claimed that she was not treated unkindly, but that she had been "enticed" to run away by the other Pequot; it is not hard to imagine the binds of empathy and history which would have made such a decision easy.[41] A Pequot captive escaped from Governor Winthrop himself used her experience in a powerful English household to garner political authority among the Pequot upon her escape, by informing "all Pequots and Nayanticks that Mr. Governors mind is, that no Pequot man should die, that her two sons shall ere long be Sachems there, &c." Williams worried that "Your [Winthrop's] wisdom (now by a fresh line or two)" would facilitate the reconstitution of the Pequot in their old homelands, a process which was well underway.[42]

The narratives which English authors constructed about the Pequot War erased the ways in which the war was an overwhelmingly Native conflict, engaged in Native spaces. The chief English contributions to the war were violence against women and children, and an almost peculiar insistence on taking slaves they had no way of keeping in a country which they did not even remotely control. And yet these narratives continued to play an important political role in Connecticut. Mason's narrative was not printed in full until 1737, and in 1743 it was submitted to the

[41] Williams to Winthrop, Nov 10, 1637, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 79.
[42] Williams to Winthrop, August 1639, in *Letters of Roger Williams,* 136.

imperial commission of 1743 in the Mohegan land case as part of the colony's ongoing struggle with the Pequot and Mohegan over their rights to land.[43]

In *Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England,* Amy Den Ouden argues that the "depiction of Pequots as 'captives' and 'surrenderers' was precisely the representation employed by the General Assembly in 1714 when Mashantucket [Pequot] rights to their reservation in Noank were denied."[44] The Pequot, on the other hand, emphasized an alternative narrative, in which the Pequot surrender at the end of the Pequot War was not the beginning of a perpetual captivity, but rather of an alliance between the Pequot, Mohegan, and Connecticut governments, an alliance cemented when the Pequot allied themselves to Connecticut in King Philip's War.[45]

The politically expedient and ethnocentric English portrayal of the Pequot War rooted in the accounts of John Mason and other English participants firmly cemented itself in the historiography of New England. In his 1958 history of King Philip's War, *Flintlock and Tomahawk,* Douglas Leach begins by painting King Philip's War as an inevitable conflict: "here in the Wilderness two mutually incompatible ways of life confronted each other, and one of the two would have to prevail." Leach supports this argument by summarizing the Pequot War as "the ominous drumbeats of large scale organized [Indian] resistance," a foreshadowing of

---

[43] Amy Den Ouden, *Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 147.
[44] Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 148.
[45] Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 149.

King Philip's War, ended by "prompt and ruthless retaliation by colonial military forces."[46]

In *Facing East from Indian Country: a Native History of Early America,* Daniel Richter argues that "if we shift our perspective to try to view the past in a way that faces east from Indian country, history takes on a very different appearance. Native Americans appear in the foreground, and Europeans enter from distant shores. North America becomes the 'old world' and Western Europe the 'new.'"[47] Grounding the history of Indian slavery and servitude in New England in a history of the Pequot War re-imagined from a position of English weakness, rather than English strength, gives us a beginning from which to build a history centered around Indian decisions and Indian autonomy. Even after victory in King Philip's War gave the English hegemonic political power in southern New England, Native people continued to exercise autonomy and sovereignty. Although slavery was an exercise of power over Native peoples, Indian slaves and servants found ways to shape their own lives and resist English domination.

This thesis sits within a deeply rooted historiography of Native peoples in the Northeast, a historiography which has consistently used Native subjects to further colonial projects. English scholars began writing about Native American peoples virtually the moment they arrived. Proto-ethnographies such as *New England Canaan* by Thomas Morton, *A Key into the Language of America* by Roger Williams

---

[46] Douglas Edward Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip's War* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1958), 1.
[47] Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 8.

and John Josselyn's *Two Voyages to New England*, provide much of the raw material for ethno-historical studies of Native people in early New England such as Kathleen J. Bragdon's *Native People of Southern New England, 1500-1650.*[48]

Bragdon argued that early Puritan histories of New England such as Cotton Mather's *Magnalia Christi Americana* (1702) and William Hubbard's *The Present State of New England* (1677) "consistently failed to acknowledge the coherence, integrity, and equivalent humanity of Native Cultures, and continued to employ the Natives as foils against which the actions of colonists, statesmen, and pioneers could be favorably judged."[49] However, these histories have often served purposes beyond simple narration of the past.

Both Roger Williams and Thomas Morton used their writing about Native cultures for political ends, and wrote histories that criticized, rather than lauded, the Puritans. Williams included short verses at the end of each section of his Narragansett vocabulary that compared the English unfavorably with the Indians: "If Natures sons both wild and tame, humane and courteous be: How ill becomes it Sonnes of God To want Humanity?"[50] Morton was a royalist and a classicist who disliked the Puritans on both personal and political grounds.[51] His satire of Puritan values was thinly veiled behind names like "Capt. Shrimp" and "Innocence Faircloth," and like Williams he used the contrast between the genuine respect he felt

---

[48] Thomas Morton, *New English Canaan* (1637) edited by Jack Dempsey (Scituate, MA: Digital Scanning Inc., 2000); Josselyn, John, *Colonial Traveler: A Critical Edition of Two Voyages to New-England* (1674), edited by Paul J Lindholdt (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1988).
[49] Kathleen J. Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England 1550-1650* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), xxi.
[50] Williams, *A Key Into the Language of America,* 10.
[51] Morton's colony Merrymount was suppressed by the Puritans as an economic, social, and religious threat to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Morton returned the favor by leading the successful charge to revoke the Massachusetts Bay Colony charter in 1635.

for Native people and Native cultures and their presumed inferiority as a foil for criticizing the Puritans. In Williams's account in particular, the use of Native peoples and cultures as a foil for European political debates coexists neatly with a genuine respect for Native culture.

This complicated relationship between Native subjects and European writers continued throughout the colonial period, in both history and literature. Early histories of the Pequot War and King Philip's War were used to discredit Native rights to sovereignty and land. When John Mason's history of the Pequot War was formally submitted as evidence by the colony of Connecticut in the Mohegan Land Case, the published history of the Pequot War was used to directly discredit Native people seeking to assert their sovereignty over lands reserved to "them and their heirs forever" by the colony of Connecticut in 1680.[52]

Histories which presented the Pequot War as the opening salvo in a battle for New England's future, and the colonists' victory in King Philip's War as the definitive conclusion of that struggle, played a crucial role in the establishment of the myth of the vanishing Indian. Colonial governments used the "inevitable extinction" of Native Peoples as an excuse to encroach on Native land. Thus, seventeenth and eighteenth Century histories of King Philip's War constituted a rhetorical extension of the war itself which effaced the continuing persistence of Native people.[53] In the

---

[52] Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 147.

[53] This historical sleight-of-hand was particularly essential because numerous Native people, including the Mohegan and Pequot, fought alongside the English in King Philip's War, and therefore shared in the victory. Examples of such histories include Increase Mather, *A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in Newe England* (1676) in *So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677,* edited by Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1978); Thomas Church, *Entertaining Passages Relating to Philip's War* (1716) in Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom, Ed., *So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1978).

nineteenth century King Philip was revived as a popular figure in the play *Metamora; or, the Last of the Wampanoags*, one of the most widely produced plays of nineteenth century American theater.[54] As Jill Lepore argues in *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity,* this play, first produced in 1829, was part of a process by which "Americans came to define themselves in relation to an imagined Indian past." This process, Lepore asserts, required that there be no Indians in the present, "or at least not anywhere nearby."[55] Once again the history of New England was being written and re-written in ways that erased the continuing presence of Native People in New England, situating them always in the past.[56]

Beginning in the 1990s, historians made a radical turn in their depictions of Indians in colonial New England. Daniel Mandell's *Behind the Frontier: Indians in Eighteenth Century Eastern Massachusetts* (1996), the collection *Presence and Persistence in Indian New England* (1997) edited by Colin Calloway, and David Silverman's account of a single Native community *Faith and Boundaries: Colonists, Christianity, and Community among the Wampanoag Indians of Martha's Vineyard, 1600-1871* (2005) argue for a robust Indian presence in New England following King Philip's War. These accounts shifted the historiography of New England from the disappearance of Native people to their persistence "behind the frontier," as

---

[54] Lepore, Jill, *The Name of War: King Philips War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Vintage Books, 1999), 191.
[55] It was no coincidence that the glorification of King Philip in popular culture coincided with the forced removal of the "five civilized tribes" from the Southeast. Lepore, *The Name of War,* 193.
[56] For an account of the process by which English people situated Indians always in the past in order to imagine their extinction in New England, see Jean M. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), xv, 35, 94, 105.

participants in colonial society who nevertheless retained Native identities and Native communities.[57]

These historians, and others like them, avoided their predecessors' failings by capturing Native communities as vibrant and human in their own right, neither mythically distinct from English communities, nor dependent on an oppositional relationship to English settlers for their identity. Amy Den Ouden's *Beyond Conquest* (2005) continues this process of asserting the persistence and survival of Native people in New England following King Philip's War, but is deeply influenced by Ouden's participation in the process by which the Eastern Pequot tribe applied for (and failed to receive) federal recognition in the early 1990s. Here, as in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, histories of Native people in New England are directly linked to the political struggles of contemporary Native peoples.

The immediate theoretical parent of this thesis is Abenaki scholar Lisa Brooks's *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast.* Brooks establishes a framework for re-centering our view of Native peoples in the Northeast, from seeing Native people and Native communities as peripheral to an expanding English frontier, to seeing Native communities as central to colonial history. "What happens to our view of American history when Native narratives are not just *included* but *privileged*?" Brooks writes. "What does the historical landscape look like when viewed through the networks of waterways and kinship in the northeast, with Europe

[57] Daniel R. Mandell, *Behind the Frontier: Indians in Eighteenth Century Eastern Massachusetts* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996); Colin G. Calloway and Neal Salisbury, eds., *Reinterpreting New England Indians and the Colonial Experience* (Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 2003); David J. Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries: Colonists, Christianity, and Community among the Wampanoag Indians of Martha's Vineyard, 1600-1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

and its colonies on the periphery?"[58] This "network of waterways and kinship" is central to Brook's conception of Native spaces and communities.

My thesis engages and expands this historiography by locating individual and community resistance and persistence not only on the reservation and on the frontier, but within the English household itself, where Native slaves lived and labored alongside their owners. Indian identity was both more persistent and less fixed than historians have supposed. Enslaved Indian, African, and mixed-race individuals and communities maintained distinct cultural identities and communities across the borders of the English family.

As a white, Euro-American historian writing a history of Indian slaves and servants, I have no choice but to engage in the same social, political, and historiographical struggles which have characterized the historiography of Native New England from its beginning. In doing so, I must balance the need to write about Indian people as fully human, autonomous people who experienced a full range of emotions and experiences, while at the same time avoiding the presumption that past people were just like present people, respecting the very real differences between Native and European communities, and approaching Indian slaves and servants on their own terms. There are no easy solutions to these challenges, but an awareness of the ways in which the history of Native New England was deployed to support the project of settler colonialism is crucial.

This thesis also exists within a second historiographical thread: the new historiography of Indian slavery in Colonial America which has arisen largely in the last decade. Almon Wheeler Lauber's *Indian Slavery within the Present Limits of the*

[58] Brooks, *The Common Pot,* xxxv.

United States, published in 1913, was for many decades the only significant work on the subject, and it continues to be cited in studies of Indian slavery in New England as an important secondary source.[59] In the past decade, monographs on Indian slavery throughout North America have argued that the enslavement of Indians brought Indians and Europeans together, formed a significant means of establishing social ties and kinship relationships, and contributed to a process of co-creation by which a new Colonial society was forged at the point of contact between Native Americans, Africans, and Europeans. This process of co-creation was enabled as much by Native power and agency as by European power and agency. For example, in *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* James Brooks argues that slavery in the colonial Southwest was mediated through kinship ties that integrated Indian and European communities, establishing a mixed society.[60]

Traditional conceptions of New England have precluded these kinds of arguments, portraying New England as a "frontier of exclusion," a society which aggressively discouraged miscegenation and creolism. I accept that the evidence supports the idea of a "frontier of exclusion" in New England, but my research

---

[59] Lauber, Almon Wheeler, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times within the Present Limits of the United States,* in *Studies in History Economics and Public Law vol. 54,* Edited by the faculty of Political Science of Columbia University (New York: Columbia University, 1913). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=WhkOAQAAIAAJ&pg (accessed Mar. 28, 2012).

[60] James F. Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002). Similarly, in *Stealing Indian Women,* Carl Ekburg argues that Indian slavery in Upper Louisiana shaped the creation of new social groups in a society in which race, class, and freedom were flexible categories navigated by individuals and communities. Carl J. Ekburg, *Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007). Other major works addressing the enslavement of Native Peoples in North America include Leland Donald, *Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America* (Berkeley: University of California Press,1997); the collection *Indian Slavery in Colonial America,* edited by Alan Gallay (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); and Tiya Miles, *The House on Diamond Hill: A Cherokee Plantation Story* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010) and *Ties that Bind: The Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.)

suggests a realignment of that "frontier," from the colonial borders where Native soldiers, French and Dutch traders, and adventurous New Englanders interacted in war and trade, to the psychological and cultural borders within English communities and households. The English constantly reinforced the cultural and personal differences between themselves and their Indian slaves and servants in order to contain the threat posed by the physical and emotional intimacy of slavery and servitude in New England. Indian slaves and servants shaped New England society by asserting their cultural identity within English spaces, and by using cross-cultural and inter-racial alliances to resist colonial authority and to define their own communities within the context of enslavement.

Following Lauber, only a few historians have explored Indian slavery in New England. Elaine Breslow's *Tituba: Reluctant Witch of Salem,* and Alan Gallay's study of Indian slavery in Carolina, *The Indian Slave Trade,* offer two different perspectives on the "Spanish" and "Carolina" Indians that New England imported in the early eighteenth century.[61] Other historians have explored Indian indenture in Rhode Island and on Martha's Vineyard, Indian captivity following King Philip's War, and debt peonage in the Whaling industry on Nantucket.[62]

---

[61] Elaine Breslaw, *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem: Devilish Indians and Puritan Fantasies* (New York: New York University Press, 1996); Alan Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

[62] David Silverman's account of the Native community on Martha's Vineyard includes a chapter on indentured servitude and the relationships between English masters, Indian servants, and the Indian communities that supplied them. An early version of this chapter was published as David J. Silverman, "The Impact of Indentured Servitude on the Society and Culture of Southern New England Indians, 1680-1810." *The New England Quarterly,* vol. 74, no. 4 (Dec. 2001): 622-666. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185443 (accessed Feb. 3, 2012). Jill Lepore's *The Name of War* includes the best analysis of the enslavement of captured Indians following King Philip's War. On slavery and indenture in Rhode Island, see John A. Sainsbury, "Indian Labor in Early Rhode Island." *The New England Quarterly,* Vol. 48, No. 3 (Sep., 1975): 378-393. http://www.jstor.org/stable/364865 (accessed Sept. 30, 2011). On Indian labor in the New England whaling industry, see Russel Lawrence Barsh, "'Colored' Seamen in the New England Whaling Industry," in *Confounding the Color Line: the*

The only contemporary historian to take Indian slavery in New England as her primary subject and explore it in a systematic way over time is Margaret Ellen Newell. In "Indian Slavery in Colonial New England," Newell argues that Indian slavery delineated racial boundaries in new and often inflexible ways.[63] Laws which protected New England's Indians from slavery, although loosely enforced, nonetheless allowed Indian indentured servants and laborers to enter white society, often at the expense of Indian communities which were made invisible in the process. At the same time, numerous Indian slaves were redefined as "black," contributing to a process by which work and social status became markers of race alongside ancestry and skin color, ultimately rendering African and slave identities inextricable. I depart from this argument significantly, by arguing that Indian servants maintained Indian communities despite indenture, and that Indian communities actively incorporated African individuals as a way of strengthening their cultures and communities.

Building on this historiography, the central questions of this thesis are: How did Indian slaves and servants in New England experience captivity between the end of King Philip's War in 1676 and the start of the American revolution in 1776? And how did the enslavement and indenture of individual Indians affect the cultural and

---

Indian-Black Experience in North America, edited by James F. Brooks (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 76-107; Mark A. Nicholas, "Mashpee Wampanoags of Cape Cod, the Whalefishery, and Seafaring's Impact on Community Development." *The American Indian Quarterly,* vol. 26, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 165-197. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4128458 (accessed Feb. 3, 2012); Daniel Vickers, "The First Whalemen of Nantucket." *The William and Mary Quarterly,* Third Series, vol. 40, no. 4 (Oct. 1983): 560-583. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1921808 (accessed Feb. 3, 2012).

[63] Margaret Ellen Newell, "Indian Slavery in Colonial New England," in *Indian Slavery in Colonial America,* edited by Alan Gallay (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 33-66. An early version of this argument appeared as "The Changing Nature of Indian Slavery in New England, 1670-1720" in *Reinterpreting New England Indians and the Colonial Experience,* edited by Colin G. Calloway and Neal Salisbury (Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 2003), 106-136.

political survival of New England's Native peoples? I argue that Native social networks persisted within the context of enslavement in New England. The recovery of the lives of Indian slaves and servants is significant because it recasts our vision of colonial New England. Rather than a world neatly arranged along lines of racial and cultural hierarchy that placed Anglo-American colonists at the social pinnacle, we encounter a society forged out of the dynamic interaction of a variety of racial and cultural groups.

The experience of slavery and servitude lead to the creation of new kinds of Indian identities and Indian communities in New England in the space created by the collapse of Native polities following King Philip's War. These new communities and identities challenged English hegemony over Indian lives, and over the production of meaning and culture in New England. Understanding the relationship between Indian slavery and Indian identity helps explain the persistence of Indian communities, despite the efforts of English settlers to erase them from the landscape.

Chapter one documents captivity and enslavement immediately following King Philip's War. How did Indians adapt to the new balance of power in New England following King Philip's War? I argue that both English and Native peoples struggled to define the terms of Indian slavery as a practice and an institution. Chapter two explores the experience of enslavement through the lives of two Indian slaves, Margaret and Maria. What were the lived experiences of Indian slaves in English households in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries? The chapter contends that Indian slaves and servants were both "insiders" and "outsiders"

in English households, assimilating in some ways, but yet maintaining Native identities and connections to Native communities.

Chapter three examines change over time in institutions of slavery. I argue that in the late seventeenth century, most Indian slaves were chattel slaves, but that Indian communities' resistance to enslavement precipitated the failure of the effort to enslave Indians directly, and led to the development of new kinds of Indian servitude such as judicial slavery, debt peonage, and indenture. Finally, chapter four looks at the new communities created by Indian slaves and servants, exploring how "Spanish" and "Carolina" Indians, Africans, and mixed-race individuals were incorporated into Indian communities.

My sources are primarily legal cases and petitions involving Native slaves, colonial newspaper advertisements, diaries, and narratives written by English missionaries and literate Indians. I've attempted to "read between the lines" of these sources for the lived experiences of Indian servants and slaves, and how they related to the English masters who represented them in court files and wrote about them in newspaper advertisements and diaries.

The slave advertisements in the *Boston News-Letter*, the first continuously published newspaper in British America, have been used as a source on Native history since the nineteenth century. However they have not been read systematically and critically as a source about Native people.[64] Advertisements for escaped Indian slaves form a rich source on labor practices, English attitudes and assumptions about

[64] Robert Desroches wrote a comprehensive study of colonial newspaper advertisements for African slaves, however his methodology precluded the examination of Indian advertisements because of the low incidence of for-sale ads. Robert E. Desrochers, Jr. "Slave-for-Sale Advertisements and Slavery in Massachusetts, 1704-1781." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 59, No. 3 (Jul. 2002): 623-664. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3491467 (accessed Jan. 28, 2011).

Indian labor, and individual resistance. By looking for continuity and change over time in escaped slave advertisements, it is possible to trace single individuals who appear in the record multiple times. For example, four advertisements placed over the course of a decade for the African slave Peter paint a picture of cross-cultural resistance against slavery over the course of a single life and across multiple English and Indian communities.

Colonial legal records further contribute to the process of teasing out the lives of Indian slaves and servants, and placing them into cultural context over time. I have comprehensively examined colonial court records for Suffolk County, centered around Boston, and Plymouth County. I also draw on cases from Middlesex County and Essex County, Massachusetts. I have tried to extract individual stories and Indian individuals from the Court records, exploring how they navigated captivity and interacted with their owners and their communities. In chapter three I use the Plymouth County court records to examine the implementation of judicial slavery on a local level.

Finally, my research has been supplemented by other sources, including petitions, diaries, published colonial narratives and histories, lists of Indians put "out to service" following colonial conflicts, indentures, and deeds. A particularly rich store of such documents is collected in volumes 30, 31, and 32 of the manuscript "Massachusetts Archive Collection." These documents offer particular insight into the distribution of captives following King Philip's War. Religious texts and histories published during the colonial period, such as Daniel Gookin's *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of The Christian Indians in New England in the Years*

1675, 1676, 1677 (1677), and Experience Mayhew's *Indian Converts* (1727), which contains biographies of Christian Indians within the Wampanoag community on Martha's Vineyard, offer perspective on the ways that English settlers conceptualized Indian individuals and Indian communities, along with glimpses of Indian lives and Indian autonomy. Although the archives I've consulted were created and assembled by the English, Native peoples found ways to assert their own voices in Colonial courts and colonial histories directly through conversion narratives and petitions.

The majority of the evidence on Indian slaves and servants is sparse, fragmented, and filtered through English voices. When working from limited source materials, historians must carefully balance the obligation to tell the stories which have been left out of past accounts with the obligation to follow the evidence where it leads. Historian Jennifer Morgan writes of enslaved women in the New World: "the absence of their literal voice in the documents does a violence which flows into modern historical accounts with almost unbearable ease."[65] The historian has a moral obligation to try to uncover these voices. On the back cover of Tiya Mile's *House on Diamond Hill,* a study of African slavery as practiced by the Cherokee, James Brooks is quoted, with the clear intention of selling the book, as saying that by weaving "profound human empathy with piercing scholarly critique, Tiya Miles lays open the suffering of all those who found themselves enmeshed in the world of Diamond Hill."[66] I believe that this question is at the heart of the methodological problem this thesis faces: how to address the balance between "human empathy" and "scholarly critique" when faced with limited and biased source material?

---

[65] Jennifer L. Morgan, *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 198.
[66] James F. Brooks in Miles, *The House on Diamond Hill,* dust jacket.

Conceptualizing Native space as networks of relationships, inter-racial, inter-cultural, and often resistance oriented, provides a frame that allows me to engage these sources as both scholar and human. The simple fact that Indian slaves existed in colonial New England demands that we re-imagine colonial New England as the site of dynamic interaction between Indian and English people and communities. Indian slaves and servants were there, and they cannot be ignored. As the history of the Pequot War which began this introduction demonstrates, the settler colonial project was as much discursive as real. In English histories, the active role Native people played in New England history has been written as passive; Indian peoples are literally written out of existence. Even as slaves, Indians were not passive participants in New England's history. By looking for the places where Indian slaves and servants appear in the colonial record, even if only fleetingly, we can begin to piece together a new narrative of New England's history and the ways in which it was shaped and experienced by the Indian slaves and servants who navigated colonialism and (re)created Native communities during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Chapter 1

"We Cannot Come Home Again"

Indian Captivity in the Aftermath of King Philip's War

As King Philip's War wound down in the summer of 1676 colonial authorities in Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Plymouth colonies found themselves truly in control of southern New England for the first time. Beginning in June and continuing into July 1676, English soldiers began to bring in large numbers of captive Wampanoag, Narragansett, and Nipmuc Indians. At the same time, Indian soldiers began to surrender in significant numbers. On July 6th, 1676, two hundred Indians "submitted themselves to mercy, in Plimouth Colony," having been "encouraged by a promise from the Government there, that all such Indians as would come in, and lay down their armes should have life and liberty granted to them, excepting only such as had been active in any of the murthers which have been committed."[1]

Between July and September hundreds more Indians surrendered or were captured. As Indians poured into colonial capitals, New England's leaders struggled to define, justify, and implement the terms and limits of Indian captivity and slavery. At the same time, New England's Native people were forced to navigate a new colonial world, one without the protection of powerful Native polities; a world in which Native freedom to move and live was deeply constrained. Individual Indians were forced to navigate servitude within the colony for the first time, while others faced the trauma of being sold into chattel slavery in Bermuda or Barbados. This was

[1] Mather, *A Brief History*, 131.

not a straightforward process of conquest and submission. Indians and Englishmen alike resisted, evaded, overstepped, and pushed at the boundaries of colonial law and colonial practice—a process aided and abetted by the continued existence of Native spaces, networks, and communities.

In the immediate aftermath of the war important legal, rhetorical, and practical distinctions were made between Indians who surrendered and Indians who were captured in battle, and between Massachusetts Bay's Christian Indian allies, Connecticut's "heathen" Indian allies, and Indian enemies. The complex lines drawn between "friend" and "enemy" Indians became a lasting impact of King Philip's War. As colonial governments debated the fates of individuals from each of these categories, colonial elites struggled to maintain control over the management of Indian captivity and enslavement against the efforts of friend and enemy Indians, returning soldiers, and profiteering merchants. This struggle blurred the lines between slavery and freedom, and "friend" and "enemy," which the colonies were in the process of establishing.

Between 1650 and the outbreak of King Philip's War a significant number of Wampanoag and Nipmuc living within and on the borders of Massachusetts, their communities decimated by disease, converted to Christianity and settled into fourteen "praying towns." The praying towns were established under the auspices of the Puritan missionary John Eliot, who became known as the "Apostle to the Indians." Despite their conversion, the Christian Indians lived largely on Native terms. They inhabited wigwams, practiced traditional agriculture, and insisted on maintaining

Native control over the church, resisting the efforts of English missionaries to control their communities religiously and politically.[2]

In the years before King Philip's War, Puritan missionaries conceptualized Indian servitude as a convenient means of instilling Christian values. In 1674 the missionary Daniel Gookin argued that Indian children should be placed "in sober and christian families," where boys could learn a trade, girls could train as housewives, and both could be taught basic English literacy.[3] In 1674, Gookin recognized that this could only happen "with the free consent of their parents and relations." Daniel Gookin came to the Massachusetts Bay Colony from Virginia in 1644, and in 1656 he was appointed Superintendent of the Indians within the jurisdiction of Massachusetts. Along with the John Eliot, Gookin was the Christian Indian's primary advocate in the colonial government.[4] As King Philip's War drew to a close, Gookin successfully defended the rights of Massachusetts's Indian allies to be viewed as indentured servants and not slaves, but he failed to conceptualize Christian Indians as true partners or equals.

During the war most of the praying towns aligned themselves with the English, however many English settlers did not distinguish between Christian Indian allies and enemy Indians. Prejudice against the Christian Indians was so powerful

---

[2] Kathleen J. Bragdon,, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009), 147, 152-154.
[3] Daniel Gookin, *Historical Collections of the Indians in New England* (1674), in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (1792; rpt., New York: Johnson Reprint, 1968), vol. 1, 219, in Ann Marie Plane, *Colonial Intimacies: Indian Marriage in Early New England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 102.
[4] Daniel Gookin, *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of The Christian Indians in New England in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677* (1677) in *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society Vol. 2* (Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, printers to the University, 1836). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=sR4GAAAAQAAJ (accessed Nov. 29, 2011), 426.

that Daniel Gookin himself was at times afraid to go out in the streets of Boston, and in May of 1676 he lost his position on the Court of Assistants of Massachusetts Bay due to his outspoken support for the Christian Indians.[5] In addition to individuals, the colonists directed their prejudice against entire Indian communities. Those Christian Indians who were not actively serving the colonial military as scouts or negotiators were confined on Deer Island and other small Islands in Boston Harbor, where they faced starvation and exposure over the winter of 1675-76.

Deer Island was the direct manifestation of English attempts to engineer a particular relationship with Native people. In 1675 an order sent to Gookin, Eliot, and two other Englishmen asked them to repair to the praying towns of Wamesitt and Nashobah, near Concord and Chelmsford, and "endeaver to settle them . . . either at Deare Island or in the place where they live so that they who are friends to the English may be secured and the English in those parts also secured." The order added that they should "use their best endeavor that those Indians may be imployed and kept to labor and take care they bee all disarmed."[6] The English associated Indian "idleness" with Indian violence. Furthermore, the order underlines one of the major contradictions in English conceptions of Indian labor. On the one hand, Indians laboring in or near English communities posed a serious danger. At the same time, only in being "imployed and kept to labor" in ways scrutable to the English, could the threat posed by Indian presence in New England be contained. The colonial concentration camp on Deer Island was an obvious solution to this dilemma: in

---

[5] Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 449, and Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk,* 151.
[6] *Massachusetts Archives Collection,* Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston, vol. 30: 190.

Boston harbor, Indians could live and work under the constant scrutiny of the colony at a safe remove from enemy Indians and vulnerable English settlers alike.

For the Christian Indians incarcerated on Deer Island, this logic proved deadly. The colony's response to the suffering on Deer Island was to have guards sent to prevent their escape, and "to get all the Indians to worke, some to spinning, others to breaking up land to plant on, others to gett fish and clams, or any other calling or honest laubor."[7] Christian Indians and their colonial defenders actively campaigned for the colony to recognize their dire straights. When the Indians confined on Deer Island petitioned that they "might have liberty to get off this Island and work for our and our families," they couched their plea for mercy in a language of work and labor calculated to appeal to the colonial government.[8] But as the situation deteriorated further, and the Indians complained that they were "in great difficulties for want of food for themselves wives and children," the colonial response was to send them a fishing boat so that they could "get clams and fish."[9] Contrary to colonial expectations, the Christian Indians were not starving to death because they were lazy, but rather because Deer Island was a desolate sandbar, and there was no food. In the end more than half of the Indians confined to Deer Island died there.[10]

Deer Island proved an omen for the policy of enslavement and servitude that the General Court of Massachusetts Bay would articulate in June 1677. Initially, captured Indians were sold within New England as slaves, but anxiety about Indian captives ran high, and by May 1677, a law was passed that "all persons whatsoever

---

[7] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 194.
[8] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 200a.
[9] *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. 30: 197.
[10] Lepore, *The Name of War,* 141.

within this jurisdiction [of Massachusetts] were prohibited and forbidden to keepe or entertaine any Indian above the age of twelve years, without allowance from authority."[11] The English developed different forms of enslavement for different categories of Indian. Captive children could be enslaved for life, although they were to be taught Christianity. Christian Indians, on the other hand, were to be resettled in their communities, and carefully watched and counted; they were forbidden to "entertayne any stranger or forraigne indian or indians into their society without the knowledge or approbation of Authority."[12] Children of Christian Indians were sent into English households as servants, "by order of Authority or with their parents or Relations consent." It was stipulated that they be taught the Christian religion, and be released upon turning age twenty-four.[13]

This policy was contested before and after becoming law. According to Daniel Gookin, "there were several motions and applications made" in the General Court with regard to the Christian Indians detained on Deer Island: "Some would have them all destroyed ; others, sent out of the country ; but some there were of more moderation, alleging that those Indians and their ancestors had a covenant with the English . . . wherein mutual protection and subjection was agreed.[14] Gookin participated in the implementation of the policy that October, drawing up a document listing thirty-two Christian Indian children, their surviving relations, and the English families they would be settled with.

---

[11] The petition of Steven Burton (May 7, 1677), *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. 30: 239.
[12] Daniel Gookin, *Indian Children put to Service* (1676) in *Historical and Genealogical Register of the New England Historic-Geneological Society, Vol. 8* (Boston: Samuel G. Drake, publisher, 1854). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=XwgQAQAAMAAJ&pg (accessed Nov. 29, 2011), 273.
[13] Gookin, *Indian Children,* 273.
[14] Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 497.

Gookin's document reveals the tension between the English desire for Indian labor and the "covenant" which the praying towns had formed with the English. The court order specified that Christian Indians would be resettled in their communities, and that children would be put out to service either as orphans, or with the "consent" of their relations. However, Gookin's list of Indian children put out to service specifies "som penalty" not only on runaways, but also on "their parents or kindred that shall entice or harborr and conceale them if they should runne away."[15]

In drawing up the document, Gookin precariously navigated the divide between slavery and freedom. Children were "put to service" supposedly with their family's consent, but their families were certainly not allowed to change their minds. Semi-autonomous Indian communities were re-established at some of the former praying towns, but they were not deemed fit to raise their own children. Gookin defended the rights of the praying Indians as Christians: the right not to be enslaved perpetually, the right to be tutored in the English language and in Christianity, but their rights were only ever as Christians, never as Indians. So long as this was the case, the interests of Puritan ministers would always be privileged over indigenous ties of family and community. This foreclosed the possibility of meaningful partnership between Christian Indians and English missionaries, and made it difficult for the English to understand the motivations driving Indians' choices.

Gookin was careful to record the geographic background and family connections which connected Native children to their communities. Gookin understood that to secure the reality of the children's release upon turning twenty-four, he needed to both record the terms of their service in writing in the colonial

[15] Gookin, *Indian Children,* 273.

legal system, and maintain a clear sense of their connections to Native places and Native communities. So Samuel Simonds, Esq. received a twelve year old boy named John, whose father was Alwitankus from Quantisit, and "his father and mother both consenting," while Jacob Greene Jr. received "a Boy named Peeter aged nine yeares, his father dead, his mother present named Nannantum of Quantisit," no mention of consent.[16] Consent legitimatized English policy, and was worth noting when possible, but it had no real impact on English decision-making.

Gookin's document also reveals instances of resistance on the part of Christian Indians. Gookin assigned Mathew Bridge of Cambridge two brothers, ten year old Jabez, and six year old Joseph. But Mathew Bridge was to be at least temporarily disappointed, as "one or both these boyes is run away wth his father," Woomsleow, of Packachooge, a praying town far from the centers of English settlement. Gookin operated under the assumption of absolute English power over the Christian Indians, dividing up families and distributing Indian children at will. In fact, Christian Indians refused to be passive recipients of Colonial policy.

Jabez, Joseph, and Woomsleow may have rejoined the remnants of their native community in Western Massachusetts, or they and their entire community might have fled north up the Connecticut river valley to refuge with the French in the New England borderlands, or west across the Connecticut, Housatonic, and Hudson rivers to seek refuge with the Iroquois at Schaghticoke.[17] When the Englishman

---

[16] Simonds also received a 10 year old girl, Hester, "her father and mother dead, late of Nashaway . . . her uncle John Woosumpegin of Naticke." Gookin, *Indian Children,* 271.

[17] The French and English were at peace during King Philip's War and had recently been allies during the Third Anglo-Dutch War from 1672 to 1674. However, this did not prevent New France from serving as a shelter for Native American refugees. A fleeing Native's greatest concern, besides hunger and exposure, was probably not the English but the Mohawk, who came into the war on the side of the

Quentin Stockwell of Deerfield was captured by Indians in September of 1677, his captors took him north up the Connecticut River, across the Green Mountains to Lake Champlain, and eventually to the French town of Chambly, near Montreal.[18] Stockwell's captors included Pocumtuck and Nipmuc from southern New England who fled to Canada in the aftermath of the war, some of whom eventually moved to Schaghticoke.[19]

The Christian Indians of Wamesit made a similar decision to flee when the English tried to confine them on Deer Island in late fall of 1675: "we cannot come home again, we go towards the French, we go where Wannalansit is," they wrote in a letter to the English at Chelmsford, "as for the [Deer] Island, we say there is no safety for us, because many English be not good, and may be they come to us and kill us."[20] The praying Indians were adept at appealing to English sensibilities, telling them "we are sorry the English have driven us from our praying to God and from our teacher," and in this vein mention of the French was probably part threat directed at the English, and part vague hope for themselves. Wamesit was far from the Connecticut River Valley, which connected southern New England to New France within Native

---

English and proved a formidable enemy, with much broader knowledge of the New England landscape than the English.

[18] Quentin Stockwell, *Quentin Stockwell's 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).

[19] Stockwell, *Captivity and Redemption,* 40, note 15, and 42, note 26.

[20] Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 483. This letter is briefly discussed in Lepore, *The Name of War,* 138. The order the Wamesitt Indians are responding to is *Massachusetts Archives Collection,* vol. 30: 190, discussed earlier in this chapter. Wannalansit is probably Wonalancet, a Penacook sachem. The Penacook lived along the Merrimack River in modern-day New Hampshire, and Wonalancet was probably just out of reach of the English.

space, and the real plan was probably to connect with a Native place "where Wannalansit is," and where the Wamesit may have had family or other connections.[21]

The Wamesit's letter to the English was delivered by the Indian servant Wepocositt, who worked for William Fletcher of Chelmsford, and was sent after the fleeing Indians. Even before King Philip's War servitude both divided Native communities, and tied them closer to the English. Unlike most Indians enslaved after the war, Wepocositt was not given or refused to take an English name, despite the fact that his community was at least ostensibly Christian. And although he did not flee the colony with the Indian community who lived closest to where he was working as a servant to the English, he was aware of where they had gone, and was judged most able to follow them and communicate with them successfully once he had found them. Wepocositt, an Indian servant in an English household, became the chief messenger between his Native and English communities. Wepocositt's role foreshadows the role Indian slaves and servants would come to play in New England society after King Philip's War, bridging Indian communities and English households.

Unfortunately, the places which escaping Indians fled to did not always have the resources to provide for them. Most of the Wamesit Indians returned after only twenty-three days, "being put to great straights for want of food," and only eighteen elected to stay behind. Whether out of concern for their souls, concern at their freedom, or both, the English took great pains to persuade the Wamesit to stay in New England. Gookin and Eliot brought the Wamesit food and other provisions, sent forth a few of the Christian Indians to persuade the eighteen hold-outs to return, and

[21] Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 483.

"appointed Englishmen to be guardians to those Indians by night and day."[22] The prospect of Christian Indians breaking away and joining with the French or with relatives to the north posed a serious threat to the English. And although in this case Native networks were not equipped to handle the refugees, in running away for twenty-three days the Wamesit community avoided confinement on Deer Island, and increased their ability to successfully negotiate with the English at Chelmsford and the colonial government in Boston.

The Wamesit's story suggests that even if Jabez, Joseph, and Woomsleow ended up returning to one of the resettled villages of Christian Indians, he may still have protected his sons from future captivity simply by playing to the English fear of losing control over their Christian Indian "allies." Alternatively, Woomsleow may have faced serious hardship and hunger outside the boundaries of English support and knowledge, before finding a way to reestablish his family outside of Massachusetts. In either case, he refused Gookin's decision to put his children to service, and opted instead to find a space beyond the boundaries of English control.

Even in the heart of Southern New England, and after King Philip's War had decimated Native polities, English control was not absolute. In late spring of 1676 an "Indian squa" was captured in Massachusetts and brought to Boston to be questioned by the government.[23] She claimed to have come from Providence by sea, unaccompanied by any other Indians, to visit "Sam Hidos wife and her cousin that lived with Same Hido." She told the English that there were 300 Indians near Providence, and although she admitted that some of them were fighting men, when

---

[22] Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 484.
[23] *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. 30: 202a. This document is undated, but based on the dates of the documents around it as well as the content it is almost certainly late spring or early summer of 1676.

asked what they did there, she emphasized planting, hunting, and gathering food.[24] Well after the tide of the war turned in favor of the English, large numbers of Narragansett in the heart of Southern New England were, at least in this woman's telling, making a go of daily life—planting crops, setting traps, and preparing the best they could for what must have been a very uncertain future.

Even as the war wound to a close, and Native defeat in Southern New England became all but certain, this Narragansett woman perceived that she had the mobility in the colonies to travel north into Massachusetts. Perhaps she was trying to seek refuge with relatives, or perhaps she was truly just visiting, but in either case Native networks of relations cut through the colonies, and Native peoples continued to move through them. At the same time, this unnamed Indian woman did not go unnoticed; she was captured and questioned by colonial authorities, who clearly still lacked essential and basic information about the Indians who continued to live among them throughout the war, in this case only twelve miles from Providence.[25] The aftermath of King Philip's War brought heightened scrutiny to Native communities, and disrupted Native networks, but the English power to restrict, control, and render legible Indian communities remained contested and uneven.

Just as the domestic information about population numbers, food supply, the whereabouts of leaders, and the number of fighting men and how well equipped they were with guns and powder, provided by an ordinary Indian woman, was of utmost concern to the English, likewise information attained by Indian captives and servants

---

[24] When questioned about the whereabouts of King Philip, the Indian woman seems to have answered honestly, telling them that Philip had last stopped by that winter, and that they had only twenty guns and no powder. *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. 30: 202a.
[25] *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. 30: 202a.

living among the English posed a serious threat to the English. When three Indian women escaped from Concord, Massachusetts in June of 1676, it is taken as a serious threat, since the Indian women who had been living among them "are acquanted with the condition of the town, and what quantity of men we have gone out; and which way they are gone."[26]

The petition which the Constable of Concord sent to the Governor recognizes the irony in how threatened the people of Concord feel by three Indian women: "While I thought to be sufficient to give a charge to 12 men; to keep sentenall over three old squas; I hope your honor will be pleased to take it into consideration; and send us some more strength to suport us . . . for we are in dayly fear; that they will make an asault on the town."[27] The constable seems almost embarrassed that the three old women managed to successfully escape, despite that they had twelve Englishmen watching over them. And yet, the fear which Concord felt represents the intimacy of captivity and servitude; Indian servants frequently lived in English households, and Indian captives were held in English towns. Although they were old women, the Indians who escaped from Concord had dangerous knowledge of Concord, its households, its layout, and its strength. One can imagine that it was precisely the domestic nature of this knowledge which frightened the English most.

In Massachusetts, the confluence of missionary theology, colonial domination, and colonial anxiety led Daniel Gookin and other colonial officials to grant certain Indian communities rights as Christians, but not as Indians. This allowed

[26] *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. 30: 203a.
[27] *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. 30: 203a.

Massachusetts Bay to defend some of the Christian Indian's interests without having to recognize intrinsic Native rights or sovereignties. This logic did not apply outside of Massachusetts. Plymouth Colony, Rhode Island, and Connecticut did not have to navigate a divide between Christian Indians and Enemy Indians, but each faced different challenges in dealing with captive Indians following the war.

In Connecticut, the Pequot and Mohegan aligned themselves with the English but refused to convert to Christianity. Due to the lack of combat within the limits of Connecticut, and the strength of the Pequot and Mohegan, Connecticut did not have the same kind of control over their Native allies that Massachusetts exercised over the praying towns. This, combined with the influence of anti-slavery Quakers in Connecticut, meant that the Connecticut government did not engage in the systematic enslavement or sale of captured Indians. Instead, Connecticut allowed individual settlers to decide for themselves Indian captives' terms of service: "for the prevention of those Indians running away . . . that are of the enemy and have submitted to mercy, such Indians, if they be taken, shall be in the power of his master to dispose of him as a captive by transportation out of the country."[28]

The Wampanoag in Plymouth and the Narragansett in Rhode Island formed the heart of Native resistance in King Philip's War. However, Rhode Island's government, which was controlled by the Quakers in 1676, took a softer stance than

[28] Alden Vaughan and Deborah Rosen, eds. *Early American Indian Documents: Treaties and Laws, 1607-1789: Vol. 17, New England and Middle Atlantic Laws* (Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 2004), 308. Almon Lauber suggests that the influence of Quakers in Connecticut limited official enslavement in the colony. Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 131. Given the presence of semi-autonomous Native communities capable of absorbing run-away captives, and the greed and anti-Indian sentiment of many white New Englanders, Connecticut slave owners' freedom to dispose of Indian captives probably led more frequently to the sale of captives who even by colonial logic should by rights have been indentured, than it did to the limiting of slavery in the state.

Plymouth or Massachusetts on captured and surrendering Indians.[29] In March of 1676 the Rhode Island Assembly even attempted to outlaw Indian slavery: "noe Indian in this Collony be a slave, but only to pay their debts or for their bringing up, or custody they have received, or to performe covenant as if they had been countrymen not in warr."[30]

Although this law did not end Indian slavery in Rhode Island, it did have an immediate impact on the distribution of captives following the war. Indian captives were sold into servitude on a sliding scale which effectively established that Indians of any age were to be freed around middle age. For example, children under five were enslaved for thirty years, while captives over the age of thirty were enslaved for seven years.[31] This "involuntary indenture," to use Lauber's term, mediated between slave and free; no one was absolutely enslaved, as were enemy Indians captured in Massachusetts or Plymouth, and few were sold to the Caribbean, however the freedom of the Narragansett was still profoundly circumscribed. The Rhode Island Legislature did not have the power to prevent slavery against the wishes of English colonists and landowners, and by the beginning of the eighteenth century Rhode Island was the New England colony with the most entrenched system of Indian and African slavery.

Plymouth Colony, like Massachusetts Bay, enslaved many captive Indians. However, the colony struggled to differentiate between Indians captured in battle, and those who surrendered on promise of amnesty. Fifty-seven Indians who surrendered in September 1675, well before it became clear that the English would ultimately win

---

[29] Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 129.
[30] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 437. See also Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 382.
[31] Sainsbury, "Indian Labor in Early Rhode Island," 383, and Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 129.

the conflict, were declared "in the same condition of rebellion" and condemned to perpetual slavery, with the Treasurer to "make sale of them, for and to the use for the collonie, as oppertunity may present."[32] Plymouth Colony's desire for revenue from the sale of Indian captives is clear from the instructions they gave to an Indian ally, Captain Amos, who "made tender to be officious in feching off such of the Indians that are our enemies as are att Elizabeth Islands."[33] Amos was to be awarded "four coates" each for the Sachems, Tatoson and Penachason, indicating the political aims of the expedition, but one "coate apeece for every other Indian that shall prove marchantable."[34] Indian captives were merchandise, and non- "marchantable" Indians weren't worth the trouble.[35]

In July of 1676 Plymouth colony declared that allowing "Indian men that are captives to settle and abide within this collonie may prove prejuditiall to our comon peace and safety," and ordered "that noe Indian male captive shall reside in this government that is above fourteen years of age att the beginning of his or theire captivity."[36] Although this law did not include those who formally surrendered, it did extend to "all such Indians as have or shall come into the collonie in a clandestine way, not applying themselves to the authorities of this jurisdiction for libertie."[37]

---

[32] Nathaniel B. Shurtleff and David Pulsifer, Eds., *Records of Plymouth Colony,* 12 vols. (Boston: The Press of William White, Printer to the Commonwealth, 1855-61), vol. 5: 174.
[33] The Elizabeth Islands are a chain of Islands south of Cape Cod, near Martha's Vineyard. At the time the Elizabeth Islands, along with Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, were formally a part of New York, but were tightly controlled by the Puritan Mayhew family.
[34] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 5: 209.
[35] In all of the colonies, the sale of Indian captives was a considerable source of revenue, excepting Connecticut, where it was largely in private hands. Between June 25 and September 25, 1676, Massachusetts Bay received 397.13 pounds for 188 prisoners, a rate of about 3 pounds per head, and a considerable sum. Lepore, *The Name of War,* 154.
[36] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 5: 210.
[37] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 5: 209.

That November, the colony made allowance for Indians who surrendered voluntarily to settle within the colony on a particular tract of land, with orders not to leave "except by order from some majestrate." Three Indians, presumably having proved themselves faithful to the government during the war, were assigned to "healp them in theire settlement" and "have the inspective of them."[38] As in the case of Captain Amos mentioned above, Plymouth relied on Indian allies in the capture, sale, and settlement of Indian captives. However, as in Massachusetts, this heavily surveilled community was not allowed the privilege of raising its own children. "The children of those Indians that ave come in and yeilded themselves to the English," were "disposed of . . . unto such of the English as may use them well, especially theire parents consenting therunto, during the time untill such children shall attaine the age of twenty foure or twenty five yeers."[39] As in Massachusetts, the question of parental consent was a contested one, here indicated by the "especially." As was so clear in Gookin's list of children put out to service, consent was ideal, but by no means necessary.

Plymouth, like Massachusetts, tried to enforce term limits on certain limited groups of captive children. Indenture proved difficult to enforce, and a significant number of English households who acquired Indian children to serve until the age of twenty-four, sold them for the cash that could be gotten in exchange for a lifetime of their labor elsewhere in New England or in the Caribbean. In March 1678, Plymouth passed a law "to prohibite all and every person and persons within our jurisdiction or elsewhere, to buy any of the indian children of any of those our captive salvages that

[38] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 5: 210.
[39] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 5: 207.

were taken and became our lawfull prisoners in our late warrs with the Indians, without speciall leave, likeing, and approbation of the government of this jurisdiction."[40] Plymouth Colony tried to stem the sale of Indian slaves and maintain government control over the distribution of Indian captives, but colonial governments struggled to maintain control over the process of enslaving or indenturing captive Indians.

Colonial merchants and soldiers found that they could profit from stealing friendly Indians or Indian servants already in service to the English without the risks of a genuine military expedition—a practice with serious political implications. In November 1676, two merchants, William Waldron and Henry Lauton, were imprisoned in Boston for "stealing and recieving onboard his said Catch, severall Indians from the Eastern parts; which hath occasioned breach of peace and much trouble to his Country."[41] Waldron and Lauton captured and sold seventeen Indians, men, women, and children. Their legal case turned not on the practice of stealing Indians, but on which Indians they stole, and in fact Waldon and Lauton were given a commission to take enemy Indians. But when the colonial official Thomas Gardner saw that Waldron and Lauton had "no goods to buy fish as was pretended," and learned that "thay had shakles Aboard for Indians," he warned them not to take "any Indians on the East side of Kenibek River becaus we had made peace with them." Gardner testified that after Waldron and Lauton did exactly that, the Indians complained "of our breach of Covenant."[42]

---

[40] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 5: 253.
[41] *Suffolk Files Collection,* Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston, 1592.
[42] Testimony of Thomas Gardner. *Suffolk Files,* 1592.

Waldron and Lauton's utter disregard for the peace treaties that Massachusetts had made with the "Eastern Indians" is particularly striking given the continuing violence along the Northern frontier, where King Philip's War did not end until April of 1678. Although the colony took Waldron and Lauton's capital crime of "man stealing" very seriously, they were eventually acquitted. Waldron claimed that he was entirely ignorant of the charges, that he had only taken enemy Indians, and, essentially, that he hadn't the slightest idea just how far to the East he was.[43] Even as the war ended, Colonial borders were fluid and dangerous places, and the court could appreciate just how hard it could be for the English to tell friend from foe.

Captain Benjamin Gibbs had no such excuse. Around midnight on a Sunday in early September 1676, Captain Gibbs and some of his soldiers landed on Prudence Island in Narragansett Bay, in the heart of Rhode Island, and "did forceably and illegally take away . . . twenty five Indian servants" belonging to local Englishmen, "men women and children."[44] For Gibbs, as for Waldron and Hauton, King Philip's War presented an opportunity for personal enrichment, and the question of justifying the capture of Indians through warfare was in practice an entirely moot point. Indians were commodities, to be bought, to be sold, or in Gibbs's case, to be stolen. It is not clear what happened to the individuals Gibbs captured, although presumably he was hoping to sell them south to the Caribbean for a profit. In the summer of 1676 profit for Indian captives was not a difficult thing to secure.

If Gibbs viewed Indian servants as commodities, how did their English owners on Prudence Island view them? And how did the twenty-five Indian men,

---

[43] Petition of William Waldron. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 213.
[44] *Suffolk Files,* 1498.

women, and children themselves experience their kidnapping? There are subtle suggestions in the court files on Gibbs's case that Indian servants had managed to reconstitute some kind of Native community on Prudence Island. According to the court testimony of John Godfrey, who was aboard ship with Gibbs, Gibbs arrived at Prudence Island around midnight, and went first to William Allen's house, where he "seized on eight indians and carried [illegible] aboard," and then "he went to the house of James Sweete, and there he seized Seventeen Indians more, and carried them aboard, and Phillipe Sweete and James Sweete challenged the said Indians."[45]

Why were twenty-five Indian servants belonging to seven or eight different Englishmen from five different families all sleeping together at two houses? It appears as if the Sweete family was responsible for seventeen Indian servants, many "belonging to" other members of the community. When the Indians were being carried off, "Phillipe Sweete and James Sweete" did not challenge Gibbs and his men, but the Indians themselves. It seems as if their control over the Indian servants was less than complete—that they were not totally sure whether "their" Indians were being kidnapped, or were simply sneaking off in the night.

The Englishmen who testified in the case of Benjamin Gibbs used English families to define the captured Indians' place within the English community on Prudence Island, affirming their rights over the Indians in the process. However, from the Indians' perspective, their community was not primarily defined by their relationships to the English, but rather by their relationships with other Indians—a disconnect which explains the ambiguity in the English testimonies.

[45] Testimony of John Godfrey. *Suffolk Files,* 1498.

We can learn more about how these Indian servants experienced service to the English just prior to and during King Philip's War, because Gibbs was not the first colonial soldier to seize Indian servants from Prudence Island under cover of darkness. In October 1675, Thomas Paine petitioned the Court of the United Colonies at Boston on behalf of "Jack an Indian and his Squa and papoose that were surprised by night uppon Prudence Island in ther wigwam by my house and with them one Caleb."[46] Caleb was "engaged" by Paine "to give me intelligence of any Indians that should come on, friends or not." Jack and his family were "taken aboard by Capt. Fullor and Capt. Goram in the night unknown to mee," and "would not be suffered to come ashore to me againe but tould me they would take them and examin them before ther General."[47]

The relationship between the Narragansett Indian Jack and his family and Thomas Paine was not exactly one of servitude; rather, it seems to have been closer to a landlord-tenant situation. Jack "hath been always with sometimes one and then another upon this Island for about thirteen years and that he planted this last year with his Squa." That Paine was not able to secure Indian labor except as a landlord in what was at least a somewhat mutually beneficial relationship reflects the fact that before King Philip's War, the English did not have the political hegemony in New England necessary to secure Indian labor without some kind of mutual relationship. In the case of Jack and Thomas Paine, the outbreak of war did not break this

---

[46] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 181.
[47] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 181. Captain Fuller and Captain Gorham both receive some mention in the English history of King Philip's War. Captain Fuller participated in a famously inept early attempt to attack the Pocasset "with all the efficiency of an army from Gilbert and Sullivan," and Captain Gorham perished at the Great Swamp Fight a few months after taking Jack at Prudence Island. Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk,* 63, 132.

relationship, and in fact it probably even strengthened it, since Jack would come to depend on Paine for his security and liberty as his fellow Narragansett rebelled against the English, at the same time as Paine came to depend on Jack to secure him from Indian violence.

Paine explains that Jack and his family "fled at first to avoid any concearne in the Warr and have kept themselves as free as any of the Naraganset Indians from guilt." Not only was Jack innocent due to his decision to break with his people and avoid war against the English, but however equal or unequal their economic relationship may have been, some aspect of Jack's relationship with Paine was one of mutual service:

> Uppon Jack's faithfullness to mee and ingagement to abide by mee peace or warr, life or death, I promised to Serve him so farr as I could and to that end that I would in a few days get the Governor of Rhode Islands sertifficate that none might take them from mee but the succeeding night to the day of this promise Capt. Fullor and Capt Goram surprised them by night.[48]

We have no way of knowing whether or not Paine had in fact been planning to secure a legal certificate securing Jack's safety, but he clearly recognized that in light of the war and the newfound distrust and fear of Native peoples which it engendered in English settlers and governments alike, such a document would have been useful.

Just as Jack depended on Paine for his security during King Philip's War, Paine and other Englishmen on Prudence Island trusted their Indian tenants and servants to secure them from attack by the Narragansett. James Sweet, who later participated in the case against Benjamin Gibbs as well, testified that Jack was

[48] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 181.

present in the community prior to the war, to "forewarne mee of any trouble and advise what to doe before the wars brokeout imediately."[49]

Paine took his agreement with Jack seriously not only because they provided each other with mutual security, but because Paine perceived New England as a world where if he broke his trust with the Native people in his community, his reputation and ability to function in the community would suffer for it. "The Indians conceive that I betrayed and sold them," Paine fretted, "whereby I may also suffer wrongfully by ther private malice if not publique." Of course, that it was in Paine's power to sell his tenants at all speaks to the increasing sense of insecurity felt by the Indians of Prudence Island in 1675. For what it's worth, Paine appears to have been entirely sincere, since he offered that "if by law or accident Jack's squa and wife may bee a captive," Paine would redeem Jack's wife "by the price that is given that they may not be parted."[50]

After finishing his petition, but before sending it, John Paine got news that Jack was not the only Indian from Providence Island who had been kidnapped that night. He added in the margin that:

> Tom Indian and the boy his brother were also living here and retained as servants upon this Island and taken from William Allen's uppon the Island unknown to mee and are for good Reason looked uppon by us as Inocent persons and that another Tom being like him it is hard to distinguish of them he may wrongfully be taken for the man.[51]

Whereas Jack is referred to only as an Indian, and it is implied that he is a "tenant," Tom and his brother are both clearly labelled as servants. And yet, the fact that Tom

---

[49] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 181.
[50] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 181.
[51] Paine's concern that Tom be mistaken for another Indian, hard to distinguish, reflects the tremendous danger that even Native individuals whose position in English society was secure coming out of King Philip's War, faced simply for being Indian. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 181.

and his brother were kidnapped along with Jack and his family suggests that they lived among the Indians in wigwams, and not in the house with their English family, as was generally the case with servants and slaves in colonial New England. It is impossible to say what precisely made Tom a servant and Jack a tenant, but regardless servants and tenants both appear to have lived in communities that were both well integrated into English settlement, but also set apart.

Presuming that Tom and his brother were successfully redeemed, it is entirely possible that they were kidnapped again less than a year later, when Benjamin Gibbs came ashore at Prudence Island and seized eight Indians near William Allen's house. The surviving testimony from Gibb's case suggests that, like Jack and his family, the men, women, and children whom Gibb's "stole" lived apart and alongside the English, retaining distinctive elements of Indian culture and lifeways, exemplified by the fact that they continued to live in wigwams, while at the same time integrating into English communities and probably doing English agricultural labor. And yet, in the Court papers submitted in the Gibbs's case, the mutual relationship which Thomas Paine and James Sweete had attested to just a year earlier is nowhere in evidence. Whether tenants or servants, the Indians Gibbs took were not kidnapped, they were stolen, and their owners "aske Demaund, take and receive of and from Capt Benjamin Gibbs of Boston all such Indian or Indians as our said attorney shall lawfully demand . . . or moneys, in the lew of the said persons."[52]

In the aftermath of King Philip's War, a set of relationships between English and Narragansett families on Prudence Island which had been based on mutual benefit, and which had been defined as servant/master or landlord/tenant, but which

[52] *Suffolk Files*, 1498.

had allowed Indian and English communities to exist alongside each other, was transformed into a financial relationship. The collapse of independent Narragansett authority in Rhode Island not only exposed the Narragansett who had willingly settled among the English on Prudence Island to the threat of random capture and sale into Caribbean slavery, it had transformed them into a kind of chattel, ensconced in a financial relationship with their English "owners" that, in the event of emergency, could be transformed into hard currency in colonial courts.

Despite the efforts of Rhode Island's Quakers to outlaw Indian slavery, and regulate Indian servitude through "involuntary indenture," the almost feudal relationship between Narragansett tenants and English landholders in Southern Rhode Island seen on Prudence Island developed into plantation slavery after King Philip's War. By the eighteenth century, Indian and African slavery were well established on Southern Rhode Island's plantations, and Rhode Island had become, relative to its size, the leading holder of African slaves in New England.[53]

John Paine was one of numerous Englishmen whose Indian servants were lost or stolen, or who felt that their rights over Indians whom they had purchased or acquired in warfare were being undermined by laws limiting the ownership of Indians. In December of 1676 the selectmen of the town of Hingham passed a "town order that whatsoever person or persons shall entertain any Indian in his family: shall pay twenty shillings as a fine to the towne for every such offence and afterwards twenty shillings per day."[54] That this order originated locally, rather than in Boston, demonstrates that Indian servants continued to inspire tremendous fear following

[53] Sainsbury, "Indian Labor in Early Rhode Island," 387.
[54] The Petition of John Jacob, Nathaniel Backer, and Mathew Cushon. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 231.

King Philip's War. The town of Hingham wanted nothing to do with Indians—servant or otherwise. And yet, despite this prejudice, Indians had come to reside in Hingham in a variety of ways and relationships, "part of them being Captives and part of them apprentices for years: some of which were bought with mony and some given to the Petitioners and others." These Indians, with their intimate knowledge of and access to domestic spaces, were perceived as a real threat by Hingham's leaders, just as three old women inspired so much fear in Concord earlier in the war. To their owners, however, the same Indians were "in no ways prejudicial to the towne: or disturbance to the publique peace or goals of this Collony: but of great use and advantage to the petitioners and neighbors."[55]

Given these kinds of fears, appealing to the docility of Indian servants was an essential tactic in convincing the colonial government to grant exemptions from laws restricting the ownership of Indians. One petitioner described his servant as "of a very good, naturall temper, and ingenious docile disposition, and who has always been and is very serviceable and useful."[56] In December of 1676 the families in Hingham who cohabited with Indian servants argued that there was "a liberty granted in every towne within the three united Collonys for the Inhabitants to keepe Indians, (Boston only excepted)," but by spring the Massachusetts government decreed that no

[55] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 231.
[56] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 239. Another common tactic, running slightly counter to this one, was to emphasize how much effort it had taken to turn an Indian child into a servant fit for an English household. George Danson and his wife, appealing to keep their Indian woman, argued not only that they relied on her labor, being old and unable to do hard labor themselves, but also that "wee our Selves with our diligence and instructing of her, hath brought her to be in some measure fitt for our service of employ." This may have been a more effective tactic, since it played into the idea of the "savage" Indian, rather than against it. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 167a.

Indians over the age of twelve could be kept as servants without explicit permission of the General Court.[57]

As in the case of Benjamin Gibbs and the petition of John Paine, some petitions demonstrate the ways in which financial and personal interests could be tightly wound. Henry Crane had three Indian servants, a man, woman and their child. Whether this Indian family aligned itself with Crane's household for mutual protection as was the case on Prudence Island, or whether Crane's two Indian servants decided to start a family in the context of their service to Crane, the two families must have been entwined before King Philip's War began. But perhaps because of the literal and cultural reproductive potential of an Indian family embedded in an English household, perhaps because family ties signified an unacceptable degree of freedom and independence for an Indian servant, or perhaps simply because three Indians was too many, the Massachusetts government denied Crane permission to keep his Indian servants, and ordered that he sell them within one month.

Crane didn't sell the Indians, at least not immediately. A month later Crane petitioned the government again, this time for a two month extension, because "your petitioner hath not had any opportunity to dispose of them . . . except he should have given them away." Two more months, Crane begged, that "he may make his best advantage of them."[58] No longer allowed to legally coexist with an Indian family, Crane sought to get the best price he could. Although appeals to the monetary value, economic productivity, and usefulness of Indian servants were much more common,

---

[57] *Massachusetts Archives,* Vol. 30: 231, 236, and 239.
[58] The Petition of Henry Crane. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 239a.

emotional bonds found their way into Englishmen's petitions as well. In a 1678 petition George Speere wrote that his Indian boy, who had been reclaimed by his family, would "rather have lost his life than to have gone from me with them; so had I gained on his affections."[59] Speere's invocation of his Indian's supposed affection was calculated to bring a financial return. The boy's Native family had successfully petitioned the government for his return, and Speere was asking for reimbursement.

The surveillance and regulation of Indian bodies could be complicated by the Indians themselves, and the line between adult and child was not always clear. On April 9, 1677, Samuell Lynde petitioned the government with a unique problem:

> Whereas your petitioner about 10 months since, before the order of not keeping any Indians in the town, Bought of Capton John Hull treasurer an Indian girle poore and lowe in flesh but tall in stature, which the Indians that were taken with her and know her said was but 12 yeares of age, and Capt. John Hunter the Indian alledging her to bee one of his friends, telling to your Petitioner that he had an order that if your petitioner intended to transport her, he had liberty to exchange her that she might not be sent away.[60] But in as much as the Girle is since growne very much in stature and fatt and full in body, brought to be very very servicieble in his family - he your petitioner thought need to acquaint the honorable Counsell of this said Girle least her bignesse in Stature should Render him delinquent to your honors late order; if he keep her in this Colloney without permission.[61]

Lynde used both English and Native authority to establish his rights over his Indian servant. He bought her from the colony prior to the law prohibiting Indian servants

---

[59] Petition of George Speere. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 244.

[60] John Hunter was a Christian Nipmuc Indian who served in the colonial military as Captain of a company of Praying Indians in King Philip's War. He received a brief but telling mention in Thomas Church's published narrative of his father Benjamin Church's memoirs: "Mr. Church, one Baxter, and Capt. Hunter an Indian . . . had not march'd above a quarter of a Mile before they started Three of the Enemy. Capt. Hunter wounded one of them in his knee, whom when he came up he discovered to be his near kinsman; the Captive desired favour for his *Squaw,* if she should fall into their hands, but ask'd none for himself, excepting the liberty of taking a Whiff of Tobacco, and while he was taking his Whiff, his kinsman [Hunter] with one blow of his Hatchet dispatch'd him." Church, *Entertaining Passages*, 410-411.

[61] The Petition of Samuell Lynde. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 236b.

over the age of twelve, but even so Lynde claims that his servant was twelve when he bought her. Furthermore, Lynde made an agreement with Captain John Hunter, a Christian Nipmuc closely allied to the colony. Lynde promised Hunter that he would not sell the Indian girl, thereby securing for her Indian relatives the assurance that she would remain in the colony, that they would know her whereabouts, and that she would therefore remain at least partially enmeshed in Native communities and kinship networks. Despite these claims to ownership, established by her legal purchase in the English economy, and confirmed within surviving Indian kinship networks, the Indian girl's body threatened to betray him. For though she had been "poore and lowe in flesh," only a child, she had quickly grown up in Lynde's household.

What underlay this anxiety about adult Indians? It is easy to understand the fear of adult male Indians, who the English viewed as a violent threat to the peace and security of the colony. But adult women posed a more complicated threat to the English. By their reproductive potential, they represented a future for Indians in North America.[62] Indian women and Indian families had the potential to create and reproduce Indian bodies and Indian identities. Although for individual colonists, Indian reproduction could be a site of economic potential, for the colonial project as a whole, it posed a grave danger—a direct threat to the crucial hope that Indian people could be entirely removed from the landscape, already expressed by the first Puritan

[62] Similarly, Jennifer Morgan argues that African women's reproductive potential was at the heart of Atlantic slave economies: African women were crucial "to the generation of profits for those who owned and oversaw enslaved laborers and to bourgeoning notions of race as a tangible index of human distinction." In a slave society which needed to reproduce its enslaved labor force, it was essential that the reproductive potential of slaves be managed, but in a settler colony like New England, the reproductive potential of indigenous people was a threat better eliminated than harnessed. Morgan, *Laboring Women,* 197.

settlers in the guise of the hand of God clearing title to the land with plagues of infectious diseases. Absent the rigid racial ideologies which grew up around the practice of African slavery, it was impossible for the New England colonies to view the perpetuation of Indian slaves and servants as anything but a threat.[63]

Undergirding this threat was the fear of miscegenation. In the aftermath of King Philip's War, the Puritans were deeply anxious about the levels of violence they had turned against the Indians. In defending themselves against the "savage" Indians, had they themselves become savages? Jill Lepore argues that the colonists "clothed their naked war with words. The writing itself would . . . undo the damage of the war by making clear once again who was English and who Indian."[64] In this context, miscegenation made literal the existential threat which indigeneity as a concept posed to the Puritan settlers: that if they were not careful they would not merely be attacked by Indian armies, but would themselves become savage.

The fact of New England as native space posed a threat, and the presence of Indian women in English households was the ultimate embodiment of that threat, despite the unthreatening "docility" which English petitioners assigned their "useful" servants. Although there are very few instances of sexual intimacy between Englishmen and natives in the colonial archive, prosecutions for interracial sexual

---

[63] This argument was influenced by Lorenzo Veracini's argument that settler colonial sovereignty is established by the ability of settlers to control indigenous and exogenous others locally, the ability to control reproduction and establish appropriate family relations, and the physical presence of the settler in the face of the "transfer" of indigenous people, leaving behind an "empty" or "open" landscape. Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 53, 64.

[64] This, Lepore argues, was often the chief difference between English and Indian cruelties: "since Indian homes were "wigwams," not "houses," their settlements "camps," not "towns," fights in swamps were courageous battles," not "massacres." Lepore, *The Name of War,* 94, 88.

contact are clustered around the beginning and end of King Philip's War.[65] It is hard not to imagine that the fear of miscegenation underlay Samuell Lynde's anxiety about having an Indian woman "full in body" living in his home.

Not only Englishmen petitioned the courts on behalf of Indian servants. Christian Indians were able to leverage the knowledge of colonial society and law which they gained in aligning themselves with the English to protest the enslavement of their friends and families. Like the petitions of John Paine or Henry Crane, these petitions speak to the continued intertwining of Native and English communities. For example, a group of Christian Indians from the praying towns of Natick and Punkapog petitioned that "severall of our kindred (being also Related to and Scattered amongst those that weer our enimys and some of them that were found amongst our enimys) were justly taken and captivated." After recognizing the legitimacy of the English capturing and enslaving Enemy indians, including their own families, the petitioners "entreat your honors in the behalf of one of our neere kindred called peter an Indian youth who submited himself to the English the last August in Plimouth . . . and was from there sould in to this coloy and heer he continued faithfully serving his master John Kingston of Milton."[66] The document goes on to explain that the government of Massachusetts called Peter among other Indian servants before the court and had him put in jail.

Significantly, just as Peter's Indian kin do not challenge the legitimacy of the English enslaving "enimys . . . justly taken," they also do not challenge the legitimacy

[65] Plane, *Colonial Intimacies,* 82.
[66] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 229.

of Peter's position as a servant, despite the fact that he was captured unfairly, and was sold in Plymouth even though he was from a praying town allied to Massachusetts. In fact, the Indian petitioners ask that Peter be "granted to Continue in this Contry Heer that we his Relatives may have liberty to Redeeme him or that he may stay with his Master."[67] In petitioning for their relative Peter's life, the authors of the document demonstrate the ways in which English and Indian networks of power and kinship had become entwined. The Indian petitioners open with a declaration of alliance to the colony of Massachusetts, an alliance predicated on the rejection and disavowal of "enemy" Indians. Despite the fact that these Indians were potentially family, enmeshed in kin relationships that encompassed and spread beyond the praying towns, the Christian Indians tacitly supported their enslavement in exchange for incorporation into and protection from newly ascendant English power.

Still, the maintenance of Native family ties and networks remained paramount. Peter's status as a servant was not the problem which his relatives appealed, in fact they would be satisfied if he were allowed to "stay with his Master" in Milton. The fear is of sale abroad, and the tacit understanding that, whatever it was they faced, captives sold out of the colony would never return. Indians sold out of the colony were utterly cut off from the networks of kinship, culture, and knowledge which protected and defined Native communities in New England, even after King Philip's War. As long as Peter remained in New England his relatives would be able to protect him. Servitude to the English did not entail leaving Native networks, and

[67] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 229.

Peter's Native relatives were clearly keeping tabs on his whereabouts following his capture by the English.[68]

Perhaps more than any other group, Massachusett's Praying Indians were forced to navigate the complex fault-lines between Indian and English identities and communities following King Philip's War. Christian Indians were turned on from all sides. As the Christian Indian Tukapewillin said to John Eliot: "The enemy Indians have also taken a part of what I had, and the richest Indians mock and scoff at me . . . the English also censure me, and say I am a hypocrite."[69] Despite the distinctions the English drew between "friend" and "enemy" Indians, the violence of King Philip's War pushed the English to view all Native peoples through the racialized category of "Indian." This nascent racial prejudice was a driving force behind the decision to incarcerate the Christian Indians on Deer Island. Christian Indians themselves were primarily concerned with preserving whatever they could of their own autonomy and that of their immediate families.

The lines between "friend" and "enemy" Indian could be complicated. The narrative of Mary Rowlandson, who was captured by Indians during King Philip's War, repeatedly emphasizes the unredeemable hypocrisy of Christian Indians: "little do many think what is the savageness and brutishness of this barbarous enemy, aye even those that seem to profess more than others among them." Rowlandson recalled

---

[68] In another case, an Englishman petitions that a "poor, blind Indian" who at some point in the past had lived near his house, "delivered 2 small children to the petitioner's house" and "did bestow them upon myselfe and my sonn." If the Petitioner is telling the truth, this document confirms that Indians sought out relationships of servitude for themselves or their children as a way of protecting them from the uncertainty and danger of unplanned captivity. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 220.

[69] Order of the Massachusetts Council, August 30, 1675, Grafton Massachusetts, Local Records, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts. Quoted in Lepore, *The Name of War,* 142. This quote is the most direct evidence for, and a beautiful statement of Lepore's argument that the praying Indians found themselves in the difficult position of being neither English enough for the English, nor Indian enough for the Indians.

seven English men and women "killed at Lancaster," who "were slain and mangled in a barbarous manner, by . . . Marlborough's praying Indians."[70] If Christian Indians could be enemies, so too could "enemy" Indians be friends. Quentin Stockwell, another English captive, remarked that the Pocumtuck Ashpelon, an Indian leader who fought against the English in King Philip's War and was forced to flee New England for New France, was nonetheless "always our great friend," and "a great comfort to the English."[71]

A few days after his capture, Stockwell's captors rendezvoused with a party of Nipmuc who passed on the rumor that "the English had taken Uncas, and all his men and sent them beyond [the] seas." The Indians "were much enraged at this," and when Stockwell denied its truth, Ashpelon angrily declared that "he would no more believe Englishmen."[72] Of course, the English had not killed Uncas, because Uncas, leader of the Mohegan, was one of their closest allies: the epitome of a "friend." That all but defeated enemy Indians still felt a sense of kinship with a Mohegan sachem closely allied to the English in 1677 demonstrates the complicated nature of "friend" and "enemy" identity. It also demonstrates that Indian communities continued to cross and defy the lines which the English drew across and between them.

Christian Indians were both captives and capturers, and Indian soldiers in Massachusetts militias were forced to petition the legal system for the freedom of their relatives. In November of 1676 an Indian woman and her infant child were

---

[70] Mary Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God, Together, With the Faithfullness of His Promises Displayed; being a Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson,* in *So Dreadful a Judgement, So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677,* edited by Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom, Ed., (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1978), 303, 326.
[71] Stockwell, *Captivity and Redemption,* 38, 40.
[72] Stockwell, *Captivity and Redemption,* 42.

thrown in jail in Boston. The woman had already been purchased, but a red band was tied around her arm, stopping the sale. Her husband, John Namesit, was a soldier in the colonial military, but nonetheless Daniel Gookin had to pay for her redemption.[73] In a similar case, Daniel Gookin appealed on behalf of Samuel and Jerimy Hide, two Indian brothers who served in the colonial military under the Indian Captain John Hunter, for the release of their niece being held in prison in Boston. In order to establish the brothers' loyalty, Gookin listed the number of Indians each had taken prisoner: "Sam Hide took at Bridgewater 1 young man; and 5 more women and children at other places" and Jeremy Hide took "two young Squas Beyond Mendon."[74]

Praying Indians proved particularly useful for bringing in captives due to their knowledge of Native landscapes. "Skulking," Jill Lepore argues, "violated every English code of conduct" and implied cowardice, deceit, and unmanliness. It was nonetheless a profoundly useful strategy for New England's enemies.[75] Indigenous knowledge of the New England landscape forced the English colonies to rely on Indian allies with the knowledge and skills necessary to capture Indians inclined "to execute their bloody Insolencies by stealth and skulking in small parties."[76] So long as Indians continued to pose a threat to New England's interests, whether in the heart

---

[73] *Massachusetts Archives,* Vol. 30: 228.
[74] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 221. Other documents which attest to the capture of allied Indians and their attempted redemption include *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 176, and *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 207a and 213, both of which involve Daniel Gookin writing on behalf of William Ahaton, a prominent Christian Indian, attempting to secure the release of family members imprisoned in Boston.
[75] Lepore, *The Name of War,* 113.
[76] At a Council Held in Boston August the thirtieth 1675, (Cambridge, 1675), brs. Quoted in Lepore, *The Name of War,* 113.

of the colonies or in contested borderlands, indigenous knowledge remained crucial to New England's security.

Thus in November of 1676, Daniel Gookin asked Peter Ephraim to round up "as many volunteer Indians (of our freinds) that you can get together, forthwith to march up to Meadfield and from there to move into the woods beyond" to hunt down "some of our Enemies" that "lurk" there. Any prisoners were to be delivered to Boston.[77] The Christian Indians probably initiated this expedition themselves. A few months earlier, Gookin had written to Boston asking permission to allow a group of Christian Indians "who desired mee to wrote these lynes," to go into the woods in search of "our skulking enemies."[78] It is as likely as not that Ephraim's expedition occurred at the behest of Christian Indians looking for the capital, both monetary and otherwise, which could be had by capturing "enemy" Indians. When Ephraim's expedition returned a few weeks later, they had captured a number of men, women, and children, although some of the men later escaped.[79]

The Christian Indians of Ephraim's expedition created a document unique among those recording Indian servants in New England: it is a list of captured Indians and their names. Whereas Christian Indians often had their English names recorded by Colonial officials like Daniel Gookin in order to secure their status as Christians, and their place in Native and English communities, "enemy Indians" were simply enemy Indians, listed as men, women, and children if they were listed as anything at all. And yet the unknown, presumably Christian Indian, author of the list of captives,

---

[77] *Massachusetts Archives,*vol. 30: 233.
[78] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 236a.
[79] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 235.

which Peter Ephraim supplied to Daniel Gookin along with his request to be paid, entered into the colonial archive the Algonquin names of his male captives.

Whether these names meant anything to the English who imprisoned and eventually sold these individuals south to Bermuda or Barbados; whether these names, or their bearers, survived that journey, is impossible to know. But in the moment that this list was created, they probably signified, just like the English names of Indian children which Gookin so carefully recorded, the place these people inhabited in a network of relations which spanned both Christian and non-Christian, allied and enemy Indians:

> 1 Anahamawut : and his squaw
> 2 quoskekoonunnit : and his Squaw
> 3 wuttalukkoobaunun
> 4 Souquard
> 5 Thomas
> 6 Sitonnom
> 7 wawiohton
> another to man no name
> and Six more Squaws
> and three children[80]

Sale to the Caribbean, and the English rhetoric that surrounded it, must have been as mystifying to Indian captives as the above list of names must have been to the colonial official in Boston who received and dutifully archived it. On November 5, 1675, nine Indian women and their six children "great and small" were examined in Boston by the Committee of the General Court, and given the choice of whether or not to accompany their husbands who were being sold into chattel slavery in the Caribbean: "Sara the wife of Great David with one child at her back, david being sent away she is willing to goe with her husband to king charles's Country to the

[80] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 235c. I have done my best to transcribe the names, but it is very difficult to decipher seventeenth century handwriting in a foreign language.

English." The English understood King Charles's Country to be any place in the British Empire, and tacitly, Barbados or Bermuda, but it is impossible to know how Sara understood that phrase. Did she expect to go to England? And when she chose to follow her husband, did Sara have the slightest idea what slavery would entail?

Other Indian women refused: "The Squah or Wife of Will: Hawkins not willing to goe with her husband being an old woman." One woman, also named Sara, perhaps understanding the gravity of being asked to choose between service in the colonies as a servant, or being sent abroad as a slave with her husband, made a statement that seems calculated to attain her freedom. Sara claimed that her husband had run away from her "and gott another squaw." Furthermore, she made a claim to a privileged relationship with the English: "Mr. Elliot knowes her well she saith."[81]

Unfortunately for New England's merchants, England's slave colonies in the Caribbean were not particularly keen on Indian captives. In June of 1676 the legislature of Barbados passed an act "to prevent the bringing of Indian slaves, and as well to send away and transport those already brought to this island from New England and the adjacent colonies, being thought a people of too subtle, bloody and dangerous Inclination to be and remain here," and a similar act was passed in Jamaica.[82] The English were not particularly subtle about the dangers of their Indian captives. In September 1676, Governors Leverett and Winslow included a certificate

---

[81] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 184a.

[82] Quoted in Jerome S. Handler, "The Amerindian Slave Population of Barbados in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Carribean Studies,* vol. 8, no. 4 (1969): 38-64. http://jeromehandler.org/1969/01/the-amerindian-slave-population-in-barbados-in-the-seventeenth-and-early-eighteenth-centuries/ (accessed June 3, 2012), 57. Also, Lepore, *The Name of War,* 168. Barbados passed a similar act in 1688, although by then the focus had shifted from New England Indians to "Spanish" and "Carolina" Indians traded out of Carolina to both New England and the Caribbean.

establishing the legality of enslavement following King Philip's War aboard a ship carrying Indian slaves:

> Whereas many of the said Heathen have of late been captivated . . . and been duly convicted of being actors and Abettors of said Philip with said inhumane and barbarous crueltys, murder, outrages, and vilainies. Wherefore by due and legall procedure the said heathen Malefactors men, women, and Children have been Scentenced and condemned to perpetuall Servitude.[83]

At the same time, it is not hard to imagine why Indian soldiers appeared "temperamentally unsuited to slavery" to plantation owners in the British Caribbean, and in doing so to suggest how New England's Indian captives may have experienced slavery.[84] Native men captured in war would have expected one of two things: to be tortured and killed, or to be tortured and then brought into the community that had captured him as a full member.[85]

To the English, the torture of captives offered definitive proof that the "Salvages" were "perfect children of the Devill."[86] In his 1677 history of King Philip's War, William Hubbard described the torture of a Narragansett captive by the

---

[83] John Leverett to All People, September 12; 1676, mms. bound, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston. Quoted in Lepore, *The Name of War,* 163.

[84] Douglas Leach argues that "North American Indians were temperamentally unsuited to slavery, and lands which had long been receptive to the African slave trade seemed to shun the stolid and intractable captives from New England." Leach, *Flintlock and Tomahawk,* 226. Similarly, Lauber notes that "these slaves did not sell well abroad, for doubtless former experience had proved their race to be unsatisfactory as slaves," Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 127.

[85] A third option existed. Old or infirm captives were "knocked on the head" and killed quickly—a fate which the English captive John Stockwell was repeatedly threatened with after he fell sick from the cold and began to slow down the party of Indians which had captured him. Stockwell, *Captivity and Redemption,* 44.

[86] Mather, *A Brief History,* 116. That the use of torture was a cultural, and not a moral difference, is driven home by the fact that the English did not view torture as wrong, only torture in the context of warfare. Torture in the context of jurisprudence was perfectly acceptable. The Indians were horrified by the English willingness to kill so indiscriminately in battle, and torture may have served as a ritual of "emotional compensation . . . for prescribed restraint in battle." Adam J. Hirsch " The Collision of Military Cultures in Seventeenth-Century New England," *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 74, No. 4 (Mar. 1988): 1187-1212. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1894407 (accessed April 4, 2012), 1192.

Mohegan.[87] The Mohegan began by "making a great Circle," with their captive in the middle. Then they "cut one of his Fingers round in the Joynt . . . then they cut off another and another, till they had dismembered one Hand . . . yet did not the Sufferer ever relent, or shew any Sign of Anguish." As the Mohegan cut off his fingers and toes, the Narragansett captive danced around the circle and sang. When his torturers asked him "how he liked the War?" he answered, "He liked it very well, and found it as sweet, as English Men did their Sugar."[88]

Native captives' fates were decided by the families of those who had lost a relative to war. Some families chose to adopt the captive in the place of the deceased. For these captives torture was a "ritual of initiation, a test of perseverance, and a spiritual journey."[89] Alternatively, the captive would still be adopted, but would then face ritual torture and death. The stoicism and courage which the Narragansett captive demonstrated as his fingers and toes were removed probably brought respect and honor not only on himself, but on the Mohegan family member he ritually replaced.[90]

A Native soldier captured by the English would have been looking for either an honorable death, however painful that might be, or full membership in his new community. With those expectations, an Indian soldier separated from his family and

---

[87] William Hubbard, *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England, from the first planting thereof in the year 1607. to this present year 1677. But chiefly of the late Troubles in the two last years, 1675 and 1676* (1677); reprinted in *The History of the Indians Wars in New England,* edited by Samuel Drake (New York: Burt Franklin, 1865; Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 2002). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=CsNL6T9DGUC (accessed June 4, 2012).
[88] Hubbard, *Narrative,* 63-64.
[89] Lepore, *The Name of War,* 13.
[90] Lepore, *The Name of War,* 13-14; Daniel K. Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 40, No. 4 (1983): 528-559. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1921807 (accessed April 4, 2012), 161-165. Richter's article and most of the sources cited by Lepore are about the Iroquois, however it seems that cultural practices relating to war and captivity were relatively constant throughout the Native Northeast.

sold onto a slave plantation in Barbados or Jamaica would have had little incentive to stay put once it became clear that he would never be accepted into his purchaser's family. Although some Indian captives probably forged new families with African slaves, violent resistance and rebellion would have offered a path towards suffering, which could be born stoically in keeping with Native cultural norms, and a death appropriate to an Algonquin soldier.

By June 1677, when Barbados banned the importation of Indian slaves, New England had been selling Indian captives sporadically since the start of the war. The Barbadian Legislature's fear of "subtle, bloody, and dangerous" Indians was probably not only a response to news of the "atrocities" committed in New England, but also to Indian slaves who "shewed no Sign of Anguish" as they were beaten, who danced and sang as they were whipped, and went looking for the spiritual rewards that accompanied an honorable and ritually-ordered death.

Unable to find purchasers, English captains eventually gave up and abandoned their valueless cargo.[91] In 1683 an English stonemason returned from a voyage abroad and reported to John Eliot that he had met a community of Indian captives, captured during King Philip's War, living free in Tangier, on the coast of Morocco.[92] In this case, the resistance of New England's Indians to captivity and slavery, and the impact Indian resistance had on English lawmakers and merchants, preserved their freedom, although it could not take them home.

---

[91] This worked out fine for Colonial governments, who had already sold the captives, and let the merchants take the loss.
[92] John Eliot to Robert Boyle, 1683, Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, 1st Ser., 3 (1794), 183. Quoted in Lepore, *The Name of War,* 170.

Even when they were shipped abroad as chattel slaves, the Native people of New England were not passive participants in colonial history. By struggling against slavery in ways consistent with their cultures and traditions, Indians shaped their experiences of colonial captivity, and prevented New England's merchants from capitalizing on their bodies. In at least one case, the resistance and persistence of New England's Indians left them struggling to maintain an Indian community in northern Africa, thousands of miles from the English plantations where New England's elites had expected them to disperse and die.

The violent displacement of King Philip's War, followed by the establishment of hegemonic English power in Southern New England, transformed relationships between English settlers and Native people. Interdependent and mutual relationships between English families and their Indian servants and tenants were transformed into inherently unequal financial relationships of servitude or slavery. In Connecticut, the Pequot and Mohegan maintained a considerable degree of autonomy in return for their alliance. In Rhode Island, however, colonial efforts to regulate Indian servitude failed miserably. In the absence of independent Narragansett authority, tenant-landlord relationships established before the war developed into chattel slavery for Indian and African slaves on Rhode Island plantations.

The English divided Indians into "friends" and "enemies," but those categories were not discrete, and they could cut across Indian communities in complex ways. While "enemy" Indians were pushed north or west, or sold into slavery in the Caribbean, Christian Indians were both constrained and monitored, first

on Deer Island, then within closely surveilled praying towns, or as indentured servants in English households. Whereas before the war, Daniel Gookin required the genuine consent of Christian Indians to educate their children in English households, after the war Christian Indians petitioned the government to keep their children in familiar English households, desperate to avoid their sale "out of the country." Nonetheless, Christian Indians leveraged their position as "friend" Indians to maintain their families and communities.

Although the scale of violence and displacement within Native communities after King Philip's War can not be minimized, New England's Indians were not passive participants in the capture and enslavement of Indians. Some Indians, like Captain Amos or the Christian Indians under Peter Ephraim, participated directly in the capture of "enemy" Indians. Others shaped institutions of captivity from the inside, by running away with their indentured children, like Woomsleow of Packachooge, or running away with their entire community, like the praying Indians of Wamesit. Whether they were indentured in English households, enslaved on English farms, fleeing up the Connecticut River Valley to New France, or shipped South to the Caribbean as chattel, the Native people of New England found ways to resist captivity, and in doing so, not only preserved some degree of personal autonomy, but protected and maintained their communities.

Chapter 2

"A Blesseing to her Soule"

Individual Experiences of Slavery and Servitude

On October 3rd, 1679, the young minister Peter Thacher set sail from Boston for Barnstable, on Cape Cod, where he was hoping for a position leading the Puritan Congregation. Below deck on the small ship, his young wife, their eleven month old child Theodora, and their white servant girl Lidea "all took sick," and "I [Thacher] was forced to bee nurse."[1] It was almost certainly a role he was un-accustomed to. What Thacher doesn't mention in his diary that day is the presence of a fifth individual who lived and worked with the Thacher family, but could never truly be a part of it: the Indian slave Margaret.

In *The Common Pot* Lisa Brooks echoes Keith Basso: "I have tried to 'fashion possible worlds, give them expressive shape, and present them for contemplation as images of the past that can deepen and enlarge awareness of the present.'"[2] In that spirit, I am less concerned with the facts of Margaret's life, than I am with its possibilities. By reading between the lines, and looking not only for where Margaret

---

[1] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Manuscript Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston. Oct. 23, 1679. A useful discussion of Thacher's diary is Edward Pierce Hamilton, "The Diary of a Colonial Clergyman Peter Thacher of Milton," in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Third Series, Vol. 71, (Oct. 1953 - May 1957), pp. 50-63.

[2] Brooks, *The Common Pot,* xxv. Following Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Place,* (Albuqurque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996), 32-33. In writing this chapter, I have also been guided by Sandra Lauderdale Graham, who wrote in her study of servant women in nineteenth century Brazil: "In seeking to recover the lives of servant women . . . I want to identify particular women, to give them name whenever possible, and to draw from the detail of lived experience. My approach is to discover the range of possible experiences that could characterize their lives." Sandra Lauderdale Graham, *House and Street: The Domestic World of Servants and Masters in Nineteenth-Century Rio de Janeiro* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988), 7.

appears, but where she doesn't, we can begin to imagine more clearly her place in the Thacher household.

We cannot know for sure that Margaret, who was also known as Peg, was on the ship with the Thacher family that October night, but given the scrupulousness with which Thacher recorded the kinds of logistical plans that would have had Margaret traveling separately, it seems a safe assumption.[3] And we can guess at why Thacher might have felt responsible for inverting his usual household role and "nursing" his child and wife himself. Just two months earlier, Thacher had come home from a "Towne-meeting" in Boston to find that his "Indian girl had like to have knocked my Theodora in head by leting her fall wherefore I took a good walnut stick and beat the Indian to purpose till shee promised never to doe soe any more. After I studyed. . . ."[4] It is possible that this incident led to a permanent reduction in Margaret's child-care duties.[5] And it is impossible not to wonder how Margaret perceived the beating. Did Margaret, who had only been purchased by Peter Thacher three months earlier, feel a real connection with the tiny Theodora? Or did she feel only resentment towards the English baby?

Even within Peter Thacher's diary the resistance of slaves and servants makes itself felt. In October 1679, Thacher noted that his friend Cricke's servants had

---

[3] Although Margaret only appears as "Margaret" at the moment she was sold, and is the rest of the time known as Peg, Pegg, or Pegge, I felt that the more formal name was appropriate. Margaret's last name is lost, having been cut off after the first letter A by damage to the manuscript.

[4] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Aug. 18, 1679.

[5] In the late nineteenth century, the historian Alice Morse Earle made a revealingly racist assessment of this scene: "We frequently glean from diaries of the times hints of the pleasures of having a wild Nipmuck or Narragansett Indian as 'help,'" Earle writes. After recounting the scene, she continues, "Mr. Thatcher was really a very kindly gentleman and good Christian, but the natural solicitude of a young father over his firstborn provoked him to the telling use of the walnut stick as a civilizing influence." Alice Morse Earle, *Customs and Fashions in Old New England* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893), 84.

evidently attempted to burn down their master's house, "by Candles that were set up alight in severall places in the house." The servants refused to confess, and "were clapt up."[6] Was Margaret's inability to cooperate the underlying reason that she did not help nurse Peter Thacher's seasick family? Was she sick as well, but Thacher simply didn't see fit to mention it? Or was Margaret in a different part of the boat altogether? It is clear from Thacher's diary that Margaret lived in the house with his family, and was a member of the household in many ways, and yet the journey to Barnstable is not the only instance in which Margaret's absence in Thacher's text stands out. It is dangerous to write history based on intuition, but nonetheless, reading Peter Thacher's diary, it *feels* as if Margaret is ever-present, yet at the same time almost entirely invisible.

The close physical and emotional proximity of Indian slaves and servants engendered among the English a profound anxiety, which they attempted to allay through particular cultural mechanisms, including what I am calling the "frontier of exclusion." Keen awareness of the cultural and personal differences between English and Indian formed the heart of New England's "frontier of exclusion." The English used these differences to create, police, and perpetuate the distance between themselves and their Native servants and slaves. Most importantly, the "frontier of exclusion" did not run only through New England's borderlands, where French, English, and Native peoples continuously struggled in peace and war to define their

[6] The case of two African slaves accused of arson in September 1681, gives an idea of Cricke's servants potential fate. Jack, "negro servant to mr Samuel woolcot" was accused of "taking a brand of fier from the hearth and swinging it up and doune for to find victualls" and ended up burning down his master's house. At the same court, Marja, "Negro servant to Joshua Lambe" was accused of "taking a Coale from under a doore and still and carried it into another Roome and laid it on floore neere the doore." Jack was hanged, and Marja was burned alive in the same fire as Jack's corpse. John Noble Ed., *Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, 1630-1692,* 2 vols. (Boston: The County of Suffolk, 1901-1904), vol. 1: 198.

place in North American society into the eighteenth century and beyond, but also within English communities "behind the frontier." The intimacy of Indian servants in English households, where they became both insiders and outsiders, privy to the private details of their English families' lives, but inherently suspicious and untrustworthy, made the "frontier of exclusion" a vital necessity to English settler colonialism.

Considering the place of the Native within colonial society underlines the necessity and utility of the frontier of exclusion. English settlers believed that it would be "a blesseing to her soule" for an Indian servant or slave to come into an English household. At the same time, Indians were a source of disorder and danger, and they required careful scrutiny and supervision.[7] Although an English home was the best place to provide this supervision, the persistence of independent Indian communities and identities presented a constant challenge to the ability of English households to contain and order Indian bodies.

Indian slaves and servants challenged the sharp lines of exclusion drawn by the English by maintaining their places in Native social networks and communities and adopting elements of English culture while maintaining elements of Native culture. The English hoped to bring Indian bodies into English homes where they could be supervised, ordered, and safely incorporated into English society, but Indian slaves and servants refused to be confined within English households and insisted on maintaining their identity and autonomy as Indians. By forging connections with English families, other slaves and servants, and free Indians, Indian slaves and

[7] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, May 14, 1679. On the relationship between English conceptions of order and disorder, and houses, see Lepore, *The Name of War,* 82-83, 87-88. On order, households, and Indian presence see Plane, *Colonial Intimacies,* especially 99-100.

servants reconstituted the threat posed by Indian identity within the context of servitude, defying English efforts to incorporate Indians safely into English spaces and to inscribe a frontier of exclusion on colonial society.

Exploring the lived experience of the Indian slave Margaret highlights the tensions created by the frontier of exclusion and illuminates the ways that Indian slaves experienced servitude. Between 1678 and 1695 the Reverend Peter Thacher kept an extremely detailed diary, in which he recorded many details of his and his family's day to day life, as well as spiritual reflections and financial accounts. Thacher had a young wife, and over the course of the diary, a succession of young children, two of whom died in infancy. He also employed a European maid servant, Lidea.

On May 7, 1679, Peter Thatcher noted in his diary: " I bought an Indian of Mrs. [Lydia] Checkley and was to pay five pound a moneth after I received her and five pound more in a Quarter of a year."[8] Although ten pounds was a significant amount of money, and certainly not a sum which Thacher could have paid all at once out of pocket, it nonetheless placed very little value on a lifetime of an Indian woman's labor.[9] Two years later, after landing a prestigious job as the leader of the church in Milton, Massachusetts, Thacher paid twelve pounds in wages to an English boy, Thomas Swift, for a single year's time.[10] And a year later, as Thacher's wealth

[8] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, May 7, 1679.
[9] In fact, Thacher needed to borrow ten pounds from Samuel Sewell in order to make his second payment on Margaret: "I Borrowed ten pound of Mr. Sewall. and payed five pound of it to Mrs. Chickley In part of pay for the Indian maid I bought of her." *Diary of Peter Thacher*, June 12, 1679.
[10] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Aug. 24, 1682.

continued to increase, he paid thirty-nine pounds in two installments for a male African slave named Ebed.[11]

Thacher's diary is not the first time that Margaret enters the colonial record. Lydia Checkley's first husband was Capt. Benjamin Gibbs, who spent much of the last year of his life entwined in the colonial legal system for the charge of "stealing Indians."[12] Gibbs kidnapped Native servants from an English settlement in Rhode Island and tried to pass them off as legitimate captives from King Philip's War.[13] In 1676, shortly before Gibbs died he deeded many of his possessions to his father-in-law, the wealthy landowner Joshua Scottow. His property at the time included "two Negro men called fferdinando and Hector and one Negro woman called fllora with one young Indian called Pegge, and also whereas hee hath two Cows . . ." [14] That Gibbs listed his African and Indian slaves alongside his livestock reflects their dehumanized status and underlines the fact that, in 1676, Indian slavery in New England was chattel slavery.

Benjamin Gibbs probably came into possession of Margaret through his service in King Philip's War. When it came to New England's Native peoples, Benjamin Gibbs had even fewer moral compunctions than the average New Englander of the time, but even so taking an Indian girl as a spoil of war was

---

[11] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Sept. 1, 1682.

[12] Hamilton Andrews Hill and George Frederick Bigelow, *An Historical Catalogue of the Old South Church (Third Church) 1669-1882,* (Boston: Printed for Private Distribution, 1883). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=8kU7dSi6qWUC&vq (accessed April 5, 2012), 220, 236.

[13] It is unlikely that Peg was one of these servants captured from the English, since the courts appear to have ruled against Gibbs and ordered the return of those stolen servants who had not yet been sold, with damages to be paid for those who had. *Suffolk Files,* 1498.

[14] Gibbs's actual will makes no mention of any of this property. "Deed 192: Benjamin Gibbs to Joshua Scottow," in *Suffolk deeds, Volume 11,* edited by Frank Bradish (Boston: Rockwell and Churchill Press, 1900). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=CqE1FME4irMC&pg (accessed April 5, 2012), 336; *Will of Benjamin Gibbs*, Suffolk County Probate Records, New Series, vol. II. Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston. Case No. 956.

considered perfectly normal among the English in New England in 1676. Perhaps Benjamin Gibbs sold Margaret's father or her male siblings south to the Caribbean into a life of chattel slavery—or perhaps he simply killed them. Gibbs may have intended to sell Margaret as well, a common practice in 1676, but not gotten around to it. In that case, the years between the end of King Philip's War and Margaret's sale to Peter Thacher might have seemed like an endless waiting period, and her eventual sale a relief.

Margaret was almost certainly abused and harassed if she was marched across New England with Gibbs's soldiers. In his account of the "Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians" during King Philip's War, Daniel Gookin recounts Benjamin Gibbs's capture of the Christian Indian Joseph Tukapewillin, who was minister to the praying town Hassanemesit and an ally of the English. In March 1676, Tukapewillin escaped from captivity among New England's Nipmuc enemies and was on his way to Boston when he was captured by Gibbs and his soldiers.[15] According to Gookin, Gibbs's men took all of Tukapewillin's goods, including "a pewter cup, that the minister had saved, which he was wont to use at the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, being given him by Mr. Elliot for their use."[16] The captured Indians were abused and harrassed, and Tukapewillin's wife, eldest son, and daughter fled, perhaps straight back to the Nipmuc.[17] Benjamin Gibbs's cruel and mocking attitude towards the Christian Indians surely encompassed the enemy Indians who he captured, and it is hard not to imagine that his time as a soldier hardened him against the humanity of New England's Indians, making him a cruel master.

---

[15] It is not at all clear how involuntary Tukapewillin's "captivity" among the Nipmuc was.
[16] Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 502.
[17] Gookin, *Doings and Sufferings,* 503. This scene is also discussed in Lepore, *The Name of War,* 142.

Given the mobility and autonomy of Native people in New England prior to King Philip's War, we cannot rule out that Margaret had been to Boston before. Still, Gibbs's large English house must have seemed deeply foreign to her, a foreignness probably amplified by the casual hatred, disgust, and fear manifest in the faces of Boston's English residents after two terrifying years of bloody warfare. Benjamin Gibbs only had one child, named Lydia after her mother, and his home had four bedrooms, so it is likely that Margaret was put up in the house. Perhaps she was given the "kitchen chamber," appointed with "one bedsteed completely furnished with curtains vallens feather bed bolster pillow Rugg blankets &c." This would have been a dramatic change from the wigwam she almost certainly grew up in, where she and her family would have lived in close quarters and slept on mats placed on the ground.[18] Nonetheless, the comparatively spacious English house might well have been far too close for comfort. Alternatively, Margaret may have lived somewhere on the grounds of the house with the African slaves Fferdinando and Hector, coming early each morning to do household labor, but returning to her own space at night.

Benjamin Gibbs died sometime in 1676, leaving Lydia Gibbs a widow. By 1679, when Lydia finally sold Benjamin Gibbs's "Indian called Pegge," she had remarried to the prominent Boston merchant Anthony Checkley. About six days after Thacher purchased her, Margaret left the home of Lydia Checkley and came to live with the Thacher family. It is impossible to know why Lydia decided to sell Margaret, but given her wealthy background and wealthy husband, it probably wasn't

[18] Often "two Families will live comfortably and lovingly in a little round house of some fourteen or sixteen foot over, and so more and more families in proportion." Williams, *A Key into the Language of America,* 33. Even after the transition to frame houses, Indian houses often remained smaller than English houses, or maintained central fires with a smoke-hole. Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775,* 138.

about money. It is easy to speculate that Lydia no longer wanted a symbol of her old husband around as she established a new household, and she may have sold Gibbs's house as well when she married Checkley. Perhaps Margaret, not yet resigned to her fate as a slave, acted out against her captor's widow and finally brought Lydia's patience with her to the breaking point.

On May 14, 1679, Peter Thacher wrote in his dairy: "yesterday night Margaret A [torn] Indian servant came to live with [us]. The Lord make her a blesseing to the family and [covered] comeing under my roofe a blesseing to her soule [that] shee may learne to know and fear the Lord her Master and God."[19] This passage reflects the widespread English sentiment that bringing Indian women and children into orderly English households would lead to their conversion to Christianity and assimilation into English society. However, if there is one thing we can say for certain about Margaret's presence and absence in Peter Thacher's diary, it is that, whether due to his own reticence or Margaret's disinterest, Thacher did not actively work to save Margaret's soul.

Thacher's diary is focussed first and foremost on his relationship to God and on his work as a minister. The day that Margaret came to live with his family, Thacher wrote in his diary psalm 94:19: "in the multitude of my thoughts within me, thy comforts delight my soule."[20] Despite the sincere comfort he took in God, Peter Thacher and his family's personal relationship to the Puritan faith was an anxious, troubled one. On September 22, 1679, Thacher's wife "came up to discourse with

---

[19] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, May 14, 1679.
[20] King James Bible (1611 edition). Thacher probably understood this passage as one which reflected tremendous anxiety as well as tremendous comfort.

mee about her spirituall condition and what the meaning of God in all this should be," but, he added, "I understood not."[21]

Thacher had a close relationship to Lidea Chapin, his white servant, and frequently "discoursed" with her about her life and soul. In the winter of 1680, Lidea fell in love with an Englishman named Thomas Huckins, who evidently spurned her for another woman. By February, Lidea "was much over powered with Mallincholly; went into the Cellar and cryed."[22] Lidea confided in Thacher, who tried to comfort her as best he could. Although Lidea, unlike Margaret, was paid regular wages for her service, she was also truly considered a part of the family. On the 25 of November, 1682, four days after he noted his fifth wedding anniversary, Thacher noted as well the day that Lidea Chapin joined their fledgling household: "This day my dear and Lidea chapin and I have kept house together five year."[23]

In this context, it is all but impossible to imagine Margaret and Thacher discussing religious or personal matters, and Thacher not taking pains to record it. If Margaret could not confide in Peter Thacher, who did she confide in? Margaret almost certainly worked closely with Lidea herself, although the evidence does not speak to whether ties of work, class, and gender were enough to overcome their cultural differences. Margaret must have had contact with other Indians who moved within the English community. In February of 1680, "Mr. Hinkley sent his Indian to sweep the Chymnys." That May, Thacher came home to find "an Indian who came

---

[21] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Sept. 22, 1679.
[22] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Feb. 11, 1679. Huckins invited Thacher and his family to his wedding in April of 1680. Lidea's personal and emotional struggles are a running theme in the diary. It seems she was at least occasionally suicidal. In February of 1680, "Lidea was ready to draw up deadly conclusions against herselfe I called her in to the study and laboured to Convince her that it was a temptation &c" Later Lidea would tell Thacher that she was "almost weary of life." *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Feb. 1, 1679; Feb. 11, 1679.
[23] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Nov. 25, 1682.

from mr. Torry with a letter to give mee." Perhaps these Indians, many of whom probably had similar lived experiences to Margaret, were her friends and confidants.

Just as Indian people moved in English spaces, English people such as Peter Thacher continued to enter Native spaces. In 1684, an aging John Eliot encouraged Thacher to make a "Lecture to the Indians once a moneth," probably at the praying town Ponkapoag.[24] Thacher also occasionally moved in Native spaces closer to home. In July of 1682, Thacher "hired an Indian to clear an Acree . . . to make medow of it." Thacher paid this Indian directly for his labor, so he was almost certainly a free man. Furthermore, by the time the job was done that August, "Indian" had become "Indians," as the Indian man Thacher hired shared the labor, and the money, with others from his Native community. These kinds of interactions between Indian and Native worlds rendered the frontier of exclusion all the more necessary.

The fundamental basis of both English ideologies and Indian experiences of slavery and servitude was labor. What kind of work did Margaret do? For Native people in the Northeast, agriculture was primarily women's work. In 1647, Roger Williams wrote that Indian women "set or plant, weede, and hill, and gather and barne all the corne, and Fruits of the field."[25] Historical anthropologist Kathleen Bragdon suggests that Native agricultural practices persisted into the eighteenth century, and that "surviving Native probate records suggest that many aspects of the transplanted English agricultural complex," such as dairying, and the keeping of

---

[24] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, July 8, 1684; Mar. 1, 1682.
[25] Williams, *A Key into the Language of America,* 98.

poultry and swine, were "ignored" even by Christian Indians.[26] Indian women were also responsible for creating and embroidering the woven mats which covered Indian wigwams, constructing and moving wigwams, and "establishing new domestic spaces."[27] Margaret probably participated in agricultural as well as domestic labor before King Philip's War, and Peter Thacher was doubtlessly well aware of Native women's ability to do what the English considered "men's" work—an idea which, along with the parallel characterization of Native men as lazy, underlay common English stereotypes about Indian people.[28]

However, Thacher's desire that Margaret's labor in his home should be "a blessing to her soule" probably limited her to English conceptions of domestic work such as "gardening, cooking, spinning and weaving textiles, sewing clothing, tending milch cows, making butter and cheese," and "caring for children."[29] Peter Thacher's wife kept a garden near the house, which Lidea helped with, and it is likely that Margaret spent time tending to the garden as well.[30] If Margaret was occasionally pressed into more intensive agricultural work, this almost certainly ended in 1682 when Thacher acquired twenty acres of land from the Church in Milton and purchased an African slave, Ebed, to work it. Although Margaret may well have grown up doing agricultural labor, English ideology strictly delineated men's and women's work. English insistence that Indian women work in the home contributed

---

[26] Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775,* 147.
[27] Williams, *A Key into the Language of America,* 32; Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1550-1650,* 114.
[28] Significantly, the English used these stereotypes not only to paint Indian men as lazy, but also to deny Indian rights to the on which land they hunted. Cronon, *Changes in the Land,* 53.
[29] Cronon, *Changes in the Land,* 52, 138.
[30] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, April 7, 1683.

to the intimacy and proximity of Indian servitude which necessitated the frontier of exclusion.

Advertisements for Indian women in colonial Newspapers often described them as "fit for any household work."[31] In 1719 a nineteen year old "Indian maid" owned by James Freeman, a brewer, was advertised as "brought up from a Child to all sorts of Houshold work, can handle her needle very well to Sew or Flower and ingenous about any work."[32] A thirty year old Indian woman was similarly advertised as "fit for all manner of household work either for town or country, can Sew, Wash, Brew, Bake, Spin and Milk Cows."[33] Although essentially just lists of the tasks English and Indian women alike were expected to do in English households, these advertisements nonetheless suggest the kinds of work Margaret would have done. That these women's owners felt the need to spell out basic domestic skills in their advertisements signified continuing doubts and anxieties about Indian slaves and servants' ability to suffer English labor in general.

One thing Margaret did not do was participate in the colonial economy—at least not with Peter Thacher's knowledge. Thacher kept a fairly studious account of his expenditures, and his diary doubled as an account book. The only expenditure directly relating to Margaret, besides her purchase, was for a pair of shoes.[34] Lidea, by comparison, was not only paid, but also occasionally went into Boston to purchase goods, or sell things on behalf of the family. Lidea sold butter, mint water, oile of mint, and other herbs grown in the garden, which were probably processed with

---

[31] *Boston News-Letter* (Boston: B. Green, 1704-1726), Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston. June 27-July 4 1715; Oct. 1-8 1716.
[32] *Boston News-Letter*, June 1-8 1719.
[33] *Boston News-Letter*, Dec 2 1719 - Jan. 4 1720.
[34] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Oct. 29, 1681.

Margaret's help.[35] The English tried to temper anxiety about Indian presence in English households by restricting their participation in outside economies; Thacher's refusal to trust Margaret with money is a concrete example of the frontier of exclusion.

Despite the frontier of exclusion and the English anxieties it signified, Indian patterns of labor and Native skills almost certainly survived in English households, both for their usefulness to the English, and because Indian servants like Margaret found ways to create continuity in their lives. The evidence on the subject is thin, but there are examples. In March 1686, Mathew Boomer was accused of "breaking the Sabbath by sufering his Indian servants to hunt on the Saboth day."[36] These male Indian servants, who were probably acquired at the end of King Philip's War a decade earlier, must have found in hunting a way of both creating distance between themselves and their English household, and a way in which distinctly indigenous skills proved useful to their master.

On June 12, 1679, some of Peter Thacher's friends were over for dinner, and they "supped upon an Indian pudding."[37] This was probably an anglicized variant of the dish which the Narragansett called Nasaump, and which Roger Williams described as "the Indian corne, beaten and boild, and eaten hot or cold with milke or butter, which are mercies beyond the Natives plaine water, and which is a dish exceedingly wholesome for the English bodies."[38] Perhaps Margaret cooked this dish herself, serving "Indian" food to her English master. Or perhaps, eating the leftovers

---

[35] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, May 12, 1683; Aug. 20, 1681.
[36] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 6: 178.
[37] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, July 25, 1679.
[38] Williams, *A Key into the Language of America,* 11-12.

in the kitchen that night, she wondered how the English could possibly call such a dish "Indian."

Illness and death were constant specters hanging over the Thacher household. One evening, while praying, Lidea collapsed into a series of convulsions, "her teeth . . . set her lips Cold and as if shee was dead." Thacher called a doctor, and "the Doctor and I were forced to set up with her all night. at Breack of day went to bed."[39] Thacher's wife was terrified of thunder: "7 March 81 we had a smart clap of thunder that set my dear into trembling and she vomitted and was very sick."[40] And in August of 1680, Thacher's three month old child "finished its Course, the Lord sanctify the blow to mee and my dear and grant supporting grace."[41] When Thacher himself fell deathly ill in the summer of 1683 Ebed, perhaps seeing Thacher's illness as an opportunity, ran away. He was found "in a path that would not lead him to any towne, that had hee not been taken . . . hee had perished." Thacher may have under-estimated the knowledge which Ebed had gained about the New England landscape from the Indians and Africans with whom he interacted, if only in the course of his agricultural work, but in any case Ebed "was taken up" and returned home.[42]

Margaret bore witness to all of this. Alongside cooking, gardening, laundry, and other basic domestic labor, caring for the family's children, and frequently for Peter Thacher's sickly wife as well, must have remained one of Margaret's central tasks, despite the lack of trust which Thacher put in her after she dropped the baby Theodora. On August 24, 1682, Peter Thacher was at a church meeting when his

---

[39] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Mar. 23, 1679.
[40] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Mar. 7, 1681.
[41] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Aug. 13, 1680.
[42] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, June 20, 1683.

infant son Oxenbridge fell sick. Margaret came to the meeting "and told mee Oxenbridge was almost choakt. soe I came home and hee was a sleep but I have him some salley oile and it went downe I desire to acknowledge gods great goodness in sparing of him."[43] Of course, Margaret herself fell sick at times as well. "Her cold increased" in January of 1682. And in August of 1684 "Peg . . . had the feaver and ague."[44] It is as easy to imagine that these bouts of illness highlighted the distance between Margaret and her English "family" as it is to imagine illness binding them closer together. Most likely illness did both, reinforcing the interdependence of each member of the household, while emphasizing the boundaries between them.

In *Black Yankees: The Development of an Afro-American Subculture in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts,* William Pierson argues that:

> the emotional attachments within Yankee families between white and black were a complex and contradictory fabric, interweaving formal expectations of social roles with coarser strands of racial prejudice and finer threads of human affection. Many slave owners felt real love for their bondspeople; and many slaves returned this emotion.[45]

Over time, the close proximity of family slavery could begin to bridge the psychological and cultural divides between Indian slaves and their English families. Pierson notes that African slaves offered freedom in their old age often refused it, citing the common Afro-American proverb "massa eat the meat; he now pick the bone."[46] Despite Margaret's invisibility within the Thacher household, particularly in comparison to the white servant Lidea, we can not discount that Margaret felt very real ties of love and affection for Thacher's family.

---

[43] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Aug. 23, 1682
[44] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, Jan. 24, 1682; Aug. 15, 1684.
[45] Pierson, *Black Yankees: The Development of an Afro-American Subculture in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 32.
[46] Pierson, *Black Yankees,* 34.

In the end, Margaret remained both Indian and English; her ties to her English family and community were very much real, but so were her continuing ties to an Indian community. On July 20, 1707, thirty-one years after Margaret first appeared in the colonial record as the slave of Benjamin Gibbs, Peter Thacher recorded in the official records of his Church in Milton that "Peg my Indian servant, (tho now a free woman), was admitted into full com'union with this Chh."[47] Thacher's wording implies that Margaret continued to work in his household as a free woman, although it is equally possible that Thacher simply continued to identify Margaret first and foremost as his servant, despite her freedom. Either way, in the summer of 1707, Margaret stood before the Milton congregation and delivered a narrative of her conversion, explaining how she had received God's grace, and entered into God's covenant.[48] Margaret's admittance to full communion in the Church suggests not only that she embraced Christianity, but that she was accepted into Milton's English community as something of an equal.

Less than five months later, Margaret exercised her newfound freedom by reaffirming her ties to an Indian community and identity. On December 3, "John Natiant was married to Peggee, that for many years was my servant and I gave her her

---

[47] Thacher, Peter, Taylor, John, and Robbins, Nathaniel, "Milton (Mass) Church Records, 1678-1754," edited by William Blake Trask, in *Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. 22*, (Boston: New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 1868). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=eyocy7cBriYC (accessed April 3, 2012). Thacher's diary trails off beginning in 1684, and the last entry is November 14, 1690, as a Small Pox epidemic raged through Milton. Because of this, it is impossible to know how Margaret's position in the household might have changed between 1685 and 1707. A third volume existed into the nineteenth century but is lost. Hamilton, "Diary of a Colonial Clergyman," 52.

[48] Delivering a conversion narrative was the final step in the process of coming into full membership in a Puritan congregation. Because Margaret was a woman, she may have delivered her Conversion Narrative privately to the Reverend Thacher, rather than publicly before the congregation. Laura Arnold Leibman, in the introduction to Experience Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* (1727) edited by Laura Arnold Leibman (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008), 23.

time."[49] John Natiant was almost certainly an Indian man, and Natiant is probably a variant spelling of Natahant.[50] In 1652 an Indian named Natahant signed a deed to land in Weymouth, Massachusetts, about ten miles from Milton, and John Natahant or Natiant was probably from the same Native family. The deed set aside twenty-four acres on the outskirts of Weymouth "which the said Natahant is content to take for himselfe and the Rest of the Indians."[51] After serving in the Thacher household for nearly thirty years, Margaret probably moved to this land with her husband, and joined Weymouth's Indian community.

Margaret's life demonstrates that the cultural and psychological barriers which kept English families and their Indian servants distinct, despite their physical proximity, were not absolute. Christianity, the English language, and shared family experiences could bring Indian servants and slaves into English communities. Peter Thacher probably viewed the day that Margaret came into full communion with his church as the final culmination of his prayer that "The Lord make . . . comeing under my roofe a blesseing to her soule."[52] Margaret may also have come to see her service

---

[49] Thacher, Peter, "Rev. Peter Thacher's Record of Marriages at Milton, Mass." in *Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. 36*, (Boston: New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 1882). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=WitTGc7aszEC (accessed April 3, 2012), 304.

[50] The lines drawn by the English between Indian and English bodies were reinforced by a powerful cultural prohibition against Indian and English intermarriage—a prohibition which effectively forced Indian slaves and servants to construct families outside of the English home. In *Sex and the Eighteenth Century Man,* Thomas Foster argues that even allegations of interracial sexual activity were slanderous and insulting. For example, the Plymouth County court awarded an Englishman twenty five pounds from an Indian woman "for saying 'publicly' that he had offered her a 'yard of Cloath, if She would Consent that he Might lay with her.'" Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 6: 144, in Thomas A. Foster, *Sex and the Eighteenth Century Man: Massachusetts and the History of Sexuality in America,* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2006), 141.

[51] "An Agreement between the Inhabitants of Wamouth concerning there Land sold now to the Towne off Wamouth" (1642, addendums 1652, 1685) in *Historical Sketch of the Town of Weymouth, Massachusetts, from 1622-1884* compiled by Gilbert Nash (Weymouth MA: Weymouth Historical Society, 1885). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=lJJuAAAAMAAJ (accessed April 3, 2012), 252-253.

[52] *Diary of Peter Thacher*, May 14, 1679.

in the Thacher household as a "blesseing to her soule," but nonetheless she maintained her ties to an Indian community, and married an Indian husband.

In moments of crisis, Indian servants in English households could sometimes rely on the safety net of a Native community to which they could escape or return. Such was the case one Saturday morning in the winter of 1678, when Maria, a pregnant "Spanish Indian" servant to Stephen French in Weymouth, Massachusetts, left her English household at the onset of labor and went to a nearby Indian wigwam. The wigwam was home to an Indian named Charles and his wife, and it was the center of a loosely-knit Native community. Maria had been sick for several weeks, and a local English midwife Ebette Hunt testified that:

> I being often at Stephen French his house I saw the said French's Indian woman have severall swooning fits and that she had a violent distemper at her navell which was a running issue of water and blood in a great measure which was very loathsome and I did judge that it was not likely that she would bere or bring forth a living child for that which should have been a nourishment to the child issued forth at her navell.[53]

Maria did not sneak off unannounced, telling Stephen French's wife Hannah that "she would go to the Indians wigwam, notwithstanding I [Hannah] used all means I could to persuade her to the Contrary, I could not prevent her going: my husband being not at home."[54] Without her husband's authority (and perhaps his physical strength as well), Hannah had no way of preventing Maria from leaving. And knowing that she was about to lose her child, Maria clearly had no intention of staying.

That Monday "Charles the Indian" came to the French household, and said "that he much sory yor Squa lost her piganiny [baby] yesterday a little before sunsett:

---

[53] Testimony of Ebette Hunt. *Suffolk Files,* 1689.
[54] Testimony of Hannah French. *Suffolk Files,* 1689.

And she no tell me till this morning when shee told my wife."[55] Maria was after more than just companionship from Charles's Indian community, she was also after privacy—something which Hannah French and her English midwife Ebbet could not and would not give her. For the English community, and the government of Massachusett's Bay, Maria's failed pregnancy was state business; it required scrutiny and investigation. In asserting control over indigenous reproduction, the colonial government of Massachusetts attempted to establish its sovereignty over Native subjects and Native households, whose disorder and inscrutability directly threatened the colonial order.[56]

From Charles's Wigwam, Maria went alone to a nearby field. When Charles asked Maria why she didn't tell Charles and his wife that she had lost her child until morning, Maria answered "great many Indians me much shamed." And when Charles and his wife went looking for the "pickaninny," they found only "something all rotten," which Charles's wife showed him, saying "me thinke English women call Bagg."[57]

The English community deeply distrusted the Indian community that had assembled itself around Charles and his wife's wigwam, and rumors that Maria murdered her child circulated rapidly. The Englishman John Vining seems to have played a central role in spreading these rumors, telling the forty-nine year old Englishman Thomas Deake, an individual respected by both Indian and English

---

[55] Testimony of Hannah French. *Suffolk Files,* 1689.
[56] The colonial government's desire to closely regulate the sexuality and reproduction of Indian subjects is directly tied to the assertion of colonial sovereignty, and what Lorenzo Veracini sees as "recurrent settler anxieties pertaining to the need to biopolitically manage their respective *domestic* domains" and demonstrate "their capacity to manage the population economy of a settler locale." Veracini, *Settler Colonialism,* 16.
[57] Testimony of Hannah French. *Suffolk Files,* 1689.

communities, "that he saw an Indian diging a hole as he thought to bury the child."[58] After his visit to Stephen French's house, Charles brought the same news he had given Hannah French to Thomas Deake, and Deake, Charles, and Vining went searching for evidence of infanticide. John Vining's story quickly fell apart as the English and Indian men arrived at the spot where Vining claimed to have seen an Indian digging, "about thirty rods ffrom the place where the wigwam stood." The ground turned out to be "not broak at all but was full of briars only." Charles explained that a shallow hole nearby was where "Thom Perridge Daughter had broke it for ground nuts."[59]

With Vining now on the defensive, Deake "examined him what Indian it was that was digging," and Vining answered uncertainly that "he thought it was a tinker, to which Charles made answer that he [the tinker] was not there at that time." Although Vining's story had fallen apart, Deake was still not satisfied, and so he returned to the Wigwam with Charles, and "examined the Indians as many as I could, that I can understand did belong to the wigwam at that time and they do all affirme to me that they see no childe."[60] In *Colonial Intimacies: Indian Marriage in Early New England,* Ann Marie Plane discusses Maria's case, and argues that Deake's vagueness "suggests a loosely assembled group of individuals, perhaps pretty much anyone of Native descent who had reason to stop for a while in Weymouth." The "disorder" of this community was "contained" by "the vigorous 'investigations' and 'examinations'

[58] Testimony of Thomas Deake. *Suffolk Files,* 1689.
[59] Testimony of Thomas Deake. *Suffolk Files*, 1689.
[60] Testimony of Thomas Deake. *Suffolk Files,* 1689.

of English magistrates and Goodwives."[61] To the English, Indian communities were in many ways inscrutable, and this made them if not overtly threatening, at least deeply worrisome.

The next morning, Tuesday, a couple of English goodwives from Weymouth engaged in their own investigation. John Vining had given Sarah Pratt a considerably more dramatic version of his story. Putting together his own apparent sighting of an Indian digging suspiciously with other rumors circulating among the English, Vining concluded that "there was a child born at the Indian wigwam and that it was thrown out to the hogges and they had eat some of it and the child Lay by the wigwam Dore." Hearing this story, Sarah Pratt "went and told goody whitmarsh and shee and I went forthwith to the wigwam."[62]

Compared to the male investigation lead by Deake and Vining, Sarah Pratt and Hanah Whitmarsh were considerably more successful, probably in large part because of their gender, and their willingness to communicate directly with Indian women. When they arrived at the Wigwam, the English women found "Stephen French his Indian Woman [Maria] and Charles Squa," who had considerably more knowledge of the matter than Charles, and asked them "where they child was." Charles's wife answered that "they could not tell ffor they ne see no Child," and then, while Maria stayed behind at the Wigwam, the two English women and Charles's Indian wife "went out to looke for the child and wee search all about that feild where the wigwam was."[63]

---

[61] Plane, *Colonial Intimacies,* 98. Planes discusses Marea's story at length, and her account has generally influenced and enriched my own argument.
[62] Testimony of Sarah Pratt. *Suffolk Files*, 1689.
[63] Testimony of Sarah Pratt. *Suffolk Files*, 1689.

Charles's wife knew where Maria had given birth, having found what "the English women call Bagg" the day before, nonetheless she let the two Englishwomen search the field for themselves, and when they "could find no child," then Charles's wife showed them "something which shee said came from the woman which wee did judge to be most like an after birth." John Vining, whose distrust of the Indians clearly ran deep, stuck with his story, claiming to Hanah Whitmarsh on Tuesday afternoon, after both the men's and women's investigations had come up empty-handed, that nonetheless they had been looking in the wrong place, and that "it was without the hedge and the Indian was going to bury it."[64] It is clear from the depositions of Hannah French, Sarah Pratt, and Hanah Whitmarsh that gender in some ways cut across Indian and English communities. Although the Englishmen of Weymouth centered their investigation around questioning Charles, it is clear from Charles's own account of events that his wife was the one who actually spoke with Maria and understood what had happened. When English men visited the wigwam, they were greeted by Indian men, and when English women visited the wigwam, they were greeted by Indian women.

Maria's story reveals a great deal about the ways in which Indian and English communities overlapped. The Indian community that centered itself around Charles's wigwam was not part of a reservation, and did not have the same formal claim to sovereignty and autonomy as, for example, the Mohegan or Pequot communities, or even a praying town such as Natick. Nonetheless, Charles's wigwam operated largely outside of English society. We know that Maria was ashamed of her situation,

[64] Testimony of Hanah Whitmarsh. *Suffolk Files,* 1689.

and that she left the Wigwam and gave birth in a field because of the "great many Indians" who were staying there.[65] Surely rumors and stories were circulating among the Indians about her situation, but Thomas Deake's investigation was greeted by all of the Indians he spoke to except for Charles himself with silence and denial.

Charles, meanwhile, essentially controlled the dissemination of information about his community to the English. He moved into English space to explain what had happened on his own terms, and then joined the Englishmen's investigation, diffusing and disproving their anxious claims about infanticide. Maria was able to find privacy and respect in the Native community that she could not get in her English home. She was allowed to stay at Charles's wigwam as long as she wished, and Charles and his wife consistently managed to avoid directly involving Maria in the investigation. Maria herself was evidently never questioned in her own investigation, except by Charles's Indian wife, and she stayed in the wigwam while the leaders of her Indian community fended off English claims to her body and her intimate knowledge.

A curious absence in the record of Maria's trial for infanticide is the child's father—the English were not explicitly concerned that Maria was not married. Maria's sexual independence speaks to the extent to which Indian slaves and servants, despite living in English households, maintained personal lives beyond the scrutiny of their English owners.[66] It is probable that Maria's lover was Indian, although he could have been African, and that he too frequented Charles's wigwam.

---

[65] Testimony of Hannah French. *Suffolk Files*, 1689.

[66] In a very different context, Sandra Lauderdale Graham argues that servants in nineteenth century Rio de Janeiro conducted private, independent lives apart from their masters, despite tremendous barriers

Maria was a "Spanish Indian," probably captured in Spanish Florida or the Spanish West Indies, and Charles and Maria could not have had much more in common culturally than Maria and Hannah French. However, their shared Indian identity, imposed from above by the English, put Charles and Maria in a position of mutual support and dependence. Whatever nations Charles and his wife were born into, and whatever indigenous languages they or their parents had once spoken, in taking Maria into their community, they responded to an Indian identity which cut across the cultural lines between "Spanish Indian" and Massachusett or Wampanaog. Charles's wigwam was a refuge in the eyes of its transient and permanent Indian inhabitants, but it was the embodiment of disorder in the eyes of the English. Maria's mobility within English and Indian communities posed a major threat to English control over Native communities and Native bodies.

The English tried to separate individual Indian slaves and servants from their Native communities, while at the same time enforcing the separation between Indian and English bodies and identities, a contradictory project which was designed to engender the erasure of Indian people from the landscape by rendering them neither Indian, nor English, nor mixed—colonial nobodies. Indian slaves and servants defied these barriers, and in doing so engineered the survival of their communities. They brought their *Indianness* into English households, while at the same time maintaining Indian communities in spite of slavery.

---

of time and money which worked to keep them in their Masters' homes, their lives scrutable in the eyes of their masters. Graham, *House and Street,* 60.

Slavery severed Margaret's ties to her Native family and the community into which she was born and brought her into an English community. Margaret was a Puritan, but the racial lines imposed by the English between Indian and English bodies formed a "frontier of exclusion" which meant that she could never be an English woman, nor marry an English man. Although it might seem self-evident that an Indian woman could not simply become an English woman, in fact it is only under a racialized logic that complete Indian assimilation is impossible—there is nothing inherent about Indian and English identities that renders them discrete, mutually exclusive, or immutable. Margaret found independence and freedom through a combination of assimilation into the Christian faith, and marriage into an Indian community.

As a "Spanish Indian," Maria was also completely severed from her family, her Native land, and her society. However, the "Indian" identity which the English imposed on her led Maria to join a new kind of Indian community, a community which operated away from the scrutiny of the English. In a moment of crisis, Maria was able to maintain her control over her own reproduction—and her dignity.

In both cases, the experience of slavery reshaped existing communities and generated new ways of being Indian in New England. In the eighteenth century, the ability of Indian slaves and servants to recreate and maintain Native communities would contribute to the shift away from chattel slavery and give rise to new forms of Native servitude.

Chapter 3

"To Prevent Indians and Negros being Rated with Horses and Hogs"

The Shift from Slavery to Indenture in the Early Eighteenth Century

On April 24, 1704, North America's first continuously published newspaper, the *Boston News-Letter*, printed its first issue. About a month later the *Boston News-Letter* printed its first slave advertisement: "Two Negro men, and one Negro woman and Child to be sold by Mr. John Colman, Merchant; to be seen at Col. Charles Hobbey, Esq. his House in Boston."[1] Over the next twelve years the *Boston News-Letter* printed 272 advertisements for the sale of roughly 411 individual African or Indian men and women.[2] Of these, 227 advertisements were for "Negro" slaves, and 45 advertisements, or about 16.5 percent, were for Indians.[3] Of the 54 Indian men, women, and children who were sold through the *Boston News-Letter* in this period, 33 were "Indians," which is to say probably New England Indians, 17 were "Carolina Indians," 3 were "Spanish Indians," and 1 was a "Surrinam Indian." Although roughly 60 percent of African slaves advertised were men, Indian slaves were about equally divided between men and women.[4]

Taken together, these advertisements demonstrate the existence of a significant slave trade in Boston. Boston had no central slave market, and merchants sold slaves out of the homes or through the Post Office, where the *Boston News-*

---

[1] *Boston News-Letter*, May 29 - June 5, 1704.

[2] I counted advertisements beginning with the first issue of the *Boston News-Letter* on April 24, 1704, and ending with the issue released December 24, 1716. Most advertisements were reprinted in multiple issues, however I counted each advertisement only once.

[3] This number includes the single advertisement for a "mulatto."

[4] For African slaves, there were 215 men, 135 women, and 10 children whose gender was not specified. For Indian slaves, there were 28 men, 25 women, and 1 child whose gender was not specified.

Letter was printed. In the early eighteenth century the New England slave trade grew in response to labor shortages caused by constant border conflicts with the French and their Indian allies, and epidemics—in 1721 a small pox epidemic in Boston killed nearly one in twelve Bostonians, and possibly as much as a third of the town's enslaved workforce.[5]

Although Africans formed the heart of the slave trade in Boston, Indians constituted a small but significant number of advertised slaves, and at the dawn of the eighteenth century Indians in New England were routinely sold as chattel.[6] However, the threat posed by Indian resistance to slavery, and the anxiety which the relationship between free Indian communities and Indian slaves inspired in English colonists, ultimately led to the failure of English efforts to enslave Native people, and the institution of new ways to capture Indian labor through debt peonage, judicial slavery, and indenture.

Advertisements for run-away slaves in the *Boston News-Letter* complicate the story told by for-sale advertisements. Between April 1704, and October 1719, 53 advertisements were printed in the *Boston News-Letter* for Indian and African runaway slaves or servants, advertising 77 escapees.[7] Of these 77 individuals, 29 were "Negro," 8 were "mulatto," and 40 were Indian, of which 22 were from New

---

[5] Desrochers, "Slave-for-Sale Advertisements," 643.

[6] Robert Desrochers's excellent article, "Slave-for-Sale Advertisements and Slavery in Massachusetts, 1704-1781," documents the vitality of New England slavery in the mid seventeenth century. On Indian slavery, Desrochers argues that "though Indians continued to be held in thrall by white New Englanders throughout the I700s, especially as indentured servants and especially in Connecticut . . . Nevertheless, only 6 masters offered for sale slaves identified as "Indians," and all but one did so between 1721 and I729." The latter statement is odd given the number of for sale ads for Indians in the newspapers Desrochers examined. Desrochers, "Slave-for-Sale Advertisements," 642-643, note 29.

[7] Sixty-six advertisements were printed for white servants or apprentices, who faced considerably better odds than Africans of disappearing into free society. White servants, who were never enslaved for life, would none-the-less face considerable added time if they were caught and returned.

England, 10 were "Carolina Indians," 7 were "Spanish Indians," and 1 was a "Surrinam Indian."[8] Thus, although Indians made up only 13 percent of the slaves advertised for sale between 1704 and 1717, they constituted a significantly larger portion of advertisements for run-away slaves in about the same period: about 52 percent.

The most important reason that Indians were more likely than Africans to run away from their masters was the continuing existence of free Indian communities, networks of kin relations and landholdings, and the persistence of Indian culture. If Maria, the Spanish Indian slave discussed in the previous chapter, had decided to run away, she would have had a place to start: a wigwam with sympathetic friends near her master's community, but largely outside of English supervision. Maria would also have had someplace to go. As transient Indians like the "tinker" who John Vining thought he saw bury Maria's child, but who Charles claimed was away from the community, moved between Indian places, they offered knowledge of New England's landscape, of near and distant Indian communities, of paths to freedom.[9]

Recognition of Indian mobility and knowledge is sometimes embedded in escaped slave advertisements. For example, in the beginning of September 1706, "A short thick Indian Girl, named Grace, aged about 17 years," ran away from "her Master Nichalas Jamain of New-York Merchant."[10] Jamain described Grace's physical appearance: "her face is full of Pock holes, very few hairs on her Eye-brows,

---

[8] In colonial New England the term "mulatto" frequently referred to Afro-Indians, although it could apply to any mixed-race individual.
[9] For an overview of New England's little-studied transient Indian population, and the networks and trails which connected Indian communities, see Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775,* 199-216.
[10] *Boston News-Letter*, Jan. 13-20, 1707.

a very flat nose, and a broad mouth," but he also noted her cultural abilities. By the age of seventeen, she could speak "English, Dutch, and French, the last best." Grace had already been missing over three months when Jamain placed his advertisement in the *Boston News-Letter*, and he had no doubts about her potential mobility. "If taken up in the Provinces of Massachusetts Bay and New Hampshire," deliver her "unto Mr. Andrew Faneuil of Boston," if in "Connecticut Colony, to mr. John Clark at Saybrook; If at Rhode-Island Colony, to Mr. William Barbutt; In Pennsylvania to Mr. Benj Godfrey; in Carolina to Messieurs Guerard and Pacquerau; if in the Province of New York at Albany to Col. Peter Schuyler."[11] As a merchant, Nicholas Jamain had a considerable web of contacts throughout North America, and Jamain recognized that a determined Indian woman with three languages under her belt might have an equally broad range of contacts and mobility.

There is a second explanation for the prominence of Indians among run-away slave advertisements as compared to for-sale advertisements. A highly visible and heavily scrutinized source such as the *Boston News-Letter* probably failed to capture the full scale of Indian slavery in New England. Beginning in the early eighteenth century, the importation of Indian slaves was outlawed in much of New England. On August 23, 1712, the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed an act forbidding the importation of "any Indian, male or female, by land or sea from any part or place whatever, to be disposed of, sold, or left within the Province."[12] Three years later Connecticut passed a similar law, explaining that Indians and other slaves, "being of a malitious and revengeful spirit, rude and insolent in their behaviour, and very

---

[11] *Boston News-Letter*, Jan. 13-20, 1707.
[12] *The Acts and Resolves, public and private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay*, 17 vols. Boston, 1869-1910, vol. 1: 698. Cited in Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 188.

ungovernable," had lately committed "divers conspiracies, outrages, barbarities, murders, burglaries, thefts, and other notorious crimes." New England, Connecticut claimed, had very "different circumstances" compared to the "plantations in the islands," and given the continuing presence of "Indian natives of the country within and about us," imported Carolina and Spanish Indians posed a serious threat.[13]

Laws barring the importation of Indian slaves probably had the effect of limiting the visibility of Indian slavery, driving the trade underground, and limiting the willingness of slave owners to advertise in newspapers.[14] However, these laws were not particularly well enforced or effective, and within a month of the act's passage in Massachusetts an advertisement was placed in the *Boston News-Letter* selling a "Carolina Indian woman" in Boston.[15] Connecticut affirmed the failure of its 1715 act to prevent trade in Indian slaves when it passed a similarly worded law thirty-five years later.[16] However, the laws demonstrate the inability (or perceived inability) of the New England colonies to assimilate foreign Indian slaves into colonial society. Furthermore, Indian slaves had the potential to incite or contaminate Indian and African slave populations, by linking slave communities to the free Indian communities "within and about us," which maintained a degree of autonomy and sovereignty in New England.

For-sale advertisements placed in the *Boston News-Letter* for Indian slaves clearly demonstrate that in the early eighteenth century Indians, like Africans, were

---

[13] J. Hammond Trumbull and Charles Jeremy Hoadley, eds., *Records of the Colony of Connecticut, 1689-1776,* 15 vols. (Hartford: Press of Case, Lockwood and Brainard, 1850-1890), vol. 5: 534.
[14] In *The Indian Slave Trade,* Alan Gallay argues that, in the trade between Carolina and Virginia, Carolina Indians "arrived in small coastal vessels," whereas "Africans were imported in large ships." This distinction may have held moving north as well, further limiting the visibility of the Indian slave trade in the colonial record. Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade,* 306.
[15] *Boston News-Letter*, Sept. 22 - 29, 1712.
[16] Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 190.

chattel. There is not a single advertisement in the *Boston News-Letter* for a white individual, whether Irish, English, or any other nationality, which does not specify their remaining term of service. Between 1704 and 1717, twenty-nine advertisements were placed in the *Boston News-Letter* selling white servants' time. A white maid might be "disposed of for Four Years," or a "British Servant Man . . . very industrious, fit for an farming or any other business" might find "his Time for about 6 years" sold.[17] White servants' "time" could be sold, but not their bodies.

In contrast, Indians were sold alongside Africans as slaves, without term limits. Indian women and their infant children were often sold together, revealing the assumption that Indian children would follow their mothers into slavery.[18] Furthermore, Indian slaves were assessed as property for the purpose of taxation. Beginning in 1696 Negro, Mulatto, and Indian servants were rated as "other personal estate" in Massachusetts.[19] For example, the 1711 inventory of the Estate of Moses Gerrish, of Newbury Massachusetts, lists "Barley, Indian corn, and oats," 10 pounds, followed by "An Indian slave," 20 pounds. Another inventory from the same year lists "Fifteen sheep, old and young," followed by "An old gun," and "An old negroe man."[20] Slaves who could not work, such as young children or those "disabled by infirmity," were exempt from taxation, as were servants who had set terms of

---

[17] The examples quoted are from the *Boston News-Letter*, Aug. 20-27, 1716; Dec. 3 - 10, 1716.
[18] For examples, see *Boston News-Letter*, April 22 - 29, 1706; Oct 18 - 25, 1708; Jan 5 - 21, 1719. Margaret Newell notes that evidence of heritable slave status in New England is also sometimes found in wills. For example Daniel Coggeshall of Rhode Island left "'my Indian woman and her suckling child Jeffrey' to his wife and children 'during the term of their natural lives.'" Jane Fletcher Fiske, *Gleanings from Newport Court Files, 1659-1783* (Boxford MA, 1999) quoted in Newell, "Indian Slavery in Colonial New England," 58.
[19] *The Acts and Resolves, public and private, of the Province of the Massachusetts Bay*, 17 vols. Boston, 1869-1910, vol. 1: 698. Cited in Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 230.
[20] Joshua Coffin and Joseph Bartlett, *A Sketch of the History of Newbury, Newburyport, and West Newbury, from 1635 to 1845* (Boston: S.G. Drake, 1845). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=FHZoBM9HefUC&dq (accessed April 5, 2012), 188.

service.[21] Whereas Africans were seen as inherently slaves-for-life, and white servants had inherent limits on their service, Indian servants were defined as property or people for the purposes of taxation based not on their race, but on whether or not they had set terms of service.

Indian slavery had its roots in the sale of Enemy Indians into "perpetual slavery" after King Philip's War, and not all Indian bodies were equally salable. Christian Indians were to be released at age twenty-four, and prominent voices, including John Eliot, Daniel Gookin, and the Rhode Island Legislature, attempted to prevent Indians from being sold as chattel. In the early eighteenth century a minority of English leaders continued to speak out against Indian slavery. In 1716 Samuel Sewell, a noted opponent of slavery, proposed to the government of Massachusetts that slaves be assessed as persons for tax purposes, "to prevent Indians and Negros being Rated with Horses and Hogs," but the measure failed to garner support.[22] In 1725 Massachusetts forbid the "carrying of any Indian out of the province except by legal authority, or on condition of giving £100 security for the safe return of such Indian," dealing a blow to the trade in Indian slaves.[23] And in March of 1720 a novelty appeared in the *Boston News-Letter* for the first time: an advertisement for an Indian servant's time. Mr. Richard Pullman of Boston offered "a very likely Indian woman's time for Eleven Years and Five months to be disposed of . . . she's a very good servant and can do any Household work."[24]

---

[21] Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 231.
[22] Sewell, Samuel, *Diary of Samuel Sewell, 1674-1729,* in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Fifth Series, vols. 5-7* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1878), vol. 3: 87. Sewell's pamphlet *The Selling of Joseph* (1700) was the first anti-slavery tract published in New England.
[23] Lauber, *Indian Slavery,* 188.
[24] *Boston News-Letter*, March 17 - 24, 1720.

As Indian servants' status vacillated between chattel slavery and indentured servitude, and legal and cultural pressure against the trade in Indian slaves mounted, colonists found new ways to enslave Indians, turning towards what historian Margarett Ellen Newell has termed "judicial slavery."[25] In "Indian Slavery in Colonial New England," Newell argues that the turn to judicial slavery was facilitated by both social and legal changes. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Native people continued to pursue traditional subsistence economies, and struggled to hold onto their traditional lands, resisting English pressure to resettle onto reservations or adopt English cultural practices. This put free Indians into a precarious position economically and socially, as they found themselves living on the borders of English communities without the legal protections afforded by tribal membership.[26] At the same time, at the end of the seventeenth century English laws were passed that increased the fines for theft to double, triple, or quadruple the value of the goods stolen.[27] Plymouth County's laws specifically targeted Indians for higher penalties. Other laws, intended to eliminate debtors' prisons, stipulated that debtors could instead be "sold for Satisfaction."[28]

Although smaller Indian communities without formal colonial "protection" were particularly vulnerable to judicial slavery, judicial slavery was not a response to the fragmentation of Indian communities, but to their continuing persistence, strength,

---

[25] Newell, "Indian Slavery," 51. Newell notes that Daniel Vickers also used the term in relation to Nantucket, focussing on debt peonage. Newell, "Indian Slavery," 65, n57. Additionally, John Sainsbury makes essentially the same argument in "Indian Labor in Early Rhode Island" when he argues that "many Indians . . . became servants to the English involuntarily, as a result of judicial processes . . . because Indians could rarely pay cash or goods in lieu of service, they were especially vulnerable to this form of punishment." Sainsbury, "Indian Labor in Early Rhode Island," 381.
[26] Newell, "Indian Slavery," 52
[27] Newell, "Indian Slavery," 52-53.
[28] Martha's Vineyard Legal Code (1672). Quoted in Newell, "Indian Slavery," 53.

and independence. Simply removing Indians from their communities and enslaving them as chattel was ineffective and dangerous. Indian slaves ran away at much higher rates than African slaves, and as Connecticut fretted, the presence of "Indian natives of the country within and about us," rendered the "notorious crimes" of Indian slaves particularly threatening.[29] The persistence of Indian communities in New England facilitated the resistance of Indian slaves. Indian resistance led to the failure of English efforts to enslave Indians directly, and the development of new ways to capture Indian labor, such as judicial slavery and debt peonage, which captured entire Indian families and communities in webs of debt, labor, and indenture that were harder to evade.

Although the laws and practices which enacted judicial slavery had the effect of re-inscribing Indian servitude on the New England landscape, they actually represented a softening of colonial policy, in line with the shift away from slavery and towards indenture, debt peonage, and other forms of unfree labor. In 1683 an Indian named Josepth Peter was accused of stealing by the General Court of Plymouth Colony. Being "a common thief and incorrigible," Peter was "sold out of the country [i.e., into chattel slavery]; and the charges of his imprisonment, &c, being defrayed, the resedew of prise to be delivered" to the man from whom he stole.[30] Later that year, Imdah, an Indian accused of "thevery att divers places att severall times" was sentenced "to be sent out of the country."[31] And in March of 1685,

[29] Trumbull and Hoadley, *Records of Connecticut,* vol. 5: 534.
[30] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 6: 108.
[31] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 6: 116.

Thomas Wappatucke was found guilty of burglary and "sold for a perpetuall servant."[32]

In 1692 Plymouth Colony was absorbed into Massachusetts and became Plymouth County. By this time, the practice of selling Indians "out of the country" had largely ended, and the records of the Plymouth County Court offer a portrait of judicial slavery put into practice. Between 1698 and 1730 the court at Plymouth either bound out or, in the case of Indians already servant to the English, added time to twenty-seven Indians convicted of crimes, most commonly stealing. These sentences ranged from four months of Samuel Thomas's time sold in December 1702, to the Englishman who paid his fine and court fees after Thomas was convicted of public drunkenness, to Phillip, a "Spanish Indian" who was given a life-long indenture for stealing (and sinking) a boat loaded with goods.[33] Phillip had collaborated with James Pryer, an English servant of the same master, who was only bound out for seven years. Phillip and Pryer's time was divided proportionally between the three men who owned the boat.[34]

Indians who were already servants posed a problem to the court, which had to decide whether the person from whom they had stolen had a stronger claim to their labor than their master. In the case of Phillip and his English accomplice, their master, Peter Collamer, refused to pay their damages, which, at 223 pounds and ten shillings amounted to a small fortune. In turn, Collamer lost his investment in Phillip and Pryer's labor when they were immediately turned over to serve the men from

---

[32] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 6: 153.
[33] David Thomas Konig, ed., *Plymouth Court Records, 1686 - 1859,* 16 Vols. (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier with the Pilgrim Society, 1978-1981), vol. 1: 265.
[34] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 254.

whom they had stolen. In a show of racialized sympathy, Collamer paid the twenty shillings necessary to get Pryer out of being whipped; Phillip received twenty lashes.[35]

A 1726 case from Suffolk County, Massachusetts highlights this tension. An Indian man, James Cooper, was sentenced to four years time for "recieving and concealing stolen money and goods," and put in the service of Christopher Almy of Newport, Rhode Island. However, it soon came to light that Cooper was "under obligation" to John Clark of Nantucket, presumably for debt.[36] In his petition to the court, Clark argued that while "the King wrongs no man but administers Justice impartially to all his subjects," nonetheless "a Criminal action of the Indian ought not to Cancel his former Obligation." After all, Clark had invested "A considerable value" in Cooper, "too much for me to lose if I could avoid it." Clark conceded that the court might reasonably suspend Cooper's obligation to Clark for the space of four years, but expressed concern that "since the said Christopher Almy as I am Informed employs him [Cooper] constantly in Voyages to the West Indies, a Climate often fatal to men born and bred in these Northern parts," his investment in Cooper was at considerable risk.[37] In the end, the dispute was resolved when Almy agreed to buy out Clark's share in Cooper, for "a full and valuable Consideration"[38]

Technically, Indians were bound out because they were unable to pay fines or court fees. However, Indians consistently had their labor valued at lower rates than English defendants, and they often faced steeper fines as well. White servants were

---

[35] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 254.
[36] Petition of Christopher Almy. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 31: 138.
[37] Petition of John Clark. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 31: 138.
[38] *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 31: 140.

sometimes indentured, and Indians occasionally scraped together the money to avoid service. In 1719 "Nathan Sam Indian belonging to Plymouth" was accused of stealing money, whipped, and fined. Unlike most Indians who came before the court at Plymouth, Sam was able to afford the fine and was not indentured.[39] In 1730 the English servant Patrick Madden was accused of stealing and, "being unable to pay," had six months added to his service.[40]

White servants could have time added to their service, but colonial courts refused to make servants of free Englishmen. When Israel Peals was indicted of "Petty Larsiny" in 1688 he was sentenced to pay a fine of twenty shillings, and if he couldn't pay, to be whipped ten stripes; servitude was never an option.[41] In contrast, when the Indian John Monetum was convicted of stealing twenty-five shillings worth of goods in 1698, he was fined "treble damages" and "court costs" which came to six pounds. Unable to pay, Monetum was bound as a servant for the term of three years.[42] Two years later, John, the fifteen year old Indian servant of Joseph Randall, was convicted of stealing only twenty shillings worth of goods. He also was ordered to pay "treble damages, fees and charges," which in this case only amounted to three pounds. But when John couldn't pay, his three pound debt was converted into six years of servitude, demonstrating the arbitrary value of Indian labor.[43]

In colonial New England English men and women owned their own labor—they could work as servants, but the state could not compel them to do so, and punishment for crimes was usually some combination of fines or public whippings.

---

[39] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 3.
[40] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 106.
[41] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 199.
[42] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 228.
[43] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 247.

Indian labor, on the other hand, could be claimed by any English person who could demonstrate that the said Indian owed them something, whether money, stolen goods, or penitence for a crime. In June of 1722 Samuel Deerskins, an "Indian labourer . . . having had his tryal," was acquitted of murder and freed after spending eleven months in jail awaiting trial. Despite his innocence, Deerskins was held responsible for the costs incurred in prosecuting and jailing him, and was bound out for two and one half years as a servant.[44]

Englishmen seem to have used the court system as a kind of labor market. In 1716 Thomas Palmer accused two Indian women of stealing from him, paid their charges and fines, and received their labor for five years.[45] The court, in turn, charged that Indian convicts be "maintained according to law," which meant provided with food and shelter. Beginning in the 1720s in Plymouth, the English also had to supply Indian servants with one or two suits of clothing at the end of their term. When the Indian servant Desire Pequin ran away in December of 1725 she "stole" a "Gown, shift, Petticoat, Handkerchief . . . two aprons and Three caps," which were essentially the clothes she would have needed to survive in the colonial world. Accused of stealing, four years were added to Pequin's term, and her master was "at the end of her term to supply her with one suit of clothing."[46] The colonial legal system implicitly recognized the logic of her theft: without clothes, one would be hard-pressed to survive a New England winter, and Pequin's master owed her almost exactly what she stole.

---

[44] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 31.
[45] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 291.
[46] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 66.

In addition to stealing and other crimes, Indians in New England could be indentured for indebtedness, both inside and outside of colonial courts. On Nantucket, where Indian men formed the backbone of the whaling industry's workforce, historian Daniel Vickers argues that by 1730 "few Indian whalemen were working on their own account."[47] Between 1725 and 1733, three quarters of the men hired by Silvanus Hussey, the most prominent whaling merchant of the time, were Indians indebted to white islanders. "Listed anonymously as "Indians" or "hands," these men were under obligation to deliver their earnings to their white masters after every voyage."[48] On Martha's Vineyard Indians indebted to English merchants for basic goods such as food and clothes found themselves forced to work in English households. Unable to participate in traditional subsistence economies of hunting, fishing, and gathering, they were forced to purchase food from the English, pushing themselves further into debt.[49] This cycle of debt peonage, like that on Nantucket, operated alongside judicial slavery as a way to limit Indian freedom and put Indian labor in the service of English interests.

The English used other means to acquire Indian labor. For example, colonial courts could hold children or wives responsible for their husbands' or fathers' debts. In 1723 Alice Sachemus's husband died in the jail at Plymouth while awaiting the outcome of a judgement against him by John Otis Jr..[50] Being dead, Sachemus's husband was unable to pay his fees and prison charges, and Sachemus was held responsible. When Alice Sachemus was unable to pay, Otis picked up the charges,

---

[47] Vickers, "First Whalemen of Nantucket," 579.
[48] Vickers, "First Whalemen of Nantucket," 579.
[49] Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries,* 191.
[50] Sachemus's case is briefly discussed in Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 135; Plane, *Colonial Intimacy,* 142.

and Alice was bound out to Otis for three years.[51] Not only did Otis pick up Alice Sachemus's debt, but he promised the court that, although he apparently intended to separate Sachemus from her infant child, the said infant "shall be no charge to the town where it is kept."[52]

Sachemus's indenture was sold twice, first to Consider Howland of Plymouth, and then to "Mr. Jabis Allen of Killingsley" in Connecticut.[53] The latter sale sent her away from her home and community in Plymouth, and probably separated her further from her child, who presumably continued to live either with Indian relatives, or more likely in an English household. Significantly, the sale occurred in January 1727, several months after her term of service was supposed to have expired.[54] A written indenture which clearly stated that Alice Sachemus was to serve only three years did not prevent Consider Howland from selling her into a neighboring colony, where it is not hard to imagine that her indenture was torn up and forgotten; after all, Indian slaves were still sold without terms in the *Boston News-Letter* well into the 1720s. The line between slave and servant remained thin and easily bent.

Compared to the Indian women who were sold into slavery with their children only a few years earlier, Alice Sachemus might have considered herself lucky that her infant child did not automatically inherit her status. However, judicial slavery had its own methods for making service hereditary. Indebted Indian families often bound out their children when they could not bind out themselves, and English landowners

---

[51] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 44.
[52] Alice Sachemus Indenture (1723-26), Special Collections, Indians, Folder 2, the Pilgrim Society, Plymouth. Online at The Pilgrim Society, http://www.pilgrimhall.org/natamdocs.htm#1723%20indenture (accessed Mar. 7, 2012).
[53] Alice Sachemus Indenture.
[54] Alice Sachemus Indenture.

at least sometimes insisted on Indian children's labor as sureties for the labor of a parent. In 1727 the Indian Thankfull Wickett, wife of Samuel Wickett, brought a complaint against her husband's former master Quintin Crymble. Samuel Wickett had given Crymble "an Indenture on three of the Chilldren of the said Samuel and Thankfull Wickett as Sureties or pledges for performance or fullfilment of Indenture by which said Samuel Wicket Bound him Self to Serve the said Crymble three years."[55]

Crymble, evidently a greedy man, sent Samuel Wickett to work in New Hampshire and received "a Bond of Ninty pounds" for his return. In the meantime, he tried to collect his insurance on Wickett's labor by acquiring the children as well, allowing the indenture to earn Crymble capital from Wickett's labor in New Hampshire even as Crymble took advantage of the labor of Wickett's children.[56] Although this is a particularly pernicious example, Indian children often found themselves serving in English households, either in payment for their parents' debts, or because their families could not afford to raise them.[57]

The Wampanoag woman Elizabeth Uhquat of Martha's Vineyard was put to an English master on the mainland when she was a child. The English missionary Experience Mayhew wrote about Uhquat in *Indian Converts,* a book of biographies of Christian Indians from Martha's Vineyard published in 1727 "to make it evident that the Preaching of the Gospel to the *Aboriginal Natives* of this Land, has not been in

---

[55] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 77.
[56] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 77. After his return from New Hampshire and the end of his service to Quintin Crymble, in June of 1728, Samuel Wickett found himself in court for stealing a horse and taking off with stolen food, powder, and rum. He was sentenced to four and a half years labor, continuing the cycle of service for himself and his family. Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 87.
[57] Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries,* 186.

vain, but that there has been some desirable Fruit and Effect thereof."[58] Mayhew's biographies focus on his subjects' conversion and Christianity, but he also gives a sympathetic glimpse into their lived experiences of the kind rarely offered by newspaper advertisements or court cases.

Elizabeth Uhquat's master "neither taught her to read, nor took care to instruct her in the principles of true Religion," a complaint which Mayhew admitted to be "the unhappy case of many of our *Indian* Youth that go to live among the *English*."[59] While a servant to the English, Elizabeth Uhquat gave birth to an illegitimate son, Tobit Potter, who, in the words of historian David Silverman, "spent most of his childhood shuttling back and forth from the mainland colonial household where his mother was an indentured servant, to other English households where he himself worked."[60] Uhquat and her son offer contrasting portraits of the role of English culture and Puritan religion in the lives of Indian servants. Uhquat was not taught Christianity as a child, and her time as a servant to the English was marked by adultery, an experience which, if Experience Mayhew is to be believed, left her "most deeply guilty."[61] When her indenture was up, Uhquat returned to her home community on Martha's Vineyard, where she found comfort in Christianity. Her husband, Joseph Uhquat, was prone to both drinking and "Idleness," but Elizabeth

---

[58] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 91.
[59] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 282.
[60] Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries,* 185. Silverman considers Tobit Potter's life at length, while Ann Marie Plane examines his mother's experience. Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries,* 185-186, Plane, *Colonial Intimacies,* 115-116.
[61] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 282.

was able to "reform him," and shape her Indian family in the Christian image which she desired.[62]

Uhquat's son Tobit Potter, on the other hand, was taught both to read and the "great Truths of Religion" by his English family. He served his English family faithfully, and when he heard of a servant who had been unfaithful he quoted Colossians 3:22, "Servants obey your Masters, &c."[63] In the end, however, English masters and an English God proved no substitute for a real family. Leaving the Meeting one day, Potter "heard the minister mention those Words, *If my Father and Mother forsake me, the Lord will take me up,* he was glad to heard this, for that he thought he had no body to take care of him."[64] When his master died, Potter was sent to another English family, but, in poor health, he was soon returned to his mother. Where Elizabeth Uhquat found comfort in the combination of Christianity and Native community on Martha's Vineyard, Potter found that his experience among the English had alienated him from the Wampanoag community, "he not being able to speak *Indian* any thing well, and none of the *Indians* with him in the time of his Sickness, excepting his mother, being able fully to understand what he said in *English*." Tobit Potter died when he was thirteen.[65]

Potter's story demonstrates how, once established by the English, indentured servitude perpetuated itself within Indian communities. Potter followed his mother into service with the English not because he inherited her status directly as chattel, but because, with his mother in an English household, there was no place else for him

---

[62] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 283.
[63] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 340.
[64] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 340. The minister was quoting Psalm 27:10.
[65] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 341, 338.

to go. And while both Elizabeth and Potter found comfort in Christianity, Potter found himself alienated from his home community and unable to communicate with his extended family.

Tobit Potter's story offers a stark contrast to that of the Spanish Indian Maria discussed in the previous chapter. Maria, an outsider to New England, was able to assimilate herself into a local Indian community despite her enslaved status. In a moment of illness, she found comfort, privacy when she needed it, and companionship at Charles's wigwam. Potter, on the other hand, was born a New England Indian, but his service to the English alienated him from his home community, leaving him an outsider among Indians and English alike, with "no body to take care of him." In Tobit Potter's case, indenture functioned exactly as the English hoped. Indenture alienated Potter from his Wampanoag community, but at the same time left him enmeshed within that community, which contained the potential for violence, disorder, and subversion that Indian identity represented to the English.

Although the vast majority of Indian slaves and servants were given little in return for their labor in English households, some, like Tobit Potter, were taught to read and write, and assimilated into English religious practice. At least among Christian Indians, children bound to English masters who took seriously their obligations to Indian children, such as Rachel Amos, who was put to live with the missionary Thomas Mayhew, and Hepzibah Assaquanhut, who was sent to "a good *English* Family in *Tisbury,"* were able to return to their Indian communities and

assume positions of respect and autonomy within their families and the church.[66] Of course, this depended on the existence of an Indian community to which to return. In April of 1711, the same year that Rachel Amos died, an advertisement was run in the *Boston News-Letter* for "An Indian Boy aged about 15 years that can Read and Write English." There were no terms on his sale.[67] Other Indian slaves and servants were able to acquire a trade beyond basic physical and domestic labor. The twenty-one year old Indian man Nim, "Run-away from his Master" David Lyell, "can do something at the Carpenter's trade," the cooper Joseph Seuell's eighteen year old "Indian lad" was also "a Cooper by Trade," and a Spanish Indian manservant was "Us'd to and fit for husbandry work."[68]

Learning a trade could offer an Indian slave or servant the opportunity to escape from servitude. Tom was the Indian servant of George Whitehorne, a sailmaker in Boston. In 1697 Whitehorne sent Tom to work for a ropemaker, William Tilby, for six months, at a rate of five shillings per week which were to be paid directly to Whitehorne.[69] Selling a slave or indentured servant's labor for a set time was a common practice in New England, and it could range from an afternoons' work sweeping a Chimney for a few shillings, to Eighteen pounds in money due to "Thomas Fowler of Boston," for the labor of his Indian servant Ishmael aboard a six month journey from Boston to Barbados.[70] The practice served as a convenient way

---

[66] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 243, 289.
[67] *Boston News-Letter*, April 23 - 30, 1711.
[68] *Boston News-Letter*, July 23 - 30, 1716; Mar 21 - 28, 1715; Aug 26 - Sept 3, 1716. Skilled Indian servants occasionally show up in Court Records as well, such as "James Mohcage, an Indian cooper who ran away from his master Timothy Morton in 1728, and had a year added to his time. Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 89.
[69] Testimony of William Tilby. *Suffolk Files,* 3963.
[70] The first example is from *Diary of Peter Thacher,* Feb. 2, 1679 (1680). The second example is: Indian Ishmael, an Indian servant, wages due to. *Suffolk Files,* 4174 (1695).

for an English slave-owner to convert a slave's labor temporarily back into hard capital.

Tom, who had picked up the sailmaking trade, tired of working for others and arranged with an Englishman named John Browne to sail on a "Briganteen called the Seaflower."[71] Samuel Gale, who was a mate on the Seaflower, testified against Browne. Probably trying to distance himself from responsibility, Gale explained that in July of 1697 he met "a fellow which called himself Tom and would have shiped himself [illegible] with me." Gale, "fearing he might be some mans servant: and looking like an Indian," turned him down. Evidently, Tom found better luck with John Browne, joined the crew of the Seaflower, and sailed out of Boston harbor that summer.

In the summer of 1697 King William's War, which pitted the English and the Iroquois Confederacy against the French and the Wabanaki Confederacy, was winding to a close; the Treaty of Wyswick which ended the conflict would be signed on September 20. However, tensions between the English and French remained high in New England, and so it is not particularly surprising that the Seaflower was intercepted and taken by the French. Browne claimed that he told the French that Tom was his servant, and "at last he told them he [Tom] was his slave hoping the French would deliver him."[72] It is not surprising that Browne's appeal to Tom's status as property failed to sway French privateers in the process of stealing English property. However, it is also entirely possible that Tom welcomed the French. After a brief stay in a French prison, by 1699 Tom "had liberty to worke for his living wch

[71] Testimony of William Tilby. *Suffolk Files,* 3963.
[72] Testimony of William Tilby. *Suffolk Files,* 3963.

was with a Saylemaker in Bayone in France."[73] Having learned a trade, Tom was able to escape to Europe and freedom. George Whitehorne took John Browne to court for damages, but there is no evidence that Tom ever came home.

Running away was not the only form of resistance Indian slaves and servants put up to slavery, indenture, or judicial slavery. Individual Indian servants found a myriad of ways to resist service to the English. When Joshua Hood, an Indian who lived, worked, and probably prayed on the missionary Josiah Cotton's sprawling farm "Plain Dealing" found himself in jail at Plymouth, another Indian, Mercy Umpany, helped him escape.[74] Perhaps Mercy understood that if convicted, Joshua Hood would lose what little freedom and autonomy he had, or perhaps she was just helping a friend. In any case, she was bound out as a servant herself when they were both caught. Mercy did, however, manage to do considerable damage to the jail.[75]

Under the tenets of judicial slavery, resistance frequently had the practical effect of adding time to one's term. In September of 1730 Richard Lowden of Marshfield, Massachusetts brought his Indian servant David Chassuck before the County Court in Plymouth for "stealing his Indentures from his said Master and Burning of them."[76] The court had Chassuck's indentures redrawn, with six months added. Indentures were not the only thing Indian servants burned. In March 1712, a young Indian girl named Hittee burned down her master's house. Hittee's case was of prurient interest to the English, and her trial was "Adjourn'd to the Meetinghouse

---

[73] Testimony of Samuel Gale. *Suffolk Files,* 3963.
[74] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 83, and Winiarski, Douglas L., "A Question of Plain Dealing: Josiah Cotton, Native Christians, and the Quest for Security in Eighteenth-Century Plymouth County," *The New England Quarterly* , Vol. 77, No. 3 (Sep. 2004): 368-413, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1559824 (accessed April 4, 2012), 393.
[75] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 83.
[76] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 109.

by reason of the Press of people." However, Hittee was declared not guilty after her Master, citing her young age, asked the Court to show leniency.[77] When overt resistance failed, there were quieter ways to escape from servitude. Samuel Sewell's diary offers a glimpse of autonomy and desperation in 1688 when Thomas, the "very usefull" Indian servant of Mr. Oliver, "hang'd himself in the Brewhouse."[78]

Alcoholism compounded the cycles of debt peonage in which many of New England's Indians found themselves trapped during the eighteenth century. "The connection between liquor and debt is clear," David Silverman writes in *Faith and Boundaries,* "despite merchant efforts to disguise account book evidence."[79] However, the sale of alcohol was one place where individual Indians could push back against the English within the legal system. Selling alcohol to Indians was illegal throughout New England, but it proved almost impossible to prevent. Tavern owners and innkeepers seem to have let their wives sell to Indians, shielding themselves from direct responsibility.[80] Furthermore, all that was required for an English person to clear themselves of the charge of selling alcohol was that they "clear themselves by their oaths."[81]

Nonetheless, Indians in Plymouth County frequently accused the English of selling them alcohol in court. For example, in December of 1701 an "Indian woman named Hope" accused Susanna, the wife of John Cole, of selling "to her 3 half pints

---

[77] *Superior Court of Judicature for the colony of Massachusetts Bay,* Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston, 270. *Diary of Samuel Sewell*, vol. 2: 340-341.
[78] *Diary of Samuel Sewell,* vol. 1: 229.
[79] Silverman, *Faith and Boundaries,* 194.
[80] Among many examples, see the case of Jane Ellis, wife of Samuel Ellis, for selling liqueur to an Indian manservant. Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 2: 41.
[81] Two such cases, brought by Indians and dismissed after the English defendant swore an oath that they were innocent, can be found in Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 268.

of rhum on Monday about the 6th of October last."[82] Susanna "refused to clear herself on Oath as the law directs," a wording which suggests that the court fully expected to be complicit in the continuing sale of alcohol to the Indians. Susanna was ordered to pay a fine of three pounds, or if she could not pay, to be imprisoned for two months.[83] Here again the Plymouth court viewed English labor as inalienable, although the bondage of jail was an acceptable punishment in lieu of a fine.

Indian communities also stood up for their rights in the colonial legal system. On May 24, 1700, the Indians of Mashpee sent a petition to the government of Massachusetts Bay "that their children not be made servants." The Mashpee began by positioning themselves within colonial New England, both geographically and politically: "Wee his Majesty King Williams subjects, Indians, inhabitants of Mashpau, and places adjecent in the town of Sandwich, or near thereto in this Province of Massachusetts."[84] The Mashpee argued that "We are a people that do own the Great Jehovah and his Son our Lord Jesus Christ; and do attend up his worship on the Lord day." As Christians, the Mashpee emphasized their loyalty to the colony, particularly in opposition to other, hostile Indians: "wee here are very willing to remain in subjection unto his majestie and his Government and have demeaned ourselves peaceably att all times, and friendly, and assisted our English neighbors, both in the former and warrs with their and our Indian enemies."[85] Indian communities in New England continued to position themselves in opposition to

---

[82] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 258.
[83] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 258.
[84] Petition of Mashpee Indians that their children not be made servants. *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 456.
[85] Petition of Mashpee Indians that their children not be made servants, *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 456.

"enemie Indians" for their own benefit. The Indians of southern New England continued to fight alongside the English throughout the eighteenth century, and in 1696 the Mohegan sold an Indian girl captured from "the enimie" in King William's War to an Englishman.[86]

Once they had established their position within the colony as "friend" Indians, the Mashpee turned to the true subject of their petition, the practice of judicial slavery:

> Thro ignorance of the law, weakness, foolishness, and inconsiderations, some of us that are elder, and severall of our children have [illegible] in the Englishmens Debts, and not being able nor perhaps careful to pay att the time appointed; ourselves or our poor Children, are frequently made servants for an unreasonable time. Now wee are willing to pay, what is already due, as soon as ever wee can, either by our labour, or otherwise, if any thing tolerable or reasonable would be accepted of. But wee do earnestly desire that some course may be taken to hinder our future unjust troubles by ordering that no Englishman is permitted to trust us for any Goods so as to expect the benefitt of the English Law, for the Recovery of their goods; wee hear this will make us more careful of our business; and that no Indian may be allowed to make himself a servant for any time, but by and with the consent of the English justice of the peace.[87]

The Mashpee as a community understood exactly what was happening in English courts, and they saw colonial law as an avenue for preventing it. On one level the Mashpee were successful; later that year Massachusetts passed "An Act for Preventing Abuses to the Indians," which stipulated that contracts of indenture were to be for a set term, to specifically lay out the master's obligations, to be reviewed by

---

[86] Petition of Richd Way as to Indian girl, purchased from the Mohegans. *Suffolk Files,* 1511. The petition also contains a revealing description of the qualities of a "good" Indian servant: "very faithfull loving obidient usefull and quiat."

[87] Petition of Mashpee Indians that their children not be made servants, *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 456.

two or more Justices of the Peace, and to be signed by the Indian in question.[88] However, the act clearly failed to prevent English abuse and exploitation of Indian labor. This is not surprising, given that the colonial legal system itself was in the business of binding out Indians.

Judicial slavery enacted by County courts and debt peonage to local merchants worked in congruence to facilitate the exploitation of Indian labor in the eighteenth century as chattel slavery became a less tenable option for co-opting Indian labor. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Indian slaves were able to use their ties to Indian networks and communities to run away more often and more successfully than their African counterparts. The resistance of Indian slaves, including those imported from Carolina and Spanish America, led Colonial governments to restrict the trade in Indian slaves, while the struggles of Indians and sympathetic colonists, as well as the increasing distance from King Philip's War and the mass captivity that followed in its wake, led to a decline in the willingness of New England society to treat Indians as chattel. However, colonial society responded with new forms of servitude such as judicial slavery that bound semi-autonomous Indian communities such as those at Mashpee and Martha's Vineyard into a network of servitude, in which cycles of debt and poverty left Indians vulnerable to a conspiracy of colonial courts, English merchants, and English landowners to exploit Indian labor.

In 1718 two Indian women from Martha's Vineyard, Dessiah Chin and Rachel Choho, joined together and ran away from their respective masters in Piscataqua, on what is today the border of Maine and New Hampshire.[89] It is impossible to know if

---

[88] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 165; Newell, "Indian Slavery," 56.
[89] *Boston News-Letter*, April 7 - 14, 1718.

they made it home, but if they did, they were almost certainly sent straight back to Piscataqua. For Indian servants from Martha's Vineyard such as Dessiah and Rachel, or Elizabeth Uhquat and Tobit Potter, running away and returning home was not a sustainable option, because Martha's Vineyard, despite its significant Indian population, no longer lay outside of English society. Arguably, Charles's wigwam outside Weymouth, Massachusetts was less scrutable to and more independent from the English than the thriving community of Christian Indians on Martha's Vineyard.

In the eighteenth century entire Indian communities, such as those on Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard, were enmeshed in debt peonage and judicial enslavement, making these kinds of qualified slavery more stable and sustainable than outright chattel slavery. Communities like Mashpee were able to oppose these policies from within the colonial legal system, but individuals had fewer avenues for resistance. By forcing colonial society to re-inscribe Indian servitude through structures of judicial slavery or debt peonage which could capture entire communities, but at the same time were less dehumanizing, violent, and permanent than chattel slavery, the resistance of Indian slaves and the persistence of Indian communities directly influenced the structure of Indian slavery in New England.

In 1723 the Pequot sachem Mary Momoho sent a petition to the Government of Connecticut on behalf of the Pequot community residing on the Lantern Hill reservation, resisting the government's attempt to count them out of existence and take their land for the English at Stonington.[90] Connecticut had counted "three men and four squaws and of Male Children twenty four, twenty of which are bound

[90] Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 71.

Servants to the English."[91] The Connecticut census confirmed the colony's suspicion that the Pequot at Lantern Hill were the last of a rapidly vanishing race. Mary Momoho challenged these figures on two counts: first, the Pequot "Male and Female which are now Surviving" are not seven, as counted by the English, but rather, "above one hundred and thirty." And secondly:

> "Though wee have bound out Some of our Children to the English for Learning and Education; 'tis no otherwise than the English bind out their Children Each to other &c. Our Children are free at the Same Age and time as the English Children are, which are bound out."[92]

Momoho's petition is a direct rebuke against the English idea, held particularly dear by Englishmen who worked closely with the Indians such as Daniel Gookin and Experience Mayhew, that servitude in English households would assimilate Indian children into Puritan faith and English society. No, the Pequot petition declares, our children remain Indians: they still *count*. That the Eastern Pequot are still recognized by the State of Connecticut as a tribal nation, and to this day continue to petition the government of the United States for Federal Recognition, implies that Indian leaders, and not English missionaries, better understood the nature of Indian servitude. Indian servants in English households were in some ways alienated from Native communities by language and cultural barriers created through childhoods spent in service, but they remained first and foremost Indians.

---

[91] Connecticut Archive, "Indians," 2nd series, vol. 2: 22, quoted in Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 71.
[92] Connecticut Archive, "Indians," 2nd series, vol. 2: 22, quoted in Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 72.

Chapter 4

"Disorders in the Night"

Forging New Communities in Slavery and Freedom

On August 8, 1718, the Reverend Cotton Mather of Boston woke to find that his Spanish Indian "Damsel," a "very useful" servant, had died suddenly in the night of "Bleeding in her Lungs." Her sudden death must have been a jarring, if not particularly uncommon or unfamiliar, event. That evening, the Spanish Indian woman was buried and Mather gave "as pungent a Discourse as I could, unto the many Indians and Negroes that came unto the funeral."[1]

To Cotton Mather, his Spanish Indian servant was a human and a family member, whose death was a "sad Occurrence in my Family" worthy of "many calls to solemn Humiliations." But she was also a commodity, and on the day she died Cotton Mather prayed that "a good Servant may [be] sent into the Family."[2] A Spanish Indian, no matter how "useful," was immediately replaceable. To the community of "many Indians and Negroes" that came to her funeral, Mather's Spanish Indian servant may have been a very different kind of family member: friend, lover, or companion.

Puritan leaders were deeply suspicious of the community of Indian and African slaves and servants that had formed in Boston. In 1703 Massachusetts passed a law "to prevent disorders in the night," which set a nine o'clock curfew for African,

---

[1] Cotton Mather, *The Diary of Cotton Mather, 1681-1724,* 2 vols., in *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, Seventh Series, Vols. VII-VIII* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1911), vol. 2: 549-550.
[2] *The Diary of Cotton Mather*, vol. 2: 550.

Indian, and Mulatto slaves and servants. The law was justified by "great disorders, insolencies and burglaries . . . ofttimes raised and committed in the night time."[3] The regulation proved ineffective, and only two years later Boston passed an ordinance reiterating the curfew, and authorizing constables to search "Houses that are suspected to Entertain such Servants or Slaves contrary to Law."[4]

Curfews and other laws limiting the mobility of Indian and African slaves and servants set Africans and Indians apart from white servants as a particular threat to colonial order, and recognized the existence of considerable mobility and autonomy on the part of New England's slaves and servants. Despite their lack of control over their labor, Indian and African slaves and servants found times and places in which to experience freedom. Slaves and servants forged communities which crossed racial lines imposed by the English, and crossed the lines of slavery and freedom to connect with free Indian communities. The funeral of Mather's unnamed Spanish Indian servant demonstrates that urban communities of color were not just escape valves for the pressures of unfree labor, but real communities which gathered together for meaningful purposes.

Spanish and Carolina Indians participated in both urban Afro-Indian communities and rural Indian communities, but they maintained a distinct cultural identity. In *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717,* historian Alan Gallay argues that many "Carolina Indians" and "Spanish Indians" came to New England through Carolina, having been captured as

---

[3] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 168.
[4] *Boston News-Letter*, Aug 37 - Sept 3, 1705.

children in raids into Spanish Florida between 1702 and 1705. In 1702 the English and their Yamasee allies conducted an attack on Florida with the dual aim of weakening Spain's hold over the region, and acquiring Indian captives for sale into slavery. After English forces pulled out of Spain, the English continued to support the Yamasee and Alabama in slave raids against Native peoples in Spanish Florida.[5]

Twenty-five years earlier, an equally likely origin for a Spanish Indian slave would have been the Spanish West Indies or the "Spanish Main" along the northern coast of South America. Raids carried out by English traders brought these "Spanish Indians" to Barbados, where they could be traded north to New England. However, by the dawn of the eighteenth century, this trade had ceased to be economical as the importation of Africans to Barbados increased.[6] In *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem,* Elaine Breslaw argues that Samuel Parris's Indian slave Tituba, famous for her participation in the Salem Witch Trials, was an Arawak Indian brought to New England from Barbados by Parris.[7] Although the fact that Tituba was "spoken of" as born in the Spanish Indies survived in New England's memory and history, she was consistently labelled as an "Indian" in seventeenth century documents.[8] Thus, the term "Spanish Indian" was not used consistently, and the word "Indian" could absorb Spanish Indians such as Carib or Arawak as well as New England Indians such as Wampanoag or Narragansett.

---

[5] Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade,* 135-137, 304.
[6] Breslaw, *Tituba,* 6, 11.
[7] Breslaw, *Tituba,* xxi. Breslaw supports her claim with archival sources from Barbados.
[8] Charles W. Upham, *Salem Witchcraft: With an Account of Salem Village and A History of Opinions on Witchcraft and Kindred Subjects*, (1867 repr., Williamstown, MA: Corner House Publishers, 1971), vol. 2: 2, quoted in Breslaw, *Tituba,* xxi.

The term "Spanish Indian" denoted slave status more clearly than "Indian." In 1711 Connecticut Colony passed a law which held slave owners financial responsible for emancipated slaves, specifying "all negro, malatto, or Spanish Indians," but not "Indians."[9] The same three racial designations were repeated when the law was repealed in 1777, implying that "Spanish Indians" remained enslaved in Connecticut long after indenture became the norm for other Native peoples.[10]

The term "Spanish Indian" was applied across a broad range of individual experiences, from Apalachee born in Spanish Florida, taken captive by the Yamasee or Alabama, and exported through Carolina to New England, to Carib or Arawak from the Spanish Indies or South America captured by English traders and sold to New England through Barbados. The identification "Spanish Indian" was not solely phenotypical, although it is probable that the English could identify Native people of different backgrounds to a degree. When the "Spanish Indian lad" Ceasar ran away from his master, a ship-carpenter from Newport Rhode Island in 1715, he was described as looking "very much like our Indians."[11] Caesar was also distinguished by the lack of "marks on his Face," in contrast to an Indian like Rose, "a thick short Woman, her Neck, Arms and Leggs marked with Flowers, after the Indian manner, and some stroacks in her Cheeks."[12]

In September 1711, an advertisement placed in the *Boston News-Letter* announced that three Carolina Indians and two Spanish Indians, owned by five

---

[9] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 325.
[10] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 380.
[11] *Boston News-Letter*, May 2 - 9, 1715.
[12] *Boston News-Letter*, Oct 8 - 15, 1711.

different masters in Boston, had run away together.[13] These five Indians almost certainly came from different tribes and had different ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. However, they probably shared the common experience of being captured and sold into slavery through Carolina. Once in Boston, the five Spanish and Carolina Indians found themselves in very different households. The Carolina Indian man Toby was owned by a Reverend, the Carolina Indian woman Phillis by a tailor, and the Spanish Indian man Manway by a leather dresser.[14] But all five Indians had sufficient independence to seek out others with whom they shared a cultural background and to harbor collective dreams of freedom. Similarly, in September 1716, three Carolina Indian servants from three different masters ran away, all of whom spoke "but broken English." These Carolina Indians, who worked for a "cordwainer" or shoemaker, a "Malster" or brewer, and a "ship-carpenter," must have had a shared sense of cultural identity which encouraged them to band together.[15]

Although a runaway slave had the potential to get very far very quickly in colonial New England, many runaways relied on local communities, at least initially. When the Carolina Indian Mall ran away from her master John Jenkins of Boston, a Mariner, her escape evidenced both careful preparation and a nearby destination. The twenty year old Mall was described as a "short, thick, fat Wench, having short Hair, is Lame in one of her Hips and goes Waddling." Furthermore, Mall had carried away

---

[13] *Boston News-Letter*, Sept. 10-17, 1711, and Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade,* 304. Gallay argues that these advertisements demonstrate the maintenance of a distinct "Carolina Indian" identity.
[14] *Boston News-Letter*, Sept. 10-17, 1711.
[15] *Boston News-Letter*, Sept. 17 - 24, 1716, and Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade,* 304.

"considerable Money, and a bundle of cloaths" in addition to what she was wearing.[16] Mall must have had access to and knowledge of both her Master's home, from which she stole money and clothing she would need to survive in New England, and a local community, probably Indian or Afro-Indian, to support her escape attempt. Hampered by physical disabilities, Mall would not be able to travel far easily, at least initially.

Although Carolina and Spanish Indians who ran away together from their Boston masters had an immediate urban community of Indian and African slaves into which they could escape, their longer-term plans were unclear. We have no way of knowing how often they were successful. Perhaps runaways imagined that if they could get far enough away from Boston, they would be able to safely incorporate themselves into New England's Indian communities. If so, it was an unrealistic dream. New England's Indians were increasingly scrutinized by white settlers and colonial officials in the eighteenth century, and although they absorbed many former slaves, they probably had little ability to harbor fugitives indefinitely. A Mid-Atlantic port city such as New York or Philadelphia might have been easier to disappear into, and escaping Indians might have envisioned themselves finding passage on a ship south and ultimately returning home. Alternatively, runaway slaves may have hoped to travel overland to safety with the French and the Abanaki Confederacy, although the French were liable to re-enslave them.[17]

---

[16] *Boston News-Letter*, Aug 6 - 13, 1711.

[17] For example, Cotton Mather's Spanish Indian servant was taken by the French while at sea and apparently kept as a servant or slave until he was retaken by the English two years later, when an English captain took him "to make a perpetual *Slave* of him." *The Diary of Cotton Mather,* vol. 1: 203.

Although Spanish and Carolina Indians maintained a sense of shared identity, and at least in some cases gravitated towards other Spanish and Carolina Indians, they also forged relationships with New England's Native people. The Spanish Indian man-servant James and the Indian man Toby ran away together from a Boston shopkeeper in 1713.[18] And James Spaniard, who was brought from "some part of the *Spanish Indies* when he was a Boy, and sold in *New-England,"* joined the Christian Indian community on Martha's Vineyard after buying his freedom, and died there in 1721. James was purchased by an English family from Chilmark on Martha's Vineyard, where, according to Experience Mayhew, he was "kindly used" and had "many good Instructions [in Christianity] given him."[19]

Unlike the Spanish Indians from Boston who plotted their escapes, James Spaniard probably saw himself, at least in part, as a member of his English family. When his Master died James was "much affected at the Breach which God had made in the Family" and reflected that "*It is the Will of God that it should be so and we must be contented."*[20] After the death of his master, James purchased his freedom and married a Wampanoag woman. James Spaniard found personal solace from the wrenching memories of being ripped from his home, his family, and his culture in the Wampanoag community which he joined through marriage, and in the Christian faith which he studied with his English master as a servant.[21]

---

[18] *Boston News-Letter*, Sept 7 - 14, 1713.
[19] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 213.
[20] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 214.
[21] Christianity was apparently a great comfort to James and he prayed regularly. However, Mayhew admitted that James "seemed to want that *Joy of Faith* which is much to be desired." Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 215.

Despite his acceptance within the local Indian community, James Spaniard nonetheless "laid much to Heart the unkind Treatment he had met withal, in being separated from all his Friends and Relations, and brought out of his Country into a strange Land, from whence he never expected to return again, and at this he sometimes appeared to be discontented." James's sense of cultural alienation was heightened by the fact that he was not a "compleat Master of either the *English* or *Indian* tongue," and "could not express himself very aptly in either the one or the other of them."[22] This must have also been a disorienting experience for James's Wampanoag wife, who was forced to communicate with her new husband in English rather than her native language.

James would have been completely recognizable as a "Spanish Indian" to the English, if not from his appearance alone, then from his heavily accented English. But James's true cultural identity probably ran much deeper, an amalgamation of his own ethnic heritage, perhaps as an Apalachee or Timucua from northern Florida, his identification with other Spanish and Carolina Indians who shared his experience of being sold to a "strange Land," a broader shared identity as "Indian," particularly the Indian identity he shared with his Wampanoag family, and the Puritan faith which brought him comfort in his old age. When Experience Mayhew included James Spaniard in *Indian Converts,* he recognized him as an Indian and a legitimate member of the Indian community on Martha's Vineyard. But James Spaniard was a new kind of Indian, one whose identity and background would have been all but unimaginable to the Wampanoag a century earlier. The formation of new kinds of Indian identity

[22] Mayhew, *Indian Converts,* 214, 215.

like Peter Spaniard's was a necessary feature of the formation of interracial communities.

The urban community of slaves and servants in eighteenth century Boston was racially complicated. Although from the perspective of an English slaveholder, there were relatively clear lines between African and Indian, slave and freeman, and white servants and Indian or African servants, in reality the many outsiders and others of New England banded together and split apart in a myriad of ways. When the thirty-nine foot sloop *Charles and Rachel* was stolen from Boston harbor in March of 1712, the "pyrats or runaways aboard her" included a Bermudian master, an English man, a French man, and a free mulatto.[23] The "Negro Man named Abraham" was listed separately, between "one Barrel Pitch" and "eight Hogheads of sugar," but it's impossible to know from the advertisement whether Abraham was an accomplice to the pirates, or part of their spoils.

In 1701 an Indian man and white woman conspired to steal goods, although the Indian was punished much more severely.[24] And in 1721 a group of white deserters from "His Majesties Service" included twenty year old Archibald Grimes, "pock broken, middlestatured," and "having on one of his Legs an Indian Mark in the shape of a Buck, and on one of his arms a G," and eighteen year old Sylvanous Pourn, "thin bodyed" with "thickish leggs, one of them having an Indian Mark in the shape of a Buck."[25] It is impossible to know if these "Indian marks" signified an actual connection to Indian cultures or communities, but it is entirely possible that they

---

[23] *Boston News-Letter*, Mar 11 - 18, 1712.
[24] Konig, *Plymouth Court Records,* vol. 1: 240. Rebecka Stanford was fined the value of the stolen goods, whereas her Indian accomplice was held responsible for double or treble the value.
[25] *Boston News-Letter*, May 22 - 29, 1721.

represented real relationships within Indian spaces. At the very least, the tattoos demonstrate a sense of identification between white soldiers and a culture imagined to be Indian.

Urban Indian and African communities were not isolated from the rural towns and reservations that remained important centers of Indian life in eighteenth century New England. Indians from rural communities travelled between Boston and their home communities, learning a trade, or finding employment on ships.[26] Daniel Mandell argues that "individuals who left their village for a port town socialized with other Indians, and when they found a spouse and perhaps sufficient capital for a farm, returned or found a new rural home." These returning Indians "extended and enriched Indian kinship networks when they brought with them new mates from other native groups or even non-Indians."[27]

From the perspective of the English, the potential for violence and resistance within these diffuse interracial communities centered around Indians. Indians were seen as particularly dangerous because of the legacy of violence between Indians and settlers in New England, because of their constant resistance, and because the continued existence of independent Indian communities meant that Indians could never be entirely co-opted within English labor systems and ideologies.

In 1689, well after the threat of formal military resistance by Indian polities had receded in Southern New England, Plymouth colony passed a law to prevent Indian plots and conspiracies. The law was part of an act of the Plymouth Court supporting Massachusetts in King William's War, which had just broken out in

---

[26] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 178, 199.
[27] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 175, 178.

Maine and New Hampshire. The law required that all Indians who desired to leave the "bounds of the townships wherein they at present reside," by night or by day, required a pass from a magistrate. The government also set a ten pound reward for any free Indian or Englishman who alerted the government to any "dangerous and considerable plott or conspiracy of the Indians or others against the English." An Indian servant who gave warning of an Indian conspiracy "shall be freed, and his master have rationall sattisfaction."[28] With the promise of freedom, Indian servants were encouraged to police their own communities. The Indians who lived in Plymouth colony as slaves, servants, and free people participated in King Williams War only as soldiers fighting alongside the English. However, the English government nonetheless perceived the presence of Indian communities within the colony as a threat—a threat which the outbreak of war in Maine and New Hampshire highlighted.

African and Indian urban communities continued to grow through the first half of the eighteenth century. By 1764 there were at least as many Indians living in Boston as in Natick, Massachusetts's most important praying town, and African slaves formed nearly ten percent of Boston's population.[29] In the mid-eighteenth century the English continued to regulate these communities with curfews and laws limiting mobility. However Indian, Mulatto, and African slaves were increasingly lumped together as the fear of specifically Indian resistance waned, and as Africans and Indians increasingly intermixed.

---

[28] Shurtleff and Pulsifer, *Records of Plymouth Colony,* vol. 6: 214.
[29] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 161, 183.

Indian and African slaves and servants were identified with "disorders" and "insolencies" by Massachusetts, and "turbulence," "quarrelling," and "Disturbance of the Peace" by Connecticut.[30] In 1750 Connecticut ordered that "*Negro, Molatto*, or *Indian* servants" could not travel outside the bounds of their town without a ticket or pass from their master or a "Justice of the Peace," and that "every Person Inhabiting in this Colony . . . is hereby Impowred to Seise, and Secure him, or them." Connecticut also made it illegal to purchase goods from an "Indian, Molatto, or Negro Servant, or Slave," barring them from legal economic activity.[31] Unfree communities were also a source of dangerous speech. In 1747 Massachusetts decreed public whipping as the punishment for an "Indian, Negro, or molatto slave" convicted of "profane swearing and cursing," and in 1750 Connecticut ordered that slaves convicted of slander or defamation be whipped forty stripes.[32]

Laws which restricted the mobility of slaves and servants were designed to contain and defuse the threat posed by interracial communities. Despite the small size of the enslaved population of New England compared to the slave colonies of Carolina or Barbados, the existence of Indian communities which brought together free and enslaved individuals, and slave communities which brought together Indians, foreign Indians, and Africans, threatened English hegemony in New England. Just as marrying into an Indian community could provide an African or Spanish Indian with opportunities which the English did not afford him, so teaming with Indians offered

---

[30] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,*168, 369.
[31] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 370. Notably, the same act contained protections intended to prevent "*Fraud in getting* Indians, *or their Children Bound out in Service to the* English," which required that all indentures be "Acknowledged before Authority." As in Massachusetts, these laws proved largely ineffective. Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 367.
[32] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 200, 363.

access to Native networks and Native knowledge. In turn, Native networks and knowledge could go a long way towards facilitating resistance, and helping runaway African and Indian slaves form alliances across racial lines.

Some time towards the end of November 1705, the "Negro Man-Slave named Peter," about twenty years old, "of a pretty brown complexion" and "middle stature," and wearing "French fall Shoes," conspired with an "Indian Man . . . named Isaac Pummatick" to run away from Kittery, Maine.[33] Isaac and Peter, both wearing black hats and gray coats, headed south down the New England coast. They were last seen together in Newbury, Massachusetts, about thirty miles south of Kittery, before they vanished into the New England winter. By the time they reappeared, five months later, they had made it all the way to South Carolina.

Peter's master was William Pepperil, who had immigrated to New England from Wales before King Philip's War and risen from an indentured servant on a fishing boat to become a prominent local merchant and judge.[34] Isaac Pummatick was not a slave, but a soldier in the English army. In 1705, Queen Anne's War was raging on New England's northern border, and French and Abanaki raids on English communities were a constant threat in southern Maine. Isaac Pummatick was a small, skinny man, who spoke good English and probably grew up in an English household after King Philip's War. He was not from Maine, and before joining the militia he had lived with Samuel Thackster in Hingham, Massachusetts, a town just south of Boston on the New England coast.

---

[33] *Boston News-Letter*, Dec. 3 - 10, 1705.
[34] Usher Parsons, *The life of Sir William Pepperell, Bart: The Only Native of New England who was Created a Baronet During our Connection with the Mother Country* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1855). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=3bANAAAAQAAJ (Accessed April 1, 2012).

It is possible that Pummatick's parents were Christian Indians, and that he was placed in Thackster's house as a child, and freed upon turning twenty-four, when he may have joined the militia of his own accord to seek autonomy or adventure. Alternatively, Pummatick may have been an "enemy Indian" captured as a child and sold as a slave to an English household. In this case, any pay he received from the military went straight to Thackster. Joining may not even have been his choice, although he may still have seen it as a path towards greater freedom or independence. The English viewed working for Samuel Thackster as a primary part of Isaac Pummatick's identity, and a fact which could ease his identification, perhaps by suggesting where he might flee. However, it is entirely possible that Pummatick saw working for Thackster not as a primary part of his identity, but rather as a passing stage in his life. Pummatick may have grown up in an Indian household and worked for Thackster briefly to pay off debts, help support his family, or as punishment for a crime.

The first three weeks of December, 1705, were unseasonably mild, and Peter and Isaac's journey was probably an easy one, staying with friends or relatives, and relying on the informal networks of servants and slaves which bubbled beneath the surface of English society.[35] Peter and Isaac probably had little knowledge of Maine's geography, and there is no reason to think that their survival skills were any better than an English person's. However, as an Indian from Massachusetts, Isaac may have been able to travel within Indian communities, hiding out in wigwams on the borders of English villages. According to Kathleen Bragdon, "nineteenth-century scholarship documented a network of trails well known to Indian peoples in the

[35] *Boston News-Letter*, Dec 17 - 24, 1705.

colonial period," and with the right knowledge, the two escapees may have been able to travel much of the way to Boston without using English roads.[36]

In Boston, Peter and Isaac probably found temporary refuge in the mixed community of Africans and Indians. Peter and Isaac may have stopped at the house of a free African or Indian, where they connected with other slaves and servants. Perhaps they drank to forget the danger they had put themselves in, or perhaps they bragged about their escape. But while colonial laws aimed at limiting slaves' autonomy failed to prevent Indians and Africans from gathering in houses and pubs, the scrutiny of Indian and African individuals which they enacted must have posed a grave threat to an escaped slave like Peter, or a deserting soldier like Isaac. In all likelihood, Peter and Isaac found passage on the sloop *Nonesuch,* bound for South Carolina, in early December.[37] If so, they made it out just in time; the very next week twin ads placed in the *Boston News-Letter* advertised their escape, stipulating that anyone who could capture the escaped slave and deserting soldier, or provide information on their whereabouts, would "be well rewarded for his pains, and all reasonable charges paid besides."[38]

Alternatively, Peter and Isaac may have caught a smaller boat for New York or Virginia, then continued south from there. In any case, they must have made it out of New England by the middle of December, because beginning December 23 the weather in Boston took a decidedly wintery turn, with "extream Cold Frezing

---

[36] Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775*, 215.
[37] *Boston News-Letter*, Nov 26 - Dec 3, 1705. If Peter and Isaac didn't make it onto the *Nonesuch,* the next boat bound for Carolina did not depart until the week of December 17.
[38] *Boston News-Letter*, Dec 3 - 10, 1705.

Weather" and multiple blizzards, so that "No Vessels Entere either Out or In."[39] For Peter and Isaac, safely on their way south, the storms in New England may have bought a considerable amount of time. Unfortunately for the two runaways, the *Boston News-Letter*, which was only a year old in 1705, extended the reach of their masters' hands considerably. When the weather let up, the newspaper followed the pair to South Carolina. On April 22, the *News-Letter* printed a follow up advertisement, identifying Isaac and Peter, and boasting that "by virtue of said Advertisement coming (in the News-Letter) to South Carolina, whither the said Negro and Indian had travelled, the Govourner of said place has secured said runaways for the Owner."[40]

Almost seven years later Peter ran away again. Since his capture in South Carolina Peter, who was probably not the easiest slave to hold and exploit, had been sold three times. He was bought first by Mr. Bareman Tanner in Cambridge, then by Mr. Morecock in Boston, and finally by 1712 he found himself the slave of Mr. Ebenezar Hubbard of Middletown, Connecticut.[41] His new master evidently knew little about his past, estimating his age at "18 years," two years younger than he had supposedly been seven years earlier. However, the intervening years had not been easy on Peter, who had acquired "a Skare on the back of one of his hands near the Nuckles," and "a Slit on one of his Ears."[42] Once again, Peter allied himself with other slaves, including "a Spanish Indian Man, Named Peter aged about Twenty years" who spoke "very good English," and belonged to Jehiel Hauley of Durham

[39] *Boston News-Letter*, Dec 24 - 31, 1705.
[40] *Boston News-Letter*, April 15 - 22, 1706.
[41] *Boston News-Letter*, June 7 - 14, 1714
[42] *Boston News-Letter*, Aug 11 - 18, 1712.

Connecticut, and two "Negro men," Trankilo and Harry, who belonged to George Phillips of Middletown. Thirty year old Trankilo had lost part of one of his fingers, while Harry, who was twenty, spoke only broken English.[43]

Ebenezar Hubbard was the grandson of George Hubbard, one of the first settlers of Middletown. The Hubbard family owned extensive amounts of farm land on both sides of the Connecticut River, and Peter was probably engaged in agricultural work on Ebenezar Hubbard's farm near Long Hill in Middletown.[44] The Spanish Indian Peter, the only runaway not from Middletown, was probably tied to the slaves of George Phillips by friendship or kinship connections that mirrored those of their owners, whose families were related by marriage through the Stowe family of Hartford.[45]

If Peter lived with his owner on Hubbard's estate near Long Hill, then he was only minutes from the Wangunk community at Wune Wahjet, where the colonists at Middletown would eventually build Indian Hill Cemetery. In 1705 the Wangunk still held considerable land in Middletown, including at least 200 acres near the bend of the river, in the heart of English settlement, and an additional reservation stretching from the English hamlet of Newfield to Wune Wahjet, which had been the center of

---

[43] *Boston News-Letter*, Aug 11 - 18, 1712.
[44] Everett C. Bacon, *Commemorative biographical record of Middle-sex County, Connecticut: containing biographical sketches of prominent and representative citizens, and of many of the early settled families* (Chicago: J.H. Beers, 1903), 26, 392.
[45] James Taylor Dickinson, and Samuel Dwight, *Genealogies of the Lymans of Middlefield, of the Dickinsons of Montreal, and of the Partridges of Hatfield* (Boston: D. Clapp & Son, 1865). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=pEdjAbnE87wC (Accessed Mar. 21, 2012), 12; and Henry F. Andrews, *The Hamlin family: a Genealogy of Capt. Giles Hamlin of Middletown, Connecticut, 1654-1900* (Exira, IA: Published by the author, 1900). Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=NbVQ7e1hZ9IC (Accessed Mar. 21, 2012), 45.

Native presence in the community since 1638, when the Pequot War forced the leader of the Wangunk to relocate from Wethersfield.[46]

Given Peter's history of partnerships with Native people, it is likely that he had friends and connections among the Indians at Wune Wahjet. Wune Wahjet in 1705 was not a handful of wigwams on a distant hill, but rather a significant community looking down on the Connecticut River, with land holdings in the heart of the English settlement of Middletown. In all likelihood, the Wangunk maintained a large degree of autonomy, reinforced by their decision to ally themselves with the English in King Philip's War. When Peter ran away from George Hubbard, he probably went first to Wune Wahjet. After meeting up with Harry, Trankilo, and the Spanish Indian Peter, the four runaways, Indian and African, likely utilized local Native knowledge of the landscape to seek freedom from slavery.

Peter was caught again, and sold again, this time to Joseph Tuck in Beverly, Massachusetts, on the coast between Boston and Kittery, and not far from Newbury, where Peter and Isaac Pummatick had tarried on their way to South Carolina. In June of 1714 Peter made his last documented escape attempt.[47] Peter, who had once, at least in so far as his English masters were concerned, aged backwards, bore the scars of a life of continuous resistance to slavery. He was still a "slim Fellow," but he was going "a little Lame," and he had lost his "Fore-upper Teeth." He was still wearing "French fall Shoes," and although they were probably not the same pair he escaped to

---

[46] Kavanagh, Sarah, "'A City of the Dead:' Indian Ghosts and Haunting Hegemonies at Indian Hill Cemetary, Middletown, CT." (Honors Thesis, Wesleyan University, 2004), 23-24, 28-29. Much of this land was alienated from the Wangunk in 1765, and shortly thereafter many of the Wangunk in the region joined the Brotherton migration, leaving New England for New York by choice. However, Wune Wahjet remained a center for regional Wangunk well into the nineteenth century, and was the sight of yearly feasts attended by Wangunk from across the region.
[47] *Boston News-Letter*, June 7 - 14, 1714.

South Carolina in, the heel was falling apart. In the advertisement Joseph Tuck placed for Peter's capture, he listed his former owners and where they lived, providing potential informants with a geographic map of Peter's communities and contacts across New England.

Like Peter, the Indian servant Patience Boston spent much of her life resisting captivity, and like Peter she moved between Indian, African, and English communities. Patience Boston was born in 1711 to Christian Indian parents on Cape Cod. After her conviction for murder in 1735, and before her execution Boston converted to Christianity, repented for her sins, and cleared her conscience before God. When *A Faithful Narrative of the Wicked Life and Remarkable Conversion of Patience Boston* was published in 1738, the publishers insisted that it was "taken from her Mouth while She was in Prison," and "publickly read to her on the Lecture a few Hours before her Execution," where she "did unconstrainedly own it, as what she had in very Deed experienced," although the publishers admitted that "it could not be exactly taken in her own Way of expressing her self."[48]

It is impossible to know to what degree Boston's story was embellished or censored by herself or others, but Patience Boston's narrative nonetheless offers a unique testimony of the life of an Indian servant in New England. Despite the obvious ideological uses Boston's story was put to by the English, and despite the

---

[48] Patience Boston, *A Faithful Narrative of the Wicked Life and Remarkable Conversion of* Patience Boston *alias* Sampson; *Who was Executed at* York, *in the County of* York, July 24th 1735, *for the Murder of Benjamin Trot of* Falmouth *in* Casco Bay, *a Child of about Eight Years of Age, whom she Drowned in a Well* (Boston: Printed and sold by S. Kneeland and T. Green. in Queen-Street over against the prison, 1738). Early American Imprints, Series 1, no.4245 (filmed), i. An insightful discussion of Boston's narrative alongside the infanticide case of Pequot Katherine Garret is in Laura Henigman's "I Would be a Witness Against My Self," in *Writing British Infanticide: Child-Murder, Gender, and Print, 1722-1859,* edited by Jennifer Thorn (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003).

Puritan structure of the text as a conversion narrative, Patience Boston's voice is the center around which the discursive and religious contributions of the English circle. Her story, taken outside the context of its publication as a Puritan religious text, is a window into an experience of servitude.

Boston's mother died when she was three years old, and soon after Boston's father, unable or unwilling to care for her, bound her out to the English family of Paul Crow. The Crow family taught her to read and treated her kindly, but nonetheless Boston spent her childhood rebelling in small and large ways, saying that she "used to play on the Sabbath, tell Lies . . . and three Times I set Fire to the House, when I was about twelve Years old."[49] When Boston was fifteen her mistress died, deeply shaking her: "I think I could not have mourned more, if my own Mother had died then . . . I see that she was a Mother to me, though I was a wicked mischievous and rebellious Servant."[50] At least so long as her mistress was alive, Patience Boston was a member of the Crow family, but the existence of strong emotional ties between Boston and her mistress did not prevent her from resisting servitude.

At age twenty-one Boston was freed, and "happy that I had no Body to Command me." As a servant, Boston "went out a Nights, and kept bad Company, and followed lewd Practices," and after she was freed she "fell into the Sin of Stealing."[51] However, it was not the judicial system which re-enslaved Boston, but her choice to marry an African slave. Marriage must have been an act of love or desperation, because Boston "bound my self a Servant with him [her husband] during his Life Time, or as long as we both should live." Not surprisingly, Patience Boston

[49] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 1.
[50] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 2.
[51] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 3.

and her African husband had a tumultuous marriage. Boston was introduced to the "Love of strong Drink" by other Indians in her community. Coming home drunk, she would abuse her husband "in Words and Actions, being mad and furious in my Drink."[52] Boston's husband was often away from home on whaling voyages, presumably hired out by their Master to earn cash, and while he was away Boston cheated on her husband. Patience Boston's first pregnancy coincided with one of her husband's whaling trips, and during her pregnancy she ran away. Boston returned home before giving birth, but while she was gone she hurt her unborn child—it was born with both arms broken, and died after only a few weeks.

Patience Boston's second pregnancy brought about a brief turn towards the Christian faith. Although both were slaves, Boston and her African husband were literate, and Boston wrote that she "loved to hear my Husband read, and would sit up to read myself after the Folks were in Bed." Boston also turned towards a wider Christian community, meeting with a minister who "gladly received . . . counseled and encouraged" her. But as the months passed, and her child's birth approached, Boston turned back to alcohol. It is impossible to know what exactly motivated Boston, whether fear, resentment, loneliness, hatred, or some other emotion, but when her second child was born she "had murder in her heart . . . attempting something that way when I perceived it's Crying," and leading to some "uneasiness in the Family."[53]

Boston's use of the word family is ambivalent. Is she referring to her Afro-Indian family, or to her English family? The social and cultural forces that brought Patience Boston into slavery in an English family when she married her African

---

[52] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 3.
[53] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 4.

husband conflated family and servitude. This might explain why Boston took out her pain and frustration on her own children; she may have wondered if her children were truly her own. At the same time, Boston's narrative positions other Indians as corrupting influences inhabiting the border between slavery and freedom. Indian communities encouraged Boston to drink, to run away, and to sin—or to resist. Boston's story highlights the fact that slaves' and servants' persistence in creating new communities and identities on the borders of slavery and freedom did not negate the violence and misery of slavery.

Shortly after her second child died of natural causes Boston, who was drunk, "quarrelled with my husband, and to vex him, told him that I had Murdered our last child, and stood to it, appealing to God as a Witness . . . so that my Husband said, he must go to the Justice, and inform against me." After sobering up in jail, Boston pleaded not guilty and was acquitted. Despite her innocence, she was not freed "till Security should be given for the Charges."[54] Boston used the judicial process to distance herself from her master and her husband, and chose to be bound to a new master for two years in order to pay off her prison charges, rather than to return to her old master.

A year later her new master sold her, at her own "desire," to Mr. Joseph Bailey of Maine. Boston asked to be sold north into Maine after being "enticed by an Indian woman who was sold in those parts," hoping that she would have "more Opportunity to follow my wicked Courses." It is impossible to know how much of a choice Patience Boston actually had in these transfers. It is possible that her narrative expresses decisions outside of her control as if she made them herself as a way to

[54] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 5-6.

discursively construct autonomy for herself after the fact.[55] But taken at her word, and stripped of the religious terms through which Boston came to view her life, we can imagine that in convincing her master to sell her to Maine, Boston was exercising what limited autonomy she had as a slave by using information gained from the wider community of Indian servants to seek out a home with more independence and less supervision.

After being sold again, Patience Boston murdered her Master's grandson, despite that she "seem'd to love him, and he me." In murder, Boston upended the imagined kinship between slave and master. Where there appeared to be a loving relationship that mirrored that of a mother and son, there was in fact only hatred.[56] After the death of her mother when she was three years old, Patience Boston's entire life was spent in various forms of bondage, from indenture, to slavery, to prison, and then back to indenture, back to slavery, and back to prison. But in writing her life, Patience Boston positioned herself as an autonomous woman, the driving force behind the circumstances of her own life.

On the one hand, this was a function of the Puritan conversion narrative within which her story was set—Boston suffered because she was wicked, and her conversion offered the promise of salvation despite her "sins." But Boston's autonomy is also situated more directly in the choices that she made in pursuit of her own ends. Boston's choice to marry an African ends up pulling her into slavery. Her choice to bind herself out through the judicial system rather than return to her master

---

[55] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 6. It seems unlikely, though not impossible, that the English publishers who stood between Boston's words and the printed text would have granted her this autonomy after the fact.

[56] Boston, *A Faithful Narrative,* 7. After this point, Patience Boston's narrative turns its attention away from her life and experiences, and focuses on her religious conversion.

after her acquittal for infanticide eventually brings her to the frontier, where she hopes, despite her status as a servant, to find increased freedom and autonomy.

Patience Boston's life also illustrates from the inside facing out the ways that the English constructed a set of institutions which effectively enslaved Indians by limiting their options, so that in every way they turned they faced some form of service to the English. Patience Boston used her willingness to murder children, or at least to confess to the murder of children, as a form of resistance. Although it is possible to see these acts as drunk and desperate, it is also possible to read them as the perfect rebuke to an English system which promised Indians that the best thing for their own good was to serve the English. Indian servitude attempted first and foremost to impose English order on disorderly Indian communities by embedding individuals in English households. Patience Boston insisted that the English were not ordering her community, but disordering it, not strengthening families through Puritan morals, but destroying them. Ultimately, Patience Boston's narrative is a challenge to Puritan society, a damning account of the failure and implicit violence of the paternalistic narrative of race and family which defined Indian and African servants' status in English households.

Patience Boston's narrative also demonstrates the tensions faced by interracial couples. The force, perhaps love, or perhaps something less scrutable, which pulled Boston and her husband together, and led Boston to give up her freedom for an interracial and intercultural relationship, ended up producing a marriage that was volatile and unsatisfactory. Furthermore, the institutions of slavery and indenture allowed Patience Boston to separate from her African husband and move to Maine in

search of greater freedom—a separation which would have been much more difficult for an English couple to achieve.

Indian and African intermarriage defied English ideas about race by incorporating African men into Indian communities, and by forging dynamic new Afro-Indian communities and identities. Colonial governments restricted white New Englanders from marrying Africans and Indians by law and custom. Massachusetts nearly passed a law criminalizing marriage between Indians and whites in 1706, but Samuel Sewall managed to remove Indians from the act before its passage, restricting the ban to intermarriage between Africans and the English.[57] Meanwhile, enslavement and war led to a paucity of men in Indian communities, while a preference for African men as slaves led to a shortage of women in African communities.[58]

African men found that by joining Indian communities they could acquire land, property, and status that were denied to them by mainstream New England society. Indian women, on the other hand, found a way of sustaining their communities in the face of English efforts to count them out of existence. Intermarriage and Afro-Indian individuals probably account for a large part of the discrepancy between English and Indian accountings of reservation populations, such as Pequot sachem Mary Momoho's insistence that the Pequot community consisted of

---

[57] Daniel Mandell,"The Saga of Sarah Muckamugg: Indian and African American Intermarriage in Colonial New England," in *Sex, Love, Race: Crossing Boundaries in North American History,* edited by Martha Hodes (New York: New York University Press, 1999), 74.
[58] Newell, "Indian Slavery," 59.

"above one hundred and thirty," where the English had counted only "three men and four squaws."[59]

In "'Colored' Seamen in the New England Whaling Industry," Russel Lawrence Barsh argues that "African American and Indian communities were so extensively intertwined by kinship and employment that they should be considered together as a single antebellum socioeconomic class."[60] Afro-Indians within the whaling industry were neither entirely African nor entirely Indian, but rather adopted elements of both identities. Furthermore, Barsh argues that the refusal of historians to accept this fact has led to a dramatic disconnect in the historiography of the New England whaling industry, where scholars concerned with Indians emphasize the ability of Indian communities to absorb Africans, while scholars concerned with African-American communities emphasize the the blackness of Afro-Indians.[61]

It is clear even from Barsh's own research that Indian communities such as Mashpee, which served as the "crucible of Afro-Indian consciousness and solidarity," retained their identity as Indian communities.[62] The porousness of these communities to related African and Afro-Indian communities did not pollute Indian identity, but rather enriched it. In 1767 Massachusetts passed an act "to regulate the Indians at Mashpee," which consistently referred to the population of Mashpee as "Indian and molatto."[63] However, the content of the law, which echoes other laws passed in the eighteenth century to protect Indian communities from fraudulent land sales, white

---

[59] Connecticut Archives, "Indians," 2nd Series, vol. 2: 22, in Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 72.
[60] Russel Lawrence Barsh, "'Colored' Seamen," 81.
[61] Barsh, "'Colored' Seamen," 80.
[62] Barsh, "'Colored' Seamen," 85. Barsh is following Francis G. Hutchins, *Mashpee: The Story of Cape Cod's Indian Town* (West Franklin NH: Amarta Press, 1979).
[63] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 204. Molatto in this context signifies Afro-Indian.

encroachment, debt, and illegal indenture, makes it clear that the addition of the word "molatto," while reflecting the changing demographics of the Mashpee community, did not impede their fundamental recognition as Indians.

This does not mean that Indian communities did not at times resist or contest the ability of African and Afro-Indian men and women to control community resources. Historian Daniel Mandell argues that African American communities in New England adopted "patriarchal, market oriented values," which sometimes clashed with "Indian traditions of female independence . . . and community management of property."[64] For example, in the late eighteenth century, the Nipmuc Indian Sarah Burnee contested her half-brother Joseph Aaron's claim to Indian land and Indian ancestry on the basis of his race. However, Burnee's claim failed and the Afro-Indian Aaron was accepted as a full member of the Nipmuc community at Hassanamisco.[65]

Although intermarriage in the context of reservation communities provided land and status to free Africans, while revitalizing demographically struggling Indian communities, Afro-Indian communities also formed in the context of slavery. A series of six advertisements placed in the *Boston News-Letter* by various members of the Niles family of Narragansett, Rhode Island between 1704 and 1708 offer a glimpse into an African and Indian slave community in the early eighteenth century, well before free Africans became a significant presence in Indian spaces. The advertisements do not directly evidence intermarriage, but they demonstrate that African and Indian slaves worked together doing agricultural labor. The slaves

[64] Mandell, "Saga of Sarah Muckamugg," 86.
[65] Mandell, "Saga of Sarah Muckamugg," 82.

owned by the Niles family moved between the Indian community at Narragansett and the English plantation where they worked. They also moved around New England following patterns set both by their own kinship ties and by the Niles family itself, which owned land in Braintree, Massachusetts and on Block Island, as well as in Point Judith and South Kingston, in Narragansett, where Nathaniel Niles farmed 500 acres.[66]

In 1704 the nineteen year old Indian man Harry, who belonged to Nathaniel Niles, ran away from Capt. John Aldin in Boston.[67] The next year an unnamed twenty-six year old "Indian manservant" ran away from Samuel Niles of Kingston, and a Spanish Indian Manservant, "aged about 28 years," ran away from the same master in 1706.[68] Samuel Niles's servants bore the signs of a hard life, including small pox scars on their faces, and old, worn clothing.

The fact that entire Indian and African families ran away, often with small children, demonstrates that for the inhabitants of the Niles's plantations in Rhode Island, running away was not just a form of rebellion, but also the promise of a new life for oneself and one's family. In 1706 a "negro woman" ran away from Nathaniel Niles Junior of Point Judith, Narragansett, bringing with her "4 small Children, three of them are Molattos, and the youngest a Negro that sucks or is lately weaned." A year later, another African woman ran away with her two year old child from the same farm.[69] These Mulatto children were almost certainly Afro-Indians. Masters in

---

[66] Gary Boyd Roberts, Ed., *Genealogies of Rhode Island Families from The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, vol. II, Niles-Wilson* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1989), 5-6. In this context, Narragansett is a geographic designation which encompasses multiple Indian and English towns in Rhode Island.
[67] *Boston News-Letter*, June 12-19, 1704.
[68] *Boston News-Letter*, Oct 1-8, 1705; July 22-29, 1706.
[69] *Boston News-Letter*, Oct 7-14, 1706; April 21-28, 1707.

New England benefited from erasing Indian identity, transforming Indian indentured servants into Mulatto or African slaves. Margaret Ellen Newell argues that New England courts "fostered ethnic slippage by designating Indian servants as mixed-race or black, often over their objections."[70]

The Indian family of John Ame that fled from their master Nathaniel Niles had already been gone for months when Niles placed his advertisement in April 1708. Ame was an Indian from Cape Cod "of middle Age and Stature," who had fought under Colonel Church, probably against the French in Maine or Acadia. He and his "Squaw" carried their two year old child with them in the dead of winter, but Ame must have had an extensive network of contacts and communities across New England, from Cape Cod where he was born, to Rhode Island where he lived and Maine where he served in the military with other Indians who had since scattered across New England. Although they spoke English, Ame's family had not fully assimilated. Poised between English and Indian worlds, John and his family's clothing reflected Indian and English cultures. They wore only "partly . . . English Cloaths, and commonly a Blanket over them," probably draped over their shoulders as a mantel, following traditional Indian practices.[71]

Although the families which the Niles family advertised for in the *Boston News-Letter* were certainly seeking long-term freedom, Indian and African servants also ran away for shorter periods. In 1729 Rhode Island passed a law "to regulate Indian dances," which noted that:

---

[70] Newell, "Indian Slavery," 59. In colonial New England, the term mulatto often referred specifically to Afro-Indian individuals. African ancestry rendered them enslaveable, but mulattos used Indian identity to contest enslavement.

[71] *Boston News-Letter*, April 12-19, 1708. On Indian clothing in the colonial period, see Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775,* 133-137.

> It is very common in this colony, and especially in Westerly and South Kingston for Indians to make dances, which has been found by experience to be very prejudicial to the adjacent inhabitants, by their excessive drinking and fighting, and wounding each other; and many servants are enticed to out-stay their time at such dances, and run away from their masters.[72]

These dances signify the continuing connections between reservation communities and plantation communities such as the Nathaniel Niles plantation in South Kingston. They also demonstrate the continuation of indigenous culture and community among Indian slaves.

The Niles's Indian and African servants were not starved for food, and both Indians and Africans were frequently described as "fat," "thickset," or even "well fed."[73] Nor were they cut off culturally from local communities—they had access to dances, parties, and alcohol. However, like Patience Boston, Indian and African slaves in Rhode Island perceived that the English rhetoric which portrayed Indian servitude as a crucible in which better, more orderly Indian families could be forged was a farce. These Indian and African families sought autonomy and freedom, with infants cradled on their backs if necessary.

The Narragansett Indian Samuel Niles probably grew up in the same household as the unnamed Indian runaways from 1705 and 1706, acquiring the name Samuel Niles from the experience. When African slaves bought or received freedom, they usually took the surname of their first or favorite owner, and Niles was probably following the same practice.[74] After his indenture to Niles, Samuel returned to the Narragansett community at Charlestown, where about 350 Indians combined Indian

---

[72] Vaughan and Rosen, *New England Laws,* 460.
[73] *Boston News-Letter*, April 12-19, 1708; Oct 7-14, 1706; April 21-28, 1707.
[74] Piersen, *Black Yankees,* 35.

and English subsistence traditions, farming, fishing, hunting, and working among the English in the whaling trade, or in domestic or agricultural labor.[75] By the 1740s Niles was a prominent Indian New Light Minister, and his leadership was political as well as religious. Niles led the body of the Narragansett community in a protracted legal and political conflict against their hereditary sachem, Thomas Ninigret, whom the English recognized as "owning" the Narragansett's collectively held land, which Ninigret routinely sold to pay off debts.[76]

The New Light movement appealed to unconverted Indians in southern New England such as the Mohegan, Pequot, and Narragansett, in large part because "its teachings included revelations, visions, and trances, which were prevalent in Indian ceremonies and rituals," and in part because it offered Indian communities greater autonomy than traditional missionaries such as Experience Mayhew were willing to offer.[77] Joseph Fish, a puritan missionary to the Narragansett, was mortified by the "Strange, Gross, Horrible Ideas and notions" of an Indian living in the home of Samuel Niles in 1773, who claimed he "Had Seen the *Great God* . . . Had seen Jesus in Heaven, A handsome Man. Seen also a Multitude of Folks in Heaven, Resembling Butterflies of Many Colours."[78] This vision of Christianity has far more in common with indigenous religious practices of "vision quests, the seeking out of sacred spaces,

---

[75] Joseph Fish, *Old Light on Separate Ways: The Narragansett Diary of* Joseph Fish, *1765-1776,* edited by William S. Simmons and Cheryl L. Simmons (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1982), xxx.
[76] Fish, *Narragansett Diary,* xx.
[77] Kim Burgess, "The Pequot's Conversion to Christianity," in *Spirit Wars: Native North American Religions in the Age of Nation Building,* edited by Ronald Niezen (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 43. The Narragansett explicitly rebuked Experience Mayhew's efforts to preach to them in 1713. Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 58-59.
[78] Fish, *Narragansett Diary,* 93.

dreams, and induced trance . . . and soul travel" than with the stringent Puritanism Fish was taught at Harvard.[79]

According to Joseph Fish, Samuel Niles was "a Sober Religious Man, of Good Sense and great Fluency of Speech," who "has a good deal of the Scriptures by heart, and professes a Regard for the Bible. But his unhappiness is this, He cannot read a Word, and So is wholly dependent . . . upon the Spirit to teach him Doctrine and Conduct." To Fish, Niles was always "in imminent danger of leaving The Word, for the Guidence of Feelings, Impressions, Visions, Appearances and Directions of Angels and of Christ himself in a Visionary Way."[80] A similar complaint could probably have been lodged against many New Light ministers, but Niles's combination of illiteracy, Indian identity, and spiritual influence and persuasiveness must have confounded the English puritans who surrounded the Narragansett reservation where Niles established the Separatist Narragansett Church.

Despite Niles's own illiteracy, he recognized the importance of education for Narragansett youth and encouraged Fish to open a school at Charlestown in the 1760s. The school was intended to foster the independence of the Narragansett. However, the English had tremendous difficulty persuading the Indians to take out a mortgage to finance the construction of the school house, due to the Narragansett's fear that "Instead of having them [the children of the Narragansett] Brought up to Learning," they would be obliged to bind their "Children Servants to the English Creditors."[81]

---

[79] Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500-1650,* 190-191.
[80] Fish, *Narragansett Diary*, 4-5.
[81] Fish, *Narragansett Diary,* 26.

The New Light movement was also deeply popular among African slaves, who, like Native people, found it more in keeping with their own religious traditions. In the early 1740s James Davenport, a traveling New Light minister from Long Island, converted hundreds of people in Stonington, Connecticut, "doing especially prodigious work among the blacks there."[82] At the same time as the English minister Davenport was converting African slaves and freedmen in Stonington, Samuel Niles was preaching at the Eastern Pequot community just outside of town.[83] Echoing his experience in Narragansett twenty years later, Joseph Fish, who was then minister of the Stonington Congregationalist Church, convinced the Eastern Pequot to join him in worship in exchange for Fish's support in establishing a school. However, Fish complained that the Pequot preferred Narragansett ministers.[84]

Samuel Niles was not the only Narragansett who travelled around New England. Narragansett from Charlestown travelled to port cities and English farms in search of work. In June of 1768 Fish complained that there was "Scarce an Indian to be found at home [in Charlestown]; As the Busy Season called them Abroad."[85] Many of these workers were probably engaged in some form of unfree labor, such as debt peonage or judicial slavery.

In Narragansett, Fish frequently met with mixed Indian and African audiences. In 1767 Fish was "prevented Going . . . to Narraganset" and "missd An Opportunity of preaching to 200 People, Indians, Negro's and White people," and in 1769 Fish preached "to Sixty Indians, Including Negros." The school which Fish

---

[82] Piersen, *Black Yankees,* 68.
[83] Although the Narragansett and Pequot are very much distinct cultures and peoples, Stonington, CT, and Charlestown, RI, are only about fifteen miles apart.
[84] Burgess, "The Pequot's Conversion to Christianity," 44.
[85] Fish, *Narragansett Diary,* 45.

opened for the Narragansett was also attended by "Strangers (of other Tribes, Molattos, etc.)"[86] It is impossible to know how active Africans were in Niles's congregation. Most Narragansett were bilingual by the mid-eighteenth century, and Niles probably preached in some combination of the Narragansett and English languages. In Mashpee, which was if anything a less insular community than Narragansett, the Wampanoag dialect remained dominant into the late eighteenth century, and language barriers may have limited the participation of outsiders in Native communities.[87]

At the same time, the shared experience of the New Light movement and its broad appeal to Africans and Indians, combined with the experience of working together on plantations near Charlestown such as those owned by the Niles family, eased the process by which Africans were brought into Native communities—a process evidenced by the growing presence of Afro-Indian "mulattoes" in Indian communities like Charlestown and Mashpee. In 1735 the English Samuel Niles's "Negro Man Mingo" married his "Indian Woman Servant Sarah." Mingo and Sarah probably moved to Braintree from Narragansett with their master as children in 1711.[88] Sarah probably retained ties to Narragansett, and Mingo and Sarah may have returned to Charlestown together during holidays, and perhaps permanently in their old age.

---

[86] Fish, *Narragansett Diary,* 40, 55, 14.
[87] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 179.
[88] *Diary of Samuel Niles,* First Congregational Church, 12 Elm St., Braintree, Massachusetts, 218; Roberts, *Genealogies of Rhode Island,* 5. In 1711, Niles became minister of the church in Braintree. Alternatively, Sarah and Mingo might have been transferred to Braintree from one of the Niles family's plantations in southern Rhode Island at a later date.

Niles and the New Light ministers continued a process, begun in the early eighteenth century, of establishing a new "Indian" identity which would cut across what had once been ethnic and cultural boundaries between groups such as the Narraganset, Wampanoag, or Pequot. This new identity also cut across wider boundaries, incorporating "Carolina" or "Spanish" Indians, New England Indians, and Afro-Indians. As time passed, this identity was strengthened by shared experiences, such as indenture or slavery in English households, and cultural ties, both indigenous and those, like Christianity, which were adopted and adapted to Indian communities.

As a young man, Samuel Niles worked alongside African slaves, Spanish Indians, and Indians like John Ame who hailed from Cape Cod, fought the French, and served the English Niles family at Narragansett. After Niles's church was established Mohegan, Pequot from Groton and Stonington, Western Niantic, and Montauk from Long Island travelled to Narragansett to hear Niles preach.[89] However, in the early eighteenth century racial "Indian" identities were not yet fixed. Indians constructed new kinds of communities which existed both within and alongside English communities and households. Indians like James Spaniard and Africans like the slave Peter moved between English and African communities, using Indian knowledge and spaces to find greater autonomy.

From the English perspective a very different process was occurring, as Indian and African identities became increasingly racialized. It is difficult to distinguish between racial identities being adopted and shaped by Indians and Africans, and racial identities being imposed on them. However, already by the eighteenth century

[89] Burgess, "The Pequot's Conversion to Christianity," 44.

the basic logic of race in New England had been established. In *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England,* Jean M. O'Brien explains that Indian history was relegated "to a degeneracy narrative marred by racial mixing and cultural loss. Conversely, non-Indian New Englanders reserved to themselves the authorship of recorded time," a "progress narrative" which asserted "cultural dynamism" as "the privilege of whiteness." Africans occupied "a different position in this racial formation," they were "narrated as polluted—their blackness can never be lost, washed away, or fully purified."[90]

This racial logic did important ideological work for the settler community, by leading inevitably to the "disappearance" or extinction of Indian peoples, while segregating African people as permanent outsiders whose labor would multiply in the service of the settler colonial project. African men who married into Indian communities directly defied this racial logic. Reservation communities which absorbed Africans posed a serious threat to their colonial overseers. In the words of Amy Den Ouden, Indian communities, "impoverished and desperate as their circumstances were," nonetheless "*produced and sustained kin and community ties on their own terms,* and in the face of a history that had demanded their annihilation."[91] The very process of interracial mixing by which Indian "blood" was supposedly "corrupted" into extinction became a tool for regeneration.

Indian communities persisted in New England despite slavery and indentured servitude, because through and within these violent and oppressive institutions, and in unceasing resistance against them, Indians were able to form new communities and

---

[90] O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting,* 107.
[91] Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 34. Emphasis in original.

new identities which defied English proscriptions for their behavior, identity, and race.

Conclusion

William Apess and the Legacy of Slavery

In 1829 the Pequot William Apess published *A Son of the Forest: The Experience of William Apess.*[1] Unlike the narrative published in Patience Boston's name, or the biographies assembled by Experience Mayhew, William Apess framed his biography without interference. *A Son of the Forest* articulates a pan-Native identity through a Native voice, and offers an inside view of indentured labor in the early Republic period.[2] The Native identity which Apess inhabited can only be understood in the context of a history in which new Indian communities and identities were forged in slavery and servitude.

Apess begins his narrative with a history of the Pequot:

> As the story of King Philip is perhaps generally known, and consequently the history of the Pequot tribe, over whom he reigned, it will suffice to say that he was overcome by treachery, and the goodly heritage occupied by this once happy, powerful, yet peaceful people was possessed in the process of time by their avowed enemies, the whites.[3]

Apess's restatement of King Philip's War is an act of forgetting crucial to the project of pan-Native identity. With or without his awareness, Apess's historical inaccuracies are doing important political work, by finally eliding the political

---

[1] Apess published *A Son of the Forest* in 1829. It was revised and republished in 1831. I have relied on the 1831 edition reprinted in *On Our Own Ground.* William Apess, *A Son of the Forest: The Experience of William Apess, A Native of the Forest, Comprising a Notice of the Pequod Tribe of Indians, Written by Himself* (1829, revised 1831) in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* edited by Barry O'Connell (Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992).

[2] Apess makes clear that "the proper term which ought to be applied to our nation . . . is that of '*Natives'*—and I humbly conceive that the natives of this country are the only people under heaven who have a just title to the name." In deference to this statement of identity, I have adopted the term "Native" in place of "Indian" for my discussion of Apess. Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 10.

[3] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 4.

distinctions between "friend" and "enemy" Indian established after King Philip's War, a war in which the Pequot fought on the side of the English. Not only was Philip king of the Wampanoag, he was *enemy* of the Pequot. Throughout the eighteenth century, the Pequot and other Native communities opposed colonial narratives that portrayed them as "conquered" or "captive" by asserting themselves as friends and allies of the English, in opposition to "Enemy Indians" such as King Philip.[4] By rewriting King Philip as a Pequot, Apess created a common history of persecution and violence for New England's Native peoples, finalizing an erasure of historical distinctions between Native nations which institutions of slavery and servitude, racial mixing, and Christianity had all done their part to dissolve over the course of the eighteenth century.

William Apess was born in Connecticut in 1798. Apess's father was of "mixed blood, his father being a white man and his mother a native," but when his father was old enough "to act for himself, he joined the Pequot tribe." Apess's mother was a Pequot "in whose veins a single drop of the white man's blood never flowed."[5] Despite Apess's somewhat ambiguous statement of his mother's racial purity, Apess's mother was probably of mixed African and Pequot ancestry.[6] For the

---

[4] Connecticut Archive, "Indians," 1st series, vol. 1: 75, in Ouden, *Beyond Conquest,* 148-149. In 1713, the Pequot submitted a petition asking the English to protect their reservation lands that alluded to their relationship as friends and allies in King Philip's War, and subsequent colonial conflicts: "we shall always bear a Grateful Remembrance and Acknowledgement [of the English] which we and our fathers have also shown by our ready and cherfull Obedience to the comands of this Govermt whenever they have had Occasion to order us out Against the comon enemy." The Pequot used this assertion to defend their lands as Native space, and their petition explicitly marked the indigenous place-names which survived beneath their English replacements, such as "ye New Settlement of the English *at Pequott (now New London).*" For a similar appeal made by the Mohegan, see Brooks, *The Common Pot,* 72-73, and by Mashpee, see the Petition of Mashpee Indians that their Children not be made Servants," *Massachusetts Archives,* vol. 30: 456, discussed in chapter 3.
[5] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 4.
[6] Barry O'Connell, *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* edited by Barry O'Connell (Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), xxvii, note 17.

first three years of Apess's life, the family lived "in comparative comfort" in Colchester, Connecticut, where Apess's father worked as a shoemaker, and his mother Candace was a slave.[7]

By 1800, the specter of slavery was fading in New England. In 1784 Connecticut passed a "Gradual Emancipation Act," and declared that the children of enslaved African Americans born after 1, 1784, were to be granted freedom upon reaching the age of 25.[8] In 1805, when Candace Apess was emancipated, she was listed by her owner as a "negro." Fifteen years later, in the 1820 Federal Census, both of Apess's parents were identified as free whites, a change which reflects the mutability of racial identity, even in the nineteenth century.[9] When Apess was three years old his parents "quarreled, parted, and went off to a great distance," leaving him and his two brothers and sisters with his mother's parents.

The Apess family was miserably poor, "clothed with rags . . . and happy to get a cold potato for our dinners . . . our wants almost totally disregarded by those who should have made every exertion to supply them."[10] One evening, Apess's grandmother returned home intoxicated, and:

> without any provocation whatever on my part, began to belabor me most unmercifully with a club; she asked if I hated her, and I very innocently answer in the affirmative as I did not know what the word meant and thought all the while that I was answering aright . . . whereupon she continued beating me, by which means one of my arms was broken in three different places.[11]

---

[7] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 4-5.
[8] Bingham, *History of Connecticut,* 390.
[9] O'Connell, *On Our Own Ground,* xxvii, note 17.
[10] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 5.
[11] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 6.

Apess was rescued from his Grandmother's murderous rage by his uncle, who then informed their white neighbor. Apess was removed from his grandparents home, supported at the expense of the Town of Colchester for a year, and then bound out to the Furman family.

"I presume," Apess writes, "that the reader will exclaim, 'What savages your grandparents were to treat unoffending, helpless children in this cruel manner.'"[12] Apess refuses to let his family's poverty and violence further the stereotype of Native Americans as "savage" or uncivilized, and he unsettles the distance between "Indian" and "white" that those stereotypes were intended to create. Apess underlines the social framework of domestic violence, and turns the blame back on the (white) reader: "I attribute it ["this cruel and unnatural conduct"] in a great measure to the whites." Whites, Apess argues, introduced alcohol to the Natives, "wronged them out of their lawfull possessions," and "committed violence of the most revolting kind upon the persons of the female portion of the tribe," who were corrupted by "the arts, and vices, and debaucheries of the whites."[13]

When Apess and his siblings lived with his grandparents, the Furman family occasionally "took pity on us . . . bringing us frozen milk."[14] By the time Apess came to live and work in the Furman household, there was already an emotional bond between Apess and his white family.[15] At the same time, indenture in a white family alienated Apess from his identity as a Native. Apess wrote that "the great fear that I entertained of my brethren [Native people] was occasioned by the many stories I had

---

[12] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 6-7.
[13] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 7.
[14] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 5.
[15] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 7.

heard of their cruelty toward the whites—how they were in the habit of killing and scalping men, women and children."[16] The "mere threat of being sent away among the Indians in to the dreary woods," wrote Apess, "had a much better effect in making me obedient to the commands of my superiors than any corporal punishment."[17] White New Englanders deployed stories about "savage Indians" as a disciplinary tool.

The sense of family and kinship which Apess felt in the Furman household was always subordinate to their economic relationship. When Apess was eleven years old, he hatched a plan to run away, and when it was discovered, Mr. Furman sold his indenture for twenty dollars.[18] Just a child, Apess was "as unwilling to go now as I had been anxious to run away before," but Furman persuaded him to "try it for a fortnight." It was only when Apess returned home two weeks later that the surprised Furman informed him that he had in fact been sold.[19]

Apess was fifteen when he ran away for good. His indenture had been sold again, to William Williams in New London. Dispirited by Williams's disapproval of Apess's decision to join the Methodist church, as well as a trying relationship with the other servants in the house, and frequent beatings, Apess "began to lose sight of religion and God," and ran away.[20] Apess and a white indentured servant from a neighboring household fled on foot, and in doing so they joined a tradition dating back to the Pequot War of Native, African, and Mulatto slaves and servants running away.

---

[16] Apess continues, "if the whites had told me how cruel they had been to the "poor Indian," I should have apprehended as much harm from them." Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 11.
[17] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 10.
[18] In 1804, twenty dollars would have been "about two months salary for a common laborer." Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 14, note 7.
[19] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 14-15.
[20] Apess fully adopted the prevalent Christian view that servants should serve their masters faithfully, and *A Son of the Forest* does not celebrate his youthful rebelliousness.

Apess and his companion first looked to their local community—they followed the familiar path home to Colchester, where they spent a week with Apess's father. When the week was up, Apess told his father that he was returning home to William Williams, and then set off through the woods towards Hartford, where Apess hoped to find anonymity, work, and eventually, passage down the Connecticut River to New York. Apess and his companion spent some time in Hartford, but they were unable to find work on a ship, so they set out on foot to New Haven, and then worked their way south to New York.[21]

A little over a month after they ran, William Williams placed an advertisement in the *Connecticut Gazette* offering a fifteen dollar reward for Apess's return. Unable to find work on a ship, and with a bounty on his head, Apess enlisted in the United States Army, and fought in Canada in the war of 1812. After the war Apess wandered around Canada, staying with Native communities, and finding work on farms around Montreal.[22] Apess returned home four years later and became a Methodist minister and missionary. Although technically two years remained on his indenture, Apess never returned to unfree labor.

In 1776 the white minister Gideon Hawley took a census of the Mashpee Indians, in which he identified four percent of the population as "Negros." Twelve years later, Hawley reported that nearly seventy percent of the Mashpee population was "mixed," and by 1791 Hawley referred to all Mashpee as "blacks."[23] The shift in the Mashpee population from "Indian" to "mixed" to "black" occurred, in Daniel

[21] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 22-23.
[22] Apess, *Son of the Forest,* 31-33.
[23] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 186-187.

Mandell's words, largely "within Hawley's mind."[24] In 1833, William Apess came to Mashpee to preach, and was formally adopted into the tribe.[25] Apess and the Mashpee reaffirmed a Native identity which was not polluted by racial mixing. Although Apess's Native identity was a racial identity in some ways, it was a very different kind of racial identity than that imagined by white Americans. Mashpee identity was forged in the community's history, their communal survival, and their relationship to the land and to their Native brethren.

Apess joined with the leaders of the Mashpee in a "revolt" against the encroachment and abuse of their white overseers. Apess articulated the demands of the Mashpee within both an Indian identity and an American identity, appealing to the United States Constitution:

> *Resolved,* That we [the Mashpee], as a tribe, will rule ourselves, and have the right to do so; for all men are born free and equal, says the Constitution of the country.
>
> *Resolved,* That we will not permit any white man to come upon our plantation, to cut or carry off wood or hay, or any other article, without our permission, after the 1st of July next.[26]

The Mashpee, as Apess forcefully observed when their white oppressors referred to them as "good citizens whom the government was disposed to treat well," were, "from the Declaration of Independence up to the session of the Legislature in 1834," not United States citizens.[27] But they were both Natives and Americans, and both identities afforded them inalienable rights to define their own communities on the land that had always been theirs.

---

[24] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 186.
[25] William Apess, *The Indian Nullification of the Unconstitutional Laws of Massachusetts, Relative to the Marshpee Tribe: or, The Pretended Riot Explained* (1835) in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* edited by Barry O'Connell (Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 174.
[26] Apes, *Indian Nullification,* 175.
[27] Apes, *Indian Nullification,* 183.

Native communities in the Early Republic were also spaces were African American identities could be forged. Like William Apess, Paul Cuffe was an important mixed-race public figure in nineteenth century New England. Paul Cuffe's father, Cuffe or Kofi, was a West African slave who came to New England in 1728, at the age of about ten, where he was purchased by a Quaker family, the Slocums of Dartmouth, Massachusetts.[28] In 1733, the Nantucket Friends became the first Quaker meeting in America to collectively denounce slavery, and as the tide of Quaker opinion turned against slavery in the 1740s, the Slocums freed Cuffe.[29]

In 1760, the Rev. Ezra Stiles recorded that seventy-five Natives lived among the English at Dartmouth, and a great many more lived in clusters of wigwams along Dartmouth's rivers, growing corn on their traditional lands.[30] Like many free Africans in eighteenth century New England, Cuffe married into this local Wampanoag community. In the 1760s, firmly ensconced within Native communities, the Cuffe family moved to Martha's Vineyard and settled in the Wampanoag community at Chilmark, where Cuffe worked as an independent merchant. By 1766, the family had saved enough money to return home and buy 116 acres in Dartmouth.[31] In 1784, Paul Cuffe married the Wampanoag Alice Pequit and went into business with his Wampanoag brother-in-law in Westport, Massachusetts; their partnership only employed African and Indian sailors.[32] By the early nineteenth century, Paul Cuffe was probably the wealthiest man of color in the United States,

---

[28] Lamont D. Thomas, *Rise to be a People: a Biography of Paul Cuffe* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 3.
[29] Thomas, *Rise to be a People,* 4.
[30] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 174.
[31] Thomas, *Rise to be a People,* 5. In moving to Chilmark, the Cuffes were part of a trend of disparate Indian communities consolidating around a handful of central communities, including
[32] Barsh, "'Colored' Seamen," 98.

and he had paid for a new Quaker meetinghouse and the town of Westport's first public school.[33]

Paul Cuffe identified at various times as Black, Indian, and "mustee" (Afro-Indian), and his sister, Freelove, was active in the Brotherton Indian movement. But by 1808, Paul Cuffe had become "black."[34] This was not an imposed identity, nor a false one, but it was a deeply political assertion. Unable to imagine the African race reaching their full potential in the shadow of America slavery, Cuffe spearheaded the first back-to-Africa movement in the United States. Cuffe hoped to establish a colony of free blacks in Africa, and in 1811 Cuffe travelled to Sierra Leone, where he met with colonial officials and indigenous Africans.[35] Meanwhile, Paul Cuffe's brother Jonathon moved to Martha's Vineyard and identified himself as a Gay Head Indian. In the words of Daniel Mandell, "Paul chose his father's identity and Jonathon chose his mother's, and both were accepted by their chosen communities."[36]

William Apess's articulation of Native identity and Native rights was inherently tied to the rights of all people of color, and to the experience of slavery and servitude: "Many of those who hold them [Native children] in servitude use them more like dogs than human beings . . . I had a sister who was slavishly used and half starved; and I have not forgotten, nor can I ever forget, the abuse I received myself."[37] In his *Eulogy On King Philip,* William Apess implicitly linked the struggles of African Americans and Native peoples through a historical narrative of King Philip's War:

---

[33] Thomas, *Rise to be a People,* 22.
[34] Barsh, "'Colored' Seamen," 98.
[35] Barsh, "'Colored' Seamen," 98, Thomas, *Rise to be a People,* 50-53.
[36] Mandell, *Behind the Frontier,* 192.
[37] Apess, *Indian Nullification,* 187.

> The most horrid act [of the Pilgrims] was in taking Philip's son, about ten years of age, and selling him to be a slave away from his father and mother. While I am writing, I can hardly restrain my feelings, to think a people calling themselves Christians should conduct so scandalous, so outrageous, making themselves appear so despicable in the eyes of the Indians . . . He that will advocate slavery is worse than a beast, is a being devoid of shame, and has gathered around him the most corrupt and debasing principles in the world; and I care not whether he be a minister or member of any church in the world.[38]

Out of New England's Native community, Apess's voice rose as a powerful condemnation of slavery, and of its power to degrade and destroy communities. By grounding his moral demand for the abolition of slavery in Native history, and speaking as a Native person, Apess actively defied the English belief that Native people were inevitably vanishing. To the extent that Native people appeared "degraded" in the nineteenth century, Apess implied, it was solely a reflection on the crimes of the English.

Despite enslavement, servitude, degradation, and encroachment, Native people persisted, survived, and found new ways to regenerate their identities and communities in the face of violent conquest and subjugation. In 1833 William Apess stood before the white settlers of America, declared himself proud to be Native, and in the same voice demanded that white Americans account for their crimes: "I know that when I cast my eye upon that white skin, and if I saw those crimes written upon it, I should enter my protest against it immediately and cleave to that which is more

[38] William Apess, *Eulogy on King Philip, as Pronounced at the Odeon, in Federal Street, Boston, by the Rev. William Apes, an Indian* (1836). in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* edited by Barry O'Connell (Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 301.

honorable. And I can tell you that I am satisfied with the manner of my creation, fully."[39]

[39] William Apess, *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians of the Pequod Tribe; or An Indians's Looking-Glass for the White Man* (1833) in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* edited by Barry O'Connell (Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 157.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Boston News-Letter (Boston: B. Green, 1704-1726) Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

Diary of Peter Thatcher, Manuscript Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

Diary of Samuel Niles, First Congregational Church, 12 Elm St., Braintree, Massachusetts.

Massachusetts Archives Collection, Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston.

Middlesex County Court Records, Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston.

Suffolk Files Collection, Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston.

Superior Court of Judicature for the colony of Massachusetts Bay, Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston.

Suffolk County Probate Records, New Series, vol. II. Case No. 956. Massachusetts State Archives, Columbia Point, Boston.

Published Legislative and Court Records

Konig, David Thomas, ed. *Plymouth Court Records, 1686 - 1859,* 16 Vols. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier with the Pilgrim Society, 1978-1981.

Noble, John, ed. *Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, 1630-1692,* 2 vols. Boston: The County of Suffolk, 1901-1904.

Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts, 9 vols. Salem MA: The Essex Institute, 1911-1975.

Shurtleff, Nathaniel B. and Pulsifer, David, eds. *Records of Plymouth Colony,* 12 vols. Boston: The Press of William White, Printer to the Commonwealth, 1855-61.

Trumbull, J. Hammond and Hoadley, Charles Jeremy, eds. *Records of the Colony of Connecticut, 1689-1776,* 15 vols. Hartford: Press of Case, Lockwood and Brainard, 1850-1890.

Vaughan, Alden, and Rosen, Deborah, eds. *Early American Indian Documents: Treaties and Laws, 1607-1789: Vol. 17, New England and Middle Atlantic Laws.* Bethesda, MD: University Publications of America, 2004.

Other Primary Sources

Alice Sachemus Indenture (1723-26). Special Collections, Indians, Folder 2, the Pilgrim Society, Plymouth. Online at The Pilgrim Society, http://www.pilgrimhall.org/natamdocs.htm#1723%20indenture (accessed Mar. 7, 2012).

"An Agreement between the Inhabitants of Wamouth concerning their Land sold now to the Towne off Wamouth," (1642, addendums 1652, 1685). In *Historical Sketch of the Town of Weymouth, Massachusetts, from 1622-1884*, 251-253, compiled by Gilbert Nash. Weymouth MA: Weymouth Historical Society, 1885. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=lJJuAAAAMAAJ (accessed April 3, 2012).

Apess, William. *A Son of the Forest: The Experience of William Apess, A Native of the Forest, Comprising a Notice of the Pequod Tribe of Indians, Written by Himself* (1829, revised 1831) in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* 3-97, edited by Barry O'Connell. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

———. *Eulogy on King Philip, as Pronounced at the Odeon, in Federal Street, Boston, by the Rev. William Apes, an Indian* (1836) in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* 377-310, edited by Barry O'Connell. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

———. *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians of the Pequod Tribe; or An Indians's Looking-Glass for the White Man* (1833) in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* 119-161, edited by Barry O'Connell. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

———. *The Indian Nullification of the Unconstitutional Laws of Massachusetts, Relative to the Marshpee Tribe: or, The Pretended Riot Explained* (1835) in *On Our Own Ground: the Complete Writing of William Apess, A Pequot,* 166-274, edited by Barry O'Connell. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

Boston, Patience. *A Faithful Narrative of the Wicked Life and Remarkable Conversion of* Patience Boston *alias* Sampson; *Who was Executed at* York, *in the County of* York, July 24th 1735, *for the Murder of Benjamin Trot of* Falmouth *in* Casco Bay, *a Child of about Eight Years of Age, whom she Drowned in a Well*. Boston: Printed and sold by S. Kneeland and T. Green. in Queen-Street over against the prison, 1738. Early American Imprints, Series 1, no. 4245. (Filmed).

Church, Thomas. *Entertaining Passages Relating to Philip's War* (1716). In *So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677,* 370-470, edited by Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1978.

Deed 192: Benjamin Gibbs to Joshua Scottow. *Suffolk deeds, Volume 11.* Edited by Frank Bradish. Boston: Rockwell and Churchill Press, 1900. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=CqE1FME4irMC (accessed April 5, 2012).

Fish, Joseph. *Old Light on Separate Ways: The Narragansett Diary of* Joseph Fish, *1765-1776,* edited by William S. Simmons and Cheryl L. Simmons. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1982.

Gardner, Lion. *Leift Lion Gardner his relation of the Pequot Warres* (1660, first printed 1833) in *History of the Pequot War,* 113-149, edited by Charles Orr. Cleveland, OH: The Helman Taylor Company, 1897. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=iE4TAAAAYAAJ (accessed March 28, 2011).

Gookin, Daniel. *An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of The Christian Indians in New England in the Years 1675, 1676, 1677* (1677) in *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society Vol. 2,* 423-534. Cambridge: Folsom, Wells, and Thurston, printers to the University, 1836. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=sR4GAAAAQAAJ (accessed Nov. 29, 2011).

———. *Indian Children put to Service* (1676) in *Historical and Genealogical Register of the New England Historic-Geneological Society, Vol. 8,* 270-273. Boston: Samuel G. Drake, publisher, 1854. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=XwgQAQAAMAAJ&pg (accessed Nov. 29, 2011).

Hubbard, William. *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England, from the first planting thereof in the year 1607. to this present year 1677. But chiefly of the late Troubles in the two last years, 1675 and 1676* (1677) reprinted in *The History of the Indians Wars in New England,* edited by Samuel Drake. New York: Burt Franklin,1865). Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 2002. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=C_sNL6T9DGUC (accessed June 4, 2012).

Josselyn, John. *Colonial Traveler: A Critical Edition of Two Voyages to New-England* (1674) edited by Paul J Lindholdt. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1988.

Mason, John. *A Brief History of the Pequot War: Especially of the memorable Taking of their Fort at Mistick in Connecticut in 1637* (written and printed in part 1637, first printed in full 1736) in *History of the Pequot War,* 1-46, edited by Charles Orr. Cleveland, OH: The Helman Taylor Company, 1897. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=iE4TAAAAYAAJ (accessed Mar. 28, 2011).

Mather, Increase. *A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in Newe England* (1676) in *So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677,* 55-206*,* edited by Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1978.

Mather, Cotton. *The Diary of Cotton Mather, 1681-1724,* 2 vols., in *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections, Seventh Series, Vols. VII-VIII.* Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1911.

Mayhew, Experience. *Indian Converts,* (1727) edited by Laura Arnold Leibman. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008.

Morton, Thomas. *New English Canaan* (1637) edited by Jack Dempsey. Scituate, MA: Digital Scanning, 2000.

Mary Rowlandson. *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God, Together, With the Faithfullness of His Promises Displayed; being a Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson* (1682) in *So Dreadful a Judgement, So Dreadful a Judgment: Puritan Responses to King Philip's War 1676-1677,* 301-369, edited by Richard Slotkin and James K. Folsom. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1978.

Sewell, Samuel. *Diary of Samuel Sewell, 1674-1729,* in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Fifth Series, vols. 5-7.* Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1878.

Stockwell, Quentin. *Quentin Stockwell's Relation of his 1677 Captivity and Redemption* (1684) in *Captive Histories: English, French, and Native Narratives of the 1704 Deerfield Raid,* 35-48, edited by Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Thacher, Peter, Taylor, John, and Robbins, Nathaniel. "Milton (Mass) Church Records, 1678-1754," edited by William Blake Trask, in *Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. 22*, 259-266. Boston: New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 1868. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=eyocy7cBriYC (accessed April 3, 2012).

Thacher, Peter. "Rev. Peter Thacher's Record of Marriages at Milton, Mass." in *Historical and Genealogical Register, Vol. 36*, 19-20. Boston: New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 1882. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=WitTGc7aszEC (accessed April 3, 2012).

Underhill, John. *News from America, or a late and experimental discovery of New England* (1638) in *History of the Pequot War,* 47-92, edited by Charles Orr. Cleveland, OH: The Helman Taylor Company, 1897. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=iE4TAAAAYAAJ (accessed Mar. 28, 2011).

Vincent, Philip. *A True Relation of the Late Batell fought in New England, between the English and the Pequet Salvages* (1638) in *History of the Pequot War,* 93-112, edited by Charles Orr. Cleveland, OH: The Helman Taylor Company, 1897. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=iE4TAAAAYAAJ (accessed Mar. 28, 2011).

Williams, Roger. *A Key Into the Language of America* (1643). New York: Cosimo Classics, 2009.

———. *Letters of Roger Williams, 1632-1682,* ed. John Russell Bartlett. Providence, RI: The Narragansett Club, 1874.

Winthrop, John. *Winthrop Papers, vol. 3,* edited by Allan Bailey Forbes. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1943.

Secondary Literature

Andrews, Henry F. *The Hamlin family: a Genealogy of Capt. Giles Hamlin of Middletown, Connecticut, 1654-1900*. Exira, IA: Published by the author, 1900. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=NbVQ7e1hZ9IC (accessed Mar. 21, 2012).

Bacon, Everett C. *Commemorative biographical record of Middle-sex County, Connecticut: containing biographical sketches of prominent and representative citizens, and of many of the early settled families*. Chicago: J.H. Beers, 1903.

Barsh, Russel Lawrence. "'Colored' Seamen in the New England Whaling Industry," in *Confounding the Color Line: the Indian-Black Experience in North America,* 76-107, edited by James F. Brooks. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Bingham, Harold J. *History of Connecticut,* vol. 1. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, 1962.

Bragdon, Kathleen J. *Native People of Southern New England, 1550-1650.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.

———. *Native People of Southern New England, 1650-1775.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2009.

Breslaw, Elaine. *Tituba, Reluctant Witch of Salem: Devilish Indians and Puritan Fantasies.* New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Brooks, James F. *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Brooks, Lisa L. *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Bross, Kristina and Wyss, Hilary E. *Early Native Literacies in New England: A Documentary and Critical Anthology*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008.

Burgess, Kim. "The Pequot's Conversion to Christianity," in *Spirit Wars: Native North American Religions in the Age of Nation Building,* 42-45, edited by Ronald Niezen. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Cave, Alfred A. *The Pequot War.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1996.

Coffin, Joshua and Bartlett, Joseph. *A Sketch of the History of Newbury, Newburyport, and West Newbury, from 1635 to 1845.* Boston: S.G. Drake, 1845. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=FHZoBM9HefUC&dq (accessed April 5, 2012).

Cronon, William. *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. New York: Hill and Wang, a division of Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1983.

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

Desrochers, Robert E. Jr. "Slave-for-Sale Advertisements and Slavery in Massachusetts, 1704-1781." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 59, No. 3 (Jul. 2002): 623-664. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3491467 (accessed Jan. 28, 2011).

Dickinson, James Taylor, and Dwight, Samuel. *Genealogies of the Lymans of Middlefield, of the Dickinsons of Montreal, and of the Partridges of Hatfield*. Boston: D. Clapp & Son, 1865. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=pEdjAbnE87wCl (Accessed Mar. 21, 2012).

Donald, Leland. *Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Douglas-Lithgow, Robert Alexander. *Dictionary of American-Indian Place and Proper Names in New England: with Many Interpretations, Etc*.. Salem MA: Salem Press, 1909.

Earle, Alice Morse. *Customs and Fashions in Old New England.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.

Ekburg, Carl J. *Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007.

Fickes, Michael L. "'They Could Not Endure That Yoke:' The Captivity of Pequot Women and Children after the War of 1637." *The New England Quarterly,* Vol. 73, No. 1 (Mar., 2000): 58-81. http://www.jstor.org/stable/366745 (accessed July 13, 2011).

Foster, Thomas A. *Sex and the Eighteenth Century Man: Massachusetts and the History of Sexuality in America.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2006.

Gally, Alan. *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

Graham, Sandra Lauderdale. *House and Street: The Domestic World of Servants and Masters in Nineteenth-Century Rio de Janeiro.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988.

Hamilton, Edward Pierce "The Diary of a Colonial Clergyman Peter Thacher of Milton," in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Third Series, Vol. 71, (Oct. 1953 - May 1957): 50-63.

Handler, Jerome S. "The Amerindian Slave Population of Barbados in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Carribean Studies,* vol. 8, no. 4 (1969): 38-64. http://jeromehandler.org/1969/01/the-amerindian-slave-population-in-barbados-in-the-seventeenth-and-early-eighteenth-centuries/ (accessed June 3, 2012).

Henigman, Laura. "I Would be a Witness Against My Self," in *Writing British Infanticide: Child-Murder, Gender, and Print, 1722-1859,* 91-111, edited by Jennifer Thorn. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.

Hill, Hamilton Andrews and Bigelow, George Frederick. *An Historical Catalogue of the Old South Church (Third Church) 1669-1882.* Boston: Printed for Private Distribution, 1883. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=8kU7dSi6qWUC&vq (accessed April 5, 2012).

Hirsch, Adam J. " The Collision of Military Cultures in Seventeenth-Century New England," *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 74, No. 4 (1988): 1187-1212. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1894407 (accessed April 4, 2012).

Kavanagh, Sarah. "'A City of the Dead:' Indian Ghosts and Haunting Hegemonies at Indian Hill Cemetery, Middletown, CT." Honors Thesis, Wesleyan University, 2004.

Lauber, Almon Wheeler. *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times within the Present Limits of the United States,* in *Studies in History Economics and Public Law vol. 54,* Edited by the faculty of Political Science of Columbia University. New York: Columbia University, 1913. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=WhkOAQAAIAAJ&pg (accessed Mar. 28, 2012).

Leach, Douglas Edward, *Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip's War.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1958.

Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philips War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Vintage Books, 1999.

Loomis, Hon. Dwight, and Calhoun, Gilbert. *The Judicial and Civil History of Connecticut*. Boston: The Boston History Company, 1895.

Mandell, Daniel. *Behind the Frontier: Indians in Eighteenth Century Eastern Massachusetts*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

———. "The Saga of Sarah Muckamugg: Indian and African American Intermarriage in Colonial New England," in *Sex, Love, Race: Crossing Boundaries in North American History,* 72-90, edited by Martha Hodes. New York: New York University Press, 1999.

Miles, Tiya. *The House on Diamond Hill: A Cherokee Plantation Story.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

———. *Ties that Bind: The Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Morgan, Jennifer L. *Laboring Women: Reproduction and Gender in New World Slavery*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Newell, Margaret Ellen. "Indian Slavery in Colonial New England," in *Indian Slavery in Colonial America,* 33-66, edited by Alan Gallay. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

———. "The Changing Nature of Indian Slavery in New England, 1670-1720" in *Reinterpreting New England Indians and the Colonial Experience,* 106-136, edited by Colin G. Calloway and Neal Salisbury. Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 2003.

Nicholas, Mark A. "Mashpee Wampanoags of Cape Cod, the Whalefishery, and Seafaring's Impact on Community Development." *The American Indian Quarterly,* vol. 26, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 165-197. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4128458 (accessed Feb. 3, 2012).

O'Brien, Jean M. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Ouden, Amy Den. *Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.

Parsons, Usher. *The life of Sir William Pepperell, Bart: The Only Native of New England who was Created a Baronet During our Connection with the Mother Country*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1855. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=3bANAAAAQAAJ (Accessed April 1, 2012).

Pierson, William. *Black Yankees: The Development of an Afro-American Subculture in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Plane, Ann Marie. *Colonial Intimacies: Indian Marriage in Early New England*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Preble, Capt. George Henry U.S.N. "Notes on Early Ship-Building in Massachusetts," in *The New England Historical and Genealogical Register and Antiquarian Journal*, 124-130, Vol. 25, No. 1. Boston: David Clapp & Son, 1871. Google Books, http://books.google.com/books?id=WxHVAAAAMAAJ (accessed Feb. 25, 2012).

Richter, Daniel K. *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

———. "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 40, No. 4 (1983): 528-559. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1921807 (accessed April 4, 2012).

Roberts, Gary Boyd, Ed. *Genealogies of Rhode Island Families from The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, vol. II, Niles-Wilson*. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1989.

Sainsbury, John A. "Indian Labor in Early Rhode Island." *The New England Quarterly,* Vol. 48, No. 3 (Sep. 1975): 378-393. http://www.jstor.org/stable/364865 (accessed Sept. 30, 2011).

Salisbury, Neal. *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

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

Silverman, David J. *Faith and Boundaries: Colonists, Christianity, and Community among the Wampanoag Indians of Martha's Vineyard, 1600-1871*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

———. "The Impact of Indentured Servitude on the Society and Culture of Southern New England Indians, 1680-1810." *The New England Quarterly,* vol. 74, no. 4 (Dec. 2001): 622-666. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3185443 (accessed Feb. 3, 2012).

Simmons, William S. *Spirit of the New England Tribes: Indian History and Folklore, 1620-1984*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1986.

Snow, Dean R. and Lanphear, Kim M. "European Contact and Indian Depopulation in the Northeast: The Timing of the First Epidemics." *Ethnohistory,* Vol. 35, No. 1 (Winter, 1988): 15-33. http://www.jstor.org/stable/482431 (accessed Feb. 2, 2012).

Thomas, Lamont D. *Rise to be a People: a Biography of Paul Cuffe.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986.

Veracini, Lorenzo. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Vickers, Daniel. *Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex CountyMassachusetts, 1630-1850*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

———. "The First Whalemen of Nantucket." *The William and Mary Quarterly,* Third Series, vol. 40, no. 4 (Oct. 1983): 560-583. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1921808 (accessed Feb. 3, 2012).

Wagner, David and Dempsey, Jack. *Mystic Fiasco: How the Indians Won the Pequot War* (Scituate, MA: Digital Scanning, 2010.

Winiarski, Douglas L. "A Question of Plain Dealing: Josiah Cotton, Native Christians, and the Quest for Security in Eighteenth-Century Plymouth County," *The New England Quarterly*, Vol. 77, No. 3 (Sep. 2004): 368-413, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1559824 (accessed April 4, 2012).