BRIDGET BENNETT *University of Leeds*

The Crisis of Restoration

Mary Rowlandson's Lost Home

Catastrophic loss marks Mary Rowlandson's 1682 captivity narrative from almost its opening lines. Toward the end of the first remove she laments her fate in the following long sentence:

> All was gone, my Husband gone (at least separated from me, he being in the Bay; and to add to my grief, the *Indians* told me they would kill him as he came homeward) my Children gone, my Relations and Friends gone, our House and home and all our comforts within door, and without, all was gone, (except my life) and I knew not but the next moment that might go too. (Rowlandson 71)

This moment of sorrowful recognition opens with an expression of inclusion and continues by delineating a set of losses. She starts and finishes with a totality—"all"—and moves from intimate human relationships—"my Children . . . Relations . . . Friends"—to material objects that carry an affective load as well as being signifiers of status and well-being—"our House and home and all our comforts." They bring mental solace as well as physical and spiritual ease.[1] Since "all" are envisaged as already "gone," as she terms it, indicating the depth of her loss, they have also already moved to an imaginary or at the least intangible realm. They can only be restored imaginatively and textually, through language and an act of naming that invokes them momentarily only to register their absence more fully. The sentence finishes by stating that even Rowlandson's future existence was uncertain, for her life could be taken from her at any time. Her words resonate with Hamlet's mournful protestation to Polonius that "[y]ou cannot take from me anything that I will not more willingly part withal—except my life, except my life, except my life" (253), evoking a similar sense of bleakness and dismay.[2]

The fleeting verbal reinstatement reveals just how much has "gone," a word she uses five times, making her anguish resonate profoundly. The sen-

tence is a lament, compiled from a series of repetitions, each of which suggests a terrible gap caused either by death, absence, or separation. It suggests a longing for a more sustained restitution and the comfort it would bring. Her narrative ultimately reveals the fact that she is both redeemed and then restored, terms that delineate the process of bringing her back into her colonial Puritan family and community. Yet it also shows the way the experience of attack and captivity changes the structure of her family and her affective life. Her youngest child and several close family members die as a direct consequence, so the family's full reunion is not possible. She cannot ever return to the family home, "our House" from which she was taken, as it has been destroyed in the attack: "all was gone," as she puts it.

Home is what is lost to Rowlandson at the start of the narrative and is what she aims textually, affectively, and materially to rebuild. The title of her narrative names Rowlandson herself as the subject of this process—*A Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*—suggesting that it is her restoration from captivity that the first-person work depicts. Yet while this is certainly the case, regarding Rowlandson only as subject to restoration by others elides her persistent preoccupation with what she is restored to and what is restored to her—how she tries to render herself whole once more. The reestablishment of home is of key significance to the larger process charted in her work. Restoration thus emerges as not just adverting to the process of returning a female Puritan captive to her community, as the title of the narrative suggests and its prefatory material by Ter Amicum[3] reiterates, but to defining the terms of colonial encounter through its impact on the home and its articulation using metaphors about home. It suggests that what needs to be repaired is a colonial home that requires spiritual and military protection. The restoration of Mary Rowlandson is also a reinstatement of one set of claims of home and a legitimization of the processes—including the violence—of colonization, settlement, and nation building. Though these are evidently (and importantly) political, economic, and religious, they also have a strong affiliative and affective element.

Thinking of Rowlandson's narrative in this manner helps develop strategies for reading other representations of home under conditions of extremity through emphasizing shared concerns. I argue that one important reason for the continuing appeal of her text is its treatment of what crisis does to the idea of home and how it deepens understanding of the

way the imagination creates or invents home even in profoundly unlikely conditions. Rowlandson depicts the physical destruction of her house, the death of close family members, and her longing for a lost past and anticipation of a better future. These crises force recognition and analysis of something that can otherwise seem inchoate and expansive—the multiple meanings of home. The narrative obliges us to consider what is threatened when home is lost and the implications for subjects who experience this. Her work does this through an account of the impact of a terrible ordeal on a white colonial woman for whom the destruction of home forces sustained and self-conscious reflection on her subjectivity. The destruction of her house and family, in other words, is depicted as awakening her fuller understanding of what home means, and this has continued relevance in a period in which environmental, political, and economic crises continue to threaten homes.

The way home comes into particular focus through warfare and violent displacement has been incisively described by a recent memoir in which the refurbishment and reparation of a house is its explicit driving force. Anthony Shadid's *House of Stone: A Memoir of Home, Family and a Lost Middle East* (2012) focuses on his literal rebuilding of, and relocation to, an abandoned family dwelling place in Marjayoun, Lebanon. Shadid was brought up in Oklahoma in a large diasporic community whose ancestors had fled warfare in the Middle East. Despite the claims of the country in which he was born and raised, he maintained an attachment to an ancestral site that exerted a powerful imaginative hold. He writes, "We are a clan who never quite arrived home, a closely knit circle whose previous generations were displaced during the abandonment of our country decades ago. When we think of home, as origin and place, our thoughts turn to Isber's place" (xvi). He represents his physical renovation of a material structure as emblematic of a broader reconstruction, undertaking the formidable project after the collapse of his first marriage due to the demands of his work as a Middle East newspaper correspondent. Writing of the life he had shared with his wife and daughter in Maryland, he says that "I had tried to keep a hand on home, but was a kind of guest star, and sometimes, as wars accelerated, I forgot the plot unfurling there" (15). As one home disintegrated he turned to another, in a place that was familiar and longed for as a way of rebuilding his life. Yet though his text casts him as an Arabic-speaking Lebanese American, he remains a foreigner in Lebanon, betrayed

by his "Oklahoma-accented Arabic, sprinkled with Egyptian colloquialisms" (16) as well as his American insistence on a "specific budget" (33) organized in advance, before restorative building work could commence. Just as in Rowlandson's narrative, the distinction between these different kinds of crisis—personal, political, linguistic, cultural, and so on—is not always easy to maintain. His memoir engages with the multiple sites and definitions of home in the context of diaspora and with their relation to memory. His diasporic sensibility is reflected in a hybrid vocabulary: Shadid uses both the English word *home* and Arabic word *bayt* to move between complex cultural assumptions to explain his profound attachment to both languages and the subtly different emphases denoted by these synonyms and produced from his experience of calamity.

Though Rowlandson's overt allegiances are to English words and people, this position is complicated by her familiarity with Indian place names: her Englishness is not of the kind that would be produced in England. Benedict Anderson identifies what he describes as her "nationalizing moment" ("Exodus" 315) as taking place after the crisis of capture. He describes the point when she sees what she calls English fields and cattle near Squaukheag: "one observes the strange, thoroughly creole crosscurrents in her words" (314). These take her across languages and over an ocean: Rowlandson, born in England but living in New England, must negotiate a complex subject position.[4] Crucially, Anderson notes that it is fair to assume that "up till the point of her abduction she had thought matter-of-factly about cattle as cattle and fields as fields" (315) but that the crisis of experiencing "fearful exile" (315) alters all this. He is right to note that she has no more reason to explain the meaning of the Indian name to her readers than she has to explain what it is to call land or animals English. Both are meaningful to her and become still more so through the crisis she undergoes. To the contemporary readers who encountered her text on the other side of the Atlantic in England, however, Rowlandson's own subject position was unlike theirs. She shows a newly emerging understanding of her status as a colonial Englishwoman who longs for a specific home that both is and is not English, a colonist who is forever altering the meaning of what home is.

While her identification with English fields and cattle is crucial, what is also important to the argument I set out here is Anderson's further observation that this "moment" disappears once she is redeemed. He notes that

"she has managed, more or less, to come home. But this home is Lancaster; it is not (yet) America" ("Exodus" 315). Reabsorbed into her community she can once again occupy a place within which she does not have to be as self-reflective as she was while captive. Yet her experiences mean that she can never again be the same young wife and mother she was before the ordeal she has experienced. Lancaster can never be home again because of the memory of being held captive, the damage done to her house, and the death and injury caused to her family and neighbors. As she shapes her postcaptivity life and creates her new home she fashions herself in conjunction with newly emerging colonial sensibilities.

Another account of displacement caused by violence, Salman Rushdie's description of returning to his childhood home in Bombay (Mumbai) years after Partition had forced his family to leave for "the unmentionable country across the border" (9), introduces a different word, *homeland*, and a moment of restoration that also focuses on a remembered house and an act of writing. In his essay "Imaginary Homelands," Rushdie links the concept of homeland not just to a house or home but to the way Indian diasporic writers imaginatively recreate sites of origin. While he welcomes the power of the imagination he also warns of the problems of exclusivity that the word *homeland* often connotes.[5] Rushdie's lost home, unlike Rowlandson's Lancaster house, is in another country and continent from the one he lives in when he writes about it in this essay. Visiting the house present to him until this point only in a black-and-white photograph in his London study, he describes his overwhelming emotion: "I realized how much I wanted to restore the past to myself, not in the faded greys of old family-album snapshots, but whole, in CinemaScope and glorious Technicolor" (9–10). The encounter produced an overwhelming desire to "reclaim" (10) a lost past. Decoupling homeland from a simple relationship to nation or ethnicity and allying it to culture, he argues that diasporic writers have a tradition of migration and displacement that provides a model for understanding their own histories in relation to other places and periods. He sees US American writers as primary exponents of this: "America, a nation of immigrants, has created great literature out of the phenomenon of cultural transplantation, out of examining the ways in which people cope with a new world" (20).[6] This can be claimed by other displaced and diasporic people, such as Indian writers.

Here, while I interpret Rowlandson's narrative within the framework

of such a diasporic tradition of representing loss, transplantation, and restoration, I recognize that she is also (unlike the two Anglophone writers with whom I have compared her) a white colonist. Her act of home making negates the claims of the indigenous occupants of Massachusetts and actively displaces them from their homes. Nonetheless all three writers have shared preoccupations and all of them have family histories involving forced migration: Rowlandson's Puritan family, like those of many other seventeenth-century Puritans, did not find England a congenial place to live. Before Rowlandson experienced the physical destruction of her New England house she had already left behind a country whose language and traditions she took with her to the new land she moved to. An important connection between each of these very different texts is that home is a kind of a palimpsest in which the physical structure of a house represents something much more intangible—the *idea* of home. In each case too, the imaginative invocation of a particular house always simultaneously invokes another home or homes. The precious lost home is a crucial element out of which a new one is constructed.[7] For Rowlandson, the complexity of what has been lost allows her varied and intricate emotional and cultural responses. She was a transplanted Englishwoman-turned-colonist, a Puritan, a wife, a mother to children born in the colonies, and a captive living with her Indian captors, sharing their food and shelter for a period of her life. Home changes dramatically and obviously in her narrative. The differing ways she writes about it indicate its complex valence for her. Her text is an example of a body of writing that tells of the movements and experiences of early modern subjects transplanted from their natal homes, first by journeys undertaken within the contexts of larger imperial or colonial projects and then by being taken captive against their will by people whose own lives were profoundly affected by the experience of contact.[8] This is the wider framework within which Rowlandson's description of her captivity and restoration takes place. It involves international trade and piracy, imperialism and national self-interest, underpinned by the movements of people and goods and people as goods.

Here I examine what happens when home is threatened by a physical attack on its material manifestation—"our House," as Rowlandson puts it—and what happens to its integrity as a locus of imaginative force, a dwelling in which a family lives—"and home." I consider Rowlandson's narrative through its articulation of her desire to maintain the integrity of both these

elements under conditions of emergency. Her text constructs the home as simultaneously the site of both intimate relationships and colonial encounter. It is the place of sanctuary and retreat from the unknown into what is safe and familiar, her Puritan family. Yet also, when it is attacked, it is revealed as having been the very contact zone itself all along. Though a fortified building designed to protect its occupants, the house may also have been the site of varied negotiations between the Rowlandsons and indigenous people who engaged with them in trade, performed household work, and so on.[9]

A focus on home highlights a central element of the colonizing process, the fashioning of sites and spaces by settlers establishing claims on the land, backed up by all the overt weapons of colonization—new laws and their enforcement, warfare and other violence, diplomacy, the naming and renaming of places. The imaginative and ideological shift that transforms a previously unfamiliar landscape into home for new settlers is a crucial element of how colonization and ultimately nation building take place in less obvious, though extraordinarily powerful, ways. If the idea of home seems more inchoate than that of nation it is because it does not and cannot have the kind of features that mark out a nation, though there are resemblances between the two. Especially for settlers, it is often markedly transnational, existing outside formal borders. Yet it is available to be co-opted into nationalist discourses. This can claim for it a singularity of the kind that the rhetoric of homeland shares, simplifying and shaping it for ideological reasons and encouraging a collective link to an area—not always a nation—of special affiliative power. The idea of a homeland is especially powerful within the context of diaspora, in which imagining the possibility of return is foundational.

Home is increasingly recognized as a significant and productive critical concept. Though it appears to be profoundly intuitive and universal, even stable, it names a set of connections and relations linking the material with the intangible and affective, rendering each more weighty as they are brought into relation to each other. So home is therefore more than the sum of its parts. A house is a material structure and is also the stuff out of which home might be fashioned. It is not of itself home, though, and requires imaginative and emotional work to effect such a transformation. Home is both a location (though not necessarily a single one) and an affective category. As a term it is also expansive, used metaphorically to encom-

pass what it means to be comfortable "at home" as well as what it means to feel unsettled or uncomfortable "not at home." This is at the heart of Sigmund Freud's celebrated formulation in his 1919 essay "The Uncanny" with its well-known distinction between the *heimlich* and *unheimlich*.[10] Analyses of space and place, migration and diaspora have developed a substantial and growing body of critical work in which home is an organizing principle.[11] Issues of exile, marginalization, and homelessness have also been the subject of work in which contestations about home and ownership, whether in terms of property rights or larger political arguments about borders, have been important.[12] This has shown the connections between home and how it has been imagined, its relation to material culture and jurisprudence, and the practices and processes that underpin and help to maintain it. Scholars in the humanities have sometimes concentrated on material culture but have also reflected on the cultural impact of the idea of home and multiplicity of representational practices that produce and reinforce it.[13] Such work extends the considerable body of scholarship produced on the domestic within American studies through conceiving of that as one, albeit key, element of the way in which a broader idea of home is managed both in organization and political significance.[14] Home is an abstract noun that encompasses material ideas, represented by dwelling places and physical structures, and also ideas of belonging and community usually shaped by factors such as religion, culture, language, and ethnicity. These can coalesce and accrue political shape through the formation of a nation-state.[15] By definition, home also circumscribes conditions of nonbelonging and "exclusions" at local (even familial) and national or global levels.[16]

A commonplace of critical reactions to Rowlandson's narrative is the claim that captivity has a significant impact on her that is registered through writing. While scholars have noted that she expresses a strong desire to return home throughout her narrative, the complexity of what that might constitute and its larger significance for colonial American literature needs further elaboration. In what follows I interpret Rowlandson's account of her captivity and restoration through complex negotiations between different and sometimes competing understandings of home. Using detailed analysis I argue that while home has multiple iterations, the most significant is as a discursive formation underwritten by imaginative and affective identifications and shaped by Puritan typology. *Home* is thus a

word she uses repeatedly but seldom elaborates on. I show that rather than this diminishing its meaning, it suggests the profundity of her affective attachment to an idea that shapes her narrative and is a response to her displacement from those things that make home for her. She demonstrates a profound affiliation that remains broadly constant, even while the objects that produce it and the context within which it is produced alter radically. In other words, despite all the pressures it comes under, it maintains a significant integrity and weightiness. This shows the deep importance it has to her as well as, I argue, to the structure and form of the Indian captivity narrative and its context in colonial America and lasting impact. Her work, long claimed as a foundational US American text, is an important precursor to a tradition of writing about relocation and loss that reaches beyond the nation. Yet at the same time it is a key text by which we can understand the drama of dreams of restitution and return that often animate nation building but that are also characteristic of diaspora.

The long sentence I quoted in opening was written retrospectively after her release: at the point of writing her narrative Rowlandson was no longer a captive.[17] She had been reunited with the surviving members of her family but not restored to the home she had lost. Her work shows her emergence as a speaking and writing subject responding to traumatic rupture.[18] The sentence includes two words that appear for the first time in her narrative: *homeward* and *home*. In this early formulation going homeward means returning to the family, household, and community.[19] But it also implies traveling west, symbolically repeating the earlier journey that had brought many English colonists across the Atlantic. Both words become increasingly significant in the narrative's later stages as Rowlandson describes her developing anxiety about the length of her captivity, her separation from her family and town, and the impact of her experience on her status and identity. However, the meanings of both words shift subtly but decisively as the narrative continues and the textual and geographical distance from the opening scene expands. They gradually loosen their initial associations with her family house and community. Instead they start to refer either to the series of places in which she lived while captive, notably the wigwams of her captors, or simultaneously to *both* her previous home *and* her places of captivity. By the end of the narrative the idea of home alters to center once more on the Puritan community and family to which she has been restored, rather than either the destroyed house that is per-

manently lost or Lancaster, in which it was located. The experience of captivity changes the ways in which she conceives of home geographically, affectively, and materially: as a place, a physical structure, and a source of comfort and community.

HOME AND THE CAPTIVITY NARRATIVE

Just as studies of home have been developing, scholars on captivity have invigorated the field by recent methodologies. In particular, exceptionalist interpretations of Indian captivity have been challenged in productive ways producing new readings of well-known texts. Furthermore, some scholars have expanded the range of texts that might be interpreted as captivity narratives, allowing for new contexts and approaches.[20] When examining the textual sources for what he calls the American captivity narrative (which expands the canon of such narratives to include the captivity of Americans outside North America) Gordon Sayre argues that Rowlandson's narrative and the account of John Smith's capture and "redemption" by the intercession of Pocahontas together constitute the "dual origin" (*American Captivity* 2) of the narrative. Yet this should not obscure the fact that both articulate a relationship to the broader Atlantic world and, in Smith's case, to international adventuring including his early experience of piracy and subsequent spell in Turkish captivity in the years before he traveled to North America.[21] His personal coat of arms included three turbaned heads to represent the three Turks he claimed to have beheaded before he was captive. In the years after he left New England he had encounters with English and French pirates (including a period in which he was held captive by French pirates). His experiences as captive and captor on both sides of the Atlantic epitomize the fact that some of the most cherished moments of US exceptionalist mythology to define and describe North America as home draw from far beyond its boundaries.

The idea of "dual origin" is also challenged by recent scholarship. This has contested the exceptionalist framework that frequently in the past governed readings of Indian captivity narratives.[22] Ralph Bauer reads the captivity narrative in hemispheric terms, that he argues will allow readers "to understand better both the distinctiveness of America's various New World transculturations vis-à-vis the Old World and inter-American na-

tional and regional differences" (666). Other critics expand this still further. Lisa Voigt argues that early modern captivity narratives draw on New World exploration and Old World histories including prior experience of Iberian and Moorish exchanges in the Mediterranean. Voigt's work participates in a significant revisionist historiography of captivity that scholars such as Paul Baepler, Robert C. Davis, Nabil Matar, Sayre, Daniel J. Vitkus, and Daniel E. Williams have all contributed to shaping, in different ways.[23] This both expands the canon and alters the interpretative frame for captivity narratives.[24] British transatlantic paradigms through which Indian captivity narratives (such as Rowlandson's) have often been read have been comprehensively and productively challenged. Thinking through, first, a cross-cultural and global textuality and, second, the manner in which Indian captivity was both scripted by (and helped to script) other narratives of captivity alters the interpretative framework through which the Indian captivity narrative can be understood. Scholars have looked for intertextual connections between otherwise apparently disparate narratives and drawn attention to figures whose personal experience extended beyond interactions between the colony and metropolis. In doing so they help to read captivity less in terms of the binaries of captive-captor and more as engaged with complex ideas of how peoples' lives intersect through imperial formations.[25]

Puritan colonists felt themselves to be menaced on many different fronts: by events in Europe that led them to seek new homes in the colonies, Barbary pirates who attacked them while at sea, and indigenous people in the New World.[26] The imperative of making a protective and protected home was profound. A critical focus on home in Rowlandson's narrative, a key exemplar of the Indian captivity narrative, does not involve a return to a more narrowly focused exceptionalism, however. It acknowledges the importance of Englishness to Rowlandson while locating her text within a more sophisticated and wide-ranging sensibility. Instead, I argue that conceiving of home as an important critical category for understanding Indian captivity allows for a refined recognition of the multiple sites, scales, places, and affective responses simultaneously existing and operating together. My reading of Rowlandson's narrative works within two emerging critical currents: scholarship on home and the developing scholarship on Indian captivity.

HOME AND THE INDIAN CAPTIVITY NARRATIVE

Rowlandson's *Narrative* opens with what I claim as the Indian captivity narrative's primal scene.[27] The protagonist is attacked, usually within his or her own house or settlement, and is taken. While other captivity narratives share many of its features, the focus on being taken from the place of residence rather than another location (such as at sea, often the site of special danger for Barbary captives) is particularly associated with Indian captivity. While home is invariably of significance this is especially the case where it is the place from which a person was captured. The captive goes on to live in another place or in a series of locations that are usually very unlike the one she or he has left behind. The captive individual has to negotiate with different languages, cultural practices, and political and social organizations. The new places in which the captive lives are often experienced as being profoundly alien or unhomely, as they often are for Rowlandson.

Differences between the protagonist's previous life and his or her experience during captivity may be features of repeated comment within the narrative, just as the moment of capture is too. The comparison between the two helps the captive understand his or her new condition within an ideological frame that reflects the captive's own worldview and that of the intended audience. The captive struggles to find ways of feeling at home in an environment that is unfamiliar, with captors experienced as hostile, and expresses a strong desire to return to both a different place and a previous existence. However, very often the captive's house is destroyed during the attack and family members die or become dispersed. The captive, whether ultimately redeemed or not, is therefore unable to enact any kind of fully realized return, as is the case with Rowlandson. The individual has to negotiate with a different or transformed home place-space or kinship group once freed. The place that is left behind often becomes a site of nostalgia, even trauma. Yet equally, it is the act of returning that gives the former captive the opportunity to tell his or her tale. In all these scenarios home names a place (geographical, temporal, and affective) around which key elements of the captive's life can be organized.

The experience of being captured alters the captive's understanding of his or her place in the world as well as the spatial and emotional parameters that shape home. This is true even if deaths or destruction of property had not taken place. It is most pronounced for a person who becomes acclima-

tized to the new conditions and remains with his or her captors, adapting accordingly. The captive establishes a new life with a chosen group, frequently using its language rather than the language spoken before captivity. This is often regarded as disturbing by the former community. For these transplanted and newly acculturated figures, sometimes known as white Indians, ideas or memories they may once have held of what constitutes home are altered by captivity. By the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, important cultural commentators such as Benjamin Franklin and Hector St Jean de Crèvecoeur were expressing anxiety about white captives who did not want to return. Cadwallader Colden wrote despairingly in 1747 that "[n]o arguments, no Intreaties, nor Tears of their Friends and Relations, could persuade many of them to leave their new Indian Friends and Acquaintance; several of them that were by the Caressings of their Relations persuaded to come Home, in a little Time grew tired of our Manner of Living, and ran away again to the Indians, and ended their Days with them" (Ebersole 191).[28] The shift emphasized above from "Friends and Relations" to "the Indians" passes through stages of intimacy, noting the difference between "new" friends and established family, the latter suggesting blood relations and a white community. The repudiation of their "Friends and Relations" and choice of new homes was not unique. Such reluctance was also noted by Henry Bouquet in 1765. He commented that white children captured when young and brought up with kindness regarded being restored to their families "in the light of a captivity" (29),[29] reversing the usual understanding of these categories. Those who are reluctant to return articulate a transformed understanding of home that was often regarded as being very unsettling.

Home is first figuratively and then literally destroyed once attacks expose the vulnerability of colonists. In the brief description of the narrative pattern of Indian captivity outlined here and characterizing Rowlandson's text, home's complexity is apparent. The security offered by the idea of home and of its physical signifier, a material structure, typically a house, is undermined by attack. Home offers sanctuary, but is always vulnerable to destruction. This can have an impact both on the structural design of houses, villages, and so on (materiality) as well as on the imaginative construction of home and the homeplace and its meaning (ideology). Home is unable to withstand certain kinds of danger, especially enemy attack, and this failure threatens to undermine its very status (material and ideologi-

cal) as a place offering physical and psychological shelter and protection. In the specific example of the colonial house, the recognition of its vulnerability could lead to fortification. In addition, colonists' awareness of the need to protect themselves against attack led to organization and resistance. In the case of Lancaster certain houses (including that of Rowlandson) were given the status of garrisons or garrison houses, which meant that they would protect more people than their usual occupants. They were structurally reinforced to assist this. The function of Rowlandson's house exceeded that of a simple dwelling place and merged with that of a fortress.

The many narratives of Indian captivity that circulated within the Atlantic world repeated this pattern of dislocation. They articulate a message of the vulnerability of white colonials to the predations of ethnic others—chiefly Indians—who were represented as posing a danger to vulnerable people, often white women and children, and the colony itself.[30] The trope of the destruction of people and property, particularly houses, becomes a key feature of many subsequent cultural productions in which whites and Indians were pitted against each other. It could take the form of juxtaposing apparently settled communities of property-owning whites who were in the process of transforming the land with mobile groups of Indians living in less fixed dwellings with a communally based relationship to natural resources. Seventeenth-century political philosophers developed a rights-based discourse that used private property and especially private land ownership as an indicator of human value. Indians were relegated to a position outside the fold of property-based ideas of rights and citizenship. By the nineteenth century and the most intensive period of aggression against Indians—in which there was a revival of interest in Rowlandson's narrative—private property was seen as one of the seminal distinguishing features that separated Indians and whites. As Michael Rogin puts it: "Indians, one nineteenth-century writer explained, were peculiarly characterized by 'the absences of private property,' the 'want of a home,' the practice of 'roaming from place to place,' and 'the habit of invading without scruple the land of others.' Only private property . . . saved mobile, expansionist Jacksonian America from fitting this description" (121). Cultural texts reproduced, often negatively, this relationship between the individual and the communal. The nineteenth-century frontier novel represented Indians as having a relationship to collective rather than individual ideas of prop-

erty and home. This extends well into the twentieth century in the western. The destruction of the white home, often central to both genres, bears a powerful ideological charge, juxtaposing the civilized against the savage. The series of twenty removes that Rowlandson uses for her narrative has a significant symbolic function, reiterating binaries of savagery and civilisation. It casts her captors unfavorably as primitive people without fixed homes in contrast to civilized colonists who face attack within their own houses. As many scholars have pointed out, distinctions between captors and captive are undermined, however, by shared needs for food and shelter. In effect, this means that both have need of key elements that frequently define a home: protection and nourishment. Rowlandson's ideological representation of her captors as rapacious savages is also challenged by the repeated instances of kindness shown toward her that she notes in ambivalent terms. In the nineteenth remove she writes that an Indian couple gave her food on "five or six" (101) occasions "and yet they were strangers that I never saw before" (101). However she adds that the husband had killed two Englishmen and kept their blood-stained clothes in the wigwam in which she was eating. Thus she is able to acknowledge generosity while also emphasizing the "savagery" of her hosts, which she represents as trumping their kindness.

MARY ROWLANDSON'S *NARRATIVE* AND HOME

Rowlandson's response to different and sometimes conflicting ideas of home corresponds to the complex ways in which many colonists negotiated their relationships to an English homeland and colonial homeplace. Home is a key—and complex—interpretive term in relation to captivity narratives. It operated at a literal level as a term with multiple resonances for real lives. Rowlandson's writing suggested the loss of home (first England, then Lancaster) as well as an imagined future (initially in Lancaster) and permanent homeplace (envisaged as New England itself) in which she could find security. Through associating home with a set of preferred customs, religious and cultural practices, and particular structures, she inscribed it with ideological imperatives that define the kind of place she wished it to become. In her varying and sometimes conflicting invocations of home Rowlandson anticipated the ways in which the processes of

colonization remake the unfamiliar and, in that ideological, political, and practical process, exclude those who cannot be accommodated to colonizsation.

Rowlandson's textual sources used metaphor and allegory to represent Puritan beliefs about the loss of home and search for a replacement. Rowlandson's ideas of home and captivity were never simply drawn from local, colonial engagements but drew from a much wider set of references, from the repeated invocation of biblical examples of captivity taking place in the Middle East to the significant models offered by such key texts as *Paradise Lost* (1667) and *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678).[31] These texts provided exemplary reading and showed that home, especially as it signifies a place of origin and comfort, was a key metaphor. They offered examples of lost homes as well as future ones. Satan is cast out of heaven at the start of *Paradise Lost*, never to return to this original dwelling place. Book 12 ends with Adam and Eve ejected from paradise in consequence of original sin, though with the possibility of ultimate restoration through the intervention of the son of God. Restoration to God and home requires recognition of the cause of separation and a period of reparation. Only through a journey of suffering and sacrifice and the redemption offered by the crucifixion can humans assure their return. The process is literalized in the allegorical journey Christian undertakes in *The Pilgrim's Progress*. He passes through a series of tests overcoming losses and trials eventually to arrive at the Celestial City. Both texts offered the opportunity to reflect on models of captivity (Christian's imprisonment in Doubting Castle, for instance, and Satan's in his own unhappy mind), exile (Adam and Eve's expulsion), and redemption (the promise of heavenly rewards within the Christian message). They showed the search for a new place to settle and a longing for what has been left behind and the multiple ramifications of separation from previous domiciles and modes of living. They did this in part by a focus on the journey itself, for the spiritual and worldly test it provided. The literal model of the journey used by John Bunyan is replicated structurally in Rowlandson's division of her narrative into a series of removes, each of which marks a separate moment of transition from one physical site to another, and between different experiences that variously challenge her faith.[32]

Rowlandson's writing emerged from a rich typology with established antecedents, a detail exploited by publishers. Collectively these texts form a significant context for Rowlandson's narrative. The first American edi-

tion of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1681), for instance, carried advertisements for sermons by Increase Mather and Samuel Willard and for Rowlandson's work.[33] The consensus that Increase Mather was the author of the preface to her narrative has grown and solidified. Critics have reflected on the kinds of political and cultural work performed by her narrative both in the colony and metropolitan center. The text is indisputably the most celebrated and well-known English-language Indian captivity narrative. It was published four times in 1682, the year of its first publication, and was a transatlantic publishing success. The first edition was issued in Boston, the second and third in Cambridge, and the fourth in London. A fifth was published in 1720, but the sixth did not appear until 1770.[34] This history suggests its significance as an English-language text articulating the experience of Puritan settlers within the colonies and recounting that experience to audiences there as well as in the metropolitan center that in some senses remained the homeland.[35]

Home was a powerful identificatory site for Puritan women, especially wives. The expectation that married women would see the home and the successful maintenance of the household as of supreme importance was articulated in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century conduct manuals. These commanded married women to stay within its boundaries. Henrie Smith's 1591 *A Preparative to Marriage*, for instance, observes that "we call the Wife, Huswife, that is house wife, not a street wife . . . to shew that a good wife keepes her house: & therefore Paul biddeth Titus to exhort women that they be chast, & keeping at home" (qtd. in Potter 156). The destruction of Rowlandson's Lancaster house, therefore, creates a predicament for her. How could she maintain the most valorized qualities of Puritan femininity? Since "keeping at home" is no longer possible, then finding a way to maintain its values is crucial if she is to remain virtuous. In this context virtue might be read as a synonym for remaining sexually inviolate, maintaining the activity of immersion in the Bible, and engaging with acceptable modes of interaction with her captors. Rowlandson emphasizes the degree to which each of these is true of the period of her captivity. Most commentators have noted the significance of her insistence on her sexual purity: she notes of her captors that *"not one of them ever offered me the least abuse of unchastity to me, in word or action"* (107). This claim to her inviolability is echoed in the preface to her text where it is given added weight by the testimony of a leading Puritan minister. Her constant citing

of appropriate extracts from the Bible emphasizes her protection of her religious beliefs and refusal to stray from what might be called the values of the "house wife." Finally, her engagement with modes of exchange and work acceptable to her gender and status (such as sewing and knitting) confirms her upholding of contemporary ideals of Puritan femininity. Yet at the same time her domestic skills allow her to operate with some dexterity within a subsistence economy in which her abilities have a value that she quickly recognizes and exploits, like a canny housewife.[36]

The parameters of Rowlandson's account are set in the early passage cited at the start of this essay. Her husband, Joseph Rowlandson, had been staying in Boston, petitioning the Massachusetts General Assembly for help protecting Lancaster from an anticipated attack. While he was away, it took place. Rowlandson had stayed at home like a good wife, yet this does not save her. The early paragraphs outline the siege by Nipmuc, Narragansett, and Wampanoag Indians. Rowlandson repeatedly refers to the dwellings in the town, alternating between calling them "houses" or referring to her house as a "Garison" (sic), indicating its status as a fortified dwelling. Her use of functional language can be seen in the opening paragraph of the *Narrative*. Looking out of the window she acts as an eyewitness to an event that was already under way. She writes of seeing "several Houses" burning and "five persons taken in one house" (68) and two under attack while "out of their Garison upon some occasion" (68). Four of those seven people were killed, all by being "knockt on the head" (68). Indian invaders use the roof of that garrison's barn as "their Fortification" (68) to protect themselves while they shoot at those collected in the garrison, killing four people. Immediately after that, what she calls "our own house" (68) is at risk. In her account of the events that follow, she uses a series of different names for it. She calls it "the house" on ten occasions. Once it is "this one house" and once simply "this house."[37] This factual mode of naming predominates. She also refers to "the Barn" twice and "our house" and "our Garrison" once each. In the middle of such violence she does not once used the more affect-laden word *home*.

After it has been under attack for around two hours, her enemies set it on fire: "There being no defence about the House, only two Flankers at two opposite corners, and one of them not finished . . . they fired it once and one ventured out and quenched it, but they quickly fired again, and that took" (69). This is a pivotal moment. While the initial fire was put out—

"one ventured out and quenched it"—a second took hold. By this time an Indian victory is assured and the rest of the introduction gives its bloody details. The fortified buildings have not protected their inhabitants and feminine virtue has not protected a Puritan wife.[38]

By the first remove she starts to call her house "home." Until that point of dramatic loss, she uses functional language to describe her surroundings. By using the word *home* she implies that the destruction of her house allows her to understand what she has lost and provides the occasion to reflect on how it might be remade. In other words it is the destruction of home (house, family, community, material possessions) and its transition into a textual and imaginative realm that transforms the way she writes about it. The process of remaking—of textual restoration—animates the rest of her narrative, as I outline below. Since she is writing at some distance from the moment that the original crisis happened, her lexical choices are made some time after the events she narrates. She writes in functional terms (albeit ones testifying to the violence of the events) and acknowledges the emotional consequences of the experience.

In the second remove she does not use the word *home* at all, but does describe leaving *the Town*, a word used for Lancaster in the previous remove (71). At this early point in the narrative Rowlandson clearly distinguishes herself from her captors. She laments the fact that she and her dying daughter have to spend the night sitting outside on the ground, though she does not mention that her captors did the same.[39] As the narrative progresses, however, she acknowledges that she gradually adapts to her new experiences and begins to accommodate herself to her surroundings. By the period of the third remove she uses the word *home* to refer to "my Masters [sic] Wigwam" (75) on three occasions. In the fourth remove the idea of returning is deflected onto Ann Joslin, her heavily pregnant neighbor who is also taken captive. She attributes Joslin's violent death at the hands of her captors to her repeated entreaties to go home. While in the eighth remove she reflects on her lost home more than once, by the ninth remove, *homeward* indicates first Lancaster but then, when she uses it for the second time a few lines later, the wigwam in which she was staying, on a site her captors had just moved to.[40] Already a shift can be seen in the way in which Rowlandson chooses to represent her relationship to home. Writing retrospectively, she depicts a transition in how she experienced captivity and the way it challenged her previously held ideas.

The word *home* is also invoked interchangeably in this remove. Rowlandson uses it first in a discussion of what she calls her "Masters [sic] maid" (84) who had been away from her home for three weeks collecting corn that had been stored in "the *Narrhaganset Country*" (84). She writes that the woman now "came home" and "brought home" some corn with her (84). Here it seems primarily and perhaps even exclusively to refer to the homeplace of another person (the "maid") or group of people (her Indian captors and the "maid" as representative of that group). While it might not seem surprising that the same word is used for both her dwelling place and that of another, the passage has more profound nuances. For immediately after this Rowlandson describes being granted permission to visit her son who was being held nearby. Getting lost while searching for him she reflects that:

> I cannot but admire at the wonderfull [sic] power and goodness of God to me, in that, though I was gone from home, and met with all sorts of *Indians*, and those I had no knowledge of, and there being no Christian soul near me; yet not one of them offered the least imaginable miscarriage to me. I turned homeward again, and met with my master, he shewed me the way to my Son. (84)

The use of the word *home* in this second example, just three sentences after the previous mention, complicates understanding of what it means at this point. The specific context suggests that she refers predominantly to the environs of the wigwam—"I was gone from home." This makes the wigwam not just the home of her master and his maid, as it was previously, but her own home too, so it also invokes the lost house in Lancaster. Such a meaning is immediately challenged by the implications of Rowlandson's statement that "I turned homeward again," to the wigwam. This is consolidated by her meeting with her "master" who then directs her to her son. What the sequence suggests is twofold. First, at this point in her narrative home primarily means the wigwam, rather than Lancaster. Second, it shows that home can mean two different—even opposing—things simultaneously.

She uses the word *home* one more time in this remove. Having visited her son, she finds that he is ill. Both are distressed. Rowlandson leaves him, simply saying, "We bemoaned one another a while, as the Lord helped us, and then I returned again. When I was returned, I found myself as unsatisfied as I was before" (84). Instead of using synonyms for home she simply

invokes the idea of return to describe leaving her son and going back to her master's wigwam: "I returned again." A few lines later she describes "going among the *Wigwams*" (84) and being treated with compassion by a squaw who gives her bear meat. She puts it in her pocket and says she "came home" (85), once again meaning her master's wigwam. Her description is loaded with affective resonances: when she returns "unsatisfied" from her son she does not use the word *home*, but when she is treated kindly, she does. Throughout the rest of the narrative a similar pattern of alternate uses recurs. It can mean Lancaster, the place she longs to return to, yet it can also refer to whichever place she happens to be staying in at that point. This changes regularly as her captors move frequently from place to place. The word *homeward* is used within a changing register too, reflecting her geographical location at a particular point in the narration. These different uses are not simply random, and they suggest, among other things, the complex pattern of repudiation and attraction Rowlandson experiences toward her captors, one that fluctuates in response to her emotions.

As the narrative continues, the ways in which Rowlandson invokes home and the synonyms she uses for it also change. She represents her relationship between her precaptivity and postcaptivity homes in a number of ways, notably through uncanny misrecognitions. Two important moments prepare the way for the altered idea of home that will eventually figure in her homecoming. The first is when she reveals that frequently, when sitting in a wigwam "and musing on things past, I should suddenly leap up and run out, as if I had been at home, forgetting where I was and what my condition was" (88). She adds that once she was "without" and looked about her, she realized where she was.[41] Later, in the sixteenth remove, she mistakes a large group of Indians for whites. She writes, "when they came near there was a vast difference between the lovely faces of Christians, and the foul looks of these Heathens, which much damped my spirit again" (94). Again she uses an overt refutation to show an appropriate response to the kind of potential political and religious catastrophe caused by her misrecognition. Just as the fortified house she once inhabited was unable to withstand physical attack, her religious-ideological fortifications cannot fully defend her previously held idea of home. In addition to these two moments, she depicts an uncanny transformation of Lancaster itself. Early in her narrative she writes that "[i]t is *a solemn sight* to see so many Christians lying in their blood, some here, and some there, like a company of Sheep

torn by Wolves" (70, emphasis added). She asks her captors whether she can stay the night in "a vacant house (deserted by the English before, for fear of the *Indians*)" (70) which they refuse to allow, saying "will you love *English men* still?" (71). When she eventually returns she describes what she sees as "*a solemn sight*" (107, emphasis added). The wording returns the reader to the opening of her narrative. Whereas the description initially suggested the experience of seeing her dead and dying neighbors, here it is used to describe seeing an empty and devastated place. She writes, "There I had lived many comfortable years amongst my Relations and Neighbours, and now not one *Christian* to be seen, nor one house left standing" (107–08). The textual repetition is developed by an account of staying for a night in "a Farm house that was left standing" (108), which she had wanted to do at the start of her narrative. Eventually able to fulfil that earlier desire, she writes that "a comfortable lodging we had, though nothing but straw to ly on" (108).

This is not the only detail repeated in the return to Lancaster. When the town is attacked she notes that even the garrison's "six stout" (69) dogs will not leave the house to defend their owners "though another time, if any *Indian* had come to the door, they were ready to fly upon him and tear him down" (69). The trope of silent dogs recurs at the end of her narrative when she leaves her captors and writes that she left "quietly and peaceably, and not a Dog moving his tongue" (107). Lancaster's dogs do not attack the Indians, and Indian dogs do not protest at the departing Rowlandson.

Her literal return is accompanied by and depicted through a linguistic one. The repetition of specific phrases creates a textual parallel that shows how the desired place of home has been rendered unhomely or uncanny by the experience of captivity. It cannot be fully restored, nor can she be restored to it, either literally or figuratively. Her captivity has forced on her a self-consciousness that she previously lacked. Rowlandson is obliged, like other captives, to remake her life. She describes the process of setting up house once more at the end of the twentieth remove. The generosity of strangers—"I was kindly entertained in severall Houses" (108)—is explicitly cited, though she does not note that this is a precise echo of the kindness offered to her by a number of her captors. Eventually she has a home once more, yet her peace of mind has gone: "*I can remember the time, when I used to sleep quietly and without working in my thoughts, whole night together, but now it is other wayes with me*" (111). Being "at home" includes

experiencing tranquillity and mental comfort, but Rowlandson can no longer have that peace of mind. The literal destruction of home has been accompanied by a psychical or emotional unmooring, a confusion about identification that her text must disavow if she is to maintain her status within her community. If, following Anderson, we read her text as one in which a nationalist identification appears and vanishes only to resonate elliptically throughout her text, it is also possible to read other more hidden possibilities. It tells, albeit indirectly and unsympathetically, the cost of nation building. In other words it depicts Indian resistance by invoking a trope of innocent occupation and violent rupture, a recurring and powerful motif within American cultural productions, especially those that focus on white-Indian relations. While her narrative's overt ideological message depicts her as victimized and homeless, her experiences allow for a subversive and different—even illicit—narrative to be detected.

Rowlandson's momentary slippages from desiring her proper Puritan community take her briefly into the territory of those white Indians whose confusing identifications made white cultural commentators so worried. The narrative depicts a transatlantic story of colonial encounter and transformation involving migration, settlement, and the founding of new homes and altered understandings of their implications. This was both a physical process involving material constructions and embodied protagonists and a psychological one involving the linguistic and imaginative fashioning of a place called home, which would eventually and slowly become the nation called the United States. Her story became incorporated into that transformation, her text reprinted frequently and read avidly for the insights it provided into how that fashioning started to take place. Restoring the place of home to her narrative renders that process more visible and reveals its subtle and affective, yet highly political, nature.

NOTES

I thank Zabelle Stodola and Betty Donahue for sharing their insights on Rowlandson and home when we were co-panelists at a 2010 conference.

1. "Comforts" can also constitute intangible feelings, such as that produced by an immersion in the Bible. Gary Ebersole writes that "[i]n seventeenth-century Puritan culture, when a person found himself in a time of trouble or doubt, picked up and read the Bible, and found 'a place of comfort' therein, frequently his spirits were lifted, his doubts were assuaged, or he was better able to under-

stand and to accept his suffering, thus transforming his original physical and mental condition" (34). See also 58–59. Certainly this is how Rowlandson depicts her Bible reading.

2. Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 2.2.210–12. At this point in the play Polonius has told Gertrude that he believes her son has lost his mind because Ophelia has refused his advances. Hamlet's losses—of the woman he loves, his sanity, his father (and in consequence his family, title, and home)—and his desire for their restoration are central to the play. Regardless of whether there is a deliberate echo here, Rowlandson's overwhelming loss and its consequences are thematically linked to those explored in *Hamlet*.
3. The name "Ter Amicum" was amended in subsequent editions to "Per Amicum."
4. Anderson inaccurately asserts that Rowlandson was born in Massachusetts and had never been to England, but this point does not undermine the important recognition he makes of her emerging colonial identity—indeed it strengthens it by showing her ongoing identification with what is in fact a natal Englishness.
5. Rushdie writes, "To forget that there is a world beyond the community to which we belong, to confine ourselves within narrowly defined cultural frontiers, would be, I believe, to go voluntarily into that form of internal exile which in South Africa is called the 'homeland'" (20).
6. This argument has been recently extended and developed by Tennenhouse in relation to the British diaspora in a US American context. See esp. ch. 3, "Diaspora and Empire."
7. See also Naficy's distinction between house, home, and homeland, in which he argues that the imagination is central to how home is constructed (5–6).
8. For one example of this see Voigt, ch. 4.
9. Kaplan makes the most incisive argument for how this is true in a nineteenth-century US context.
10. This shift from heimlich to unheimlich can be produced through violence or rupture that turns the familiar into the unfamiliar, sometimes with terrifying consequences. Vidler has argued that Freud's essay emerged from reflections on the traumatic experience of the 1914–18 war and profound anxieties about unhomeliness and literal unhoming. It was at this period of political and ethical crisis that the uncanny, a concept emerging in the eighteenth century, "reinforced its traditional links with nostalgia," leading to a metaphorical homesickness corresponding to the actual homelessness that war produced and that was experienced after the war (7). He further argues that the philosophical work of Martin Heidegger in "Building, Dwelling, Thinking" (1951) and Gaston Bachelard in *The Poetics of Space* (1958) were intellectual responses to this condition.
11. For a detailed overview see Blunt and Dowling, who ably review and delineate the key critical texts on home. A dedicated journal, *Home Cultures*, reflects the increased body and multiplicity of scholarship produced, especially in the social sciences.
12. See, for instance, Ahmed, Casteñeda, Fortier, and Sheller. The introduction does

a good job of summarizing critical trends. See also Porteous and Smith and Nadje and Koser.

13. Significant work on home in this regard includes the 1991 special issue of *Social Research* edited by Mack, titled *Home: A Place in the World*, which emerged from a project organized by the New School, leading to the publication of a book of the same name (Rub). Conceptual studies focus on how the concept of home and its regulatory boundaries has emerged out of the conjunction of materiality, domesticity, and ideology. See, for instance, Rybczynski and Wood and Beck. The forum on "Domestic Space" in the Spring 2002 issue of *Signs* surveys an array of works on the relation between each of those terms. See, especially, McDowell. See also Mezei and Briganti and the review of arts and humanities research on home by Bennett, Carroll, and Mackay.
14. Seminal texts include Ryan; Kelley; Armstrong; Brown; and Kaplan.
15. See Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; and Bhabha.
16. Marangoly George writes that

> [h]omes are not about inclusions and wide open arms as much as they are about places carved out of closed doors, closed borders and screening apparatuses. When different groups or individuals jostle each other to establish a space as their own, as an exclusive manifestation of their subjecthood, this struggle can become as urgent as keeping oneself alive. As a result, "home" becomes contested ground in times of political tumult either on the level of power struggles at a national communal stage or at the interpersonal familial level. (18)

17. For more detail on when the text was written see Derounian, "Publication." For consistency, I have listed all her works by Derounian-Stodola throughout the works cited. See also Rowlandson 40–41.
18. See, especially, Derounian-Stodola, "Puritan Orthodoxy" 82–93, but also the critique of her agruments in Burnham 63.
19. The town was built close to a Nipmuc village named Nashaway. Initially also Nashaway, its name was changed, first to Prescott and then to West Towne before Lancaster was finally settled on.
20. See, for instance, Sayre, "Renegades from Barbary"; as well as Edwards's response to it in the same journal issue.
21. See Baepler, *White Slaves*. A number of other critics also make this point.
22. On the issue of genre see, for instance, Derounian-Stodola, "Captivity"; and Bauer.
23. See Baepler, *White Slaves*; Davis; Matar, *Turks*; Sayre, *American Captivity*; Vitkus; and Williams.
24. Voigt's work, for instance, makes detailed arguments about textually specific referencing that show the complex relationships between captivity narratives and refine Sayre's account of origins. She argues that as imperial exploration spread to the New World, models for the writing about captivity were exchanged

across the Atlantic. This was a two-way process in which "representing captivity among non-Christians were not simply exported from the Mediterranean to the Americas. . . . [A]ccounts of Moorish and Turkish captivity also drew on New World sources for both specific content and, more broadly, rhetorical strategies" (9). This position is shared by other scholars. Baepler argues that since the North African captivity narrative was prominent in Europe during the period of American colonization, it became a source of images that could be adapted to the American experience; see "Barbary Captivity," 228.

25. As a way of showing the complexities of maritime interactions that made captivity at sea a threat to colonists, scholars have drawn attention to individuals whose personal stories are read as particular archetypes. Baepler, "Barbary Captivity" 218–19, describes the experiences of Joshua Gee, a Bostonian shipwright who was taken captive by Algerian privateers. See also Baepler, *White Slaves* 1–2 and 59–69. Gee's son and namesake was a minister in Boston's North Church at the same time as Cotton Mather who attacked Barbary captivity publicly from his pulpit on more than one occasion. Mather and others were undoubtedly concerned about Barbary captivity and recognized that North American and North African captivity were both part of a continuum threatening colonists. In 1698 Mather's "A Pastoral Letter to the English Captives in Africa" was published. He noted in his diary that the captives in Morocco had read his letter. In 1703 his sermon "The Glory of Goodness" celebrated the redemption and release of those English captives who had been held for several years. Figures of European migrancy to North Africa and North America are instructive. They help contextualize these individual stories as the inevitable outcome of a process of migration that involved leaving one home and establishing another. In the early modern period many Europeans were drawn to North Africa to find work. Before the start of the Great Migration in the 1620s, the numbers of British in North Africa exceeded the number in North America. Matar, "Introduction" 2.
26. In 1625 two American vessels were captured and taken to Morocco and in 1640 a family of colonists was captured in the Atlantic and taken into slavery in Algiers. Baepler, *White Slaves* 6. In 1679 Seth Southall, governor of Carolina, was captured on his way to the colonies and held in Algiers for three months. Vitkus 6–7.
27. The definition of captivity I give here draws on, and is indebted to, Sayre's detailed summation. See *American Captivity* 4–5. See also Namias 22.
28. See also Axtell.
29. He also notes that some women escaped back to "the Indian towns" and some of those who were unable to run away "continued many days in bitter lamentation, even refusing sustenance" (29).
30. See Ebersole 132.
31. This was, famously, started when Bunyan was incarcerated—held captive it might be argued—for his religious beliefs.
32. Burnham argues that Rowlandson's narrative is about the "journey between"

(60) capture and restoration, encompassing both physical and spiritual hardships.

33. Derounian-Stodola, "Publication" 244. She goes so far as to call Rowlandson's narrative an "American version" (257) of Bunyan's text.
34. Even at this early stage the target audiences were recognized as being distinctive. The adaptation of the title of the narrative to suit its audiences in the old and new homeplaces was an acknowledgment that their different experiences and reading needs had to be addressed. Derounian-Stodola, "Publication" 239–40, 248. She speculates that after the first interest in the text "the popular market was saturated in America, and apparently was not overly receptive in England," which is why it did not appear again until 1720.
35. Derounian-Stodola, "Publication" 249–57.
36. See also Potter (156), who argues that Rowlandson identifies herself with a privilege born of conforming to such cultural expectations, which she claims to maintain even while a captive.
37. She sometimes uses an uppercase *H* and sometimes does not.
38. Ter Amicum notes that one of Lancaster's problems was the result of its being remote but also "not being Gerisoned [sic] as it might" (Rowlandson 64). Rowlandson's house, he argues, was vulnerable "through the disadvantage of a defective Fortification" (64). See also Hubbard 60–62.
39. She writes, "so it must be, that I must sit all this cold winter night upon the cold snowy ground, with my sick Childe in my armes, looking that every hour would be the last of its life" (73).
40. She writes, "But instead of going either to *Albany* or homeward, we must go five miles up the River, and then go over it. Here we abode a while" (84).
41. Toulouse has noted of this passage that Rowlandson, who quotes Judges here, "represents her desire for an idealized home as analogous to Samson's desire for the foreign Dalilah. Like Dalilah, 'home' is represented as a desire that replaces the father" (59).

WORKS CITED

Ahmed, Sara, Claudia Casteñeda, Anne-Marie Fortier, and Mimi Sheller, eds. *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*. New York: Berg, 2003.

Anderson, Benedict. "Exodus." *Critical Inquiry* 20.2 (1994): 314–27.

———. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

Axtell, James. "The White Indians of Colonial America." *William and Mary Quarterly* 32 (1975): 55–88.

Baepler, Paul. "The Barbary Captivity Narrative in American Culture." *Early American Literature* 39 (2004): 217–46.

———, ed. *White Slaves, African Masters: An Anthology of American Barbary Narratives*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999.

Bauer, Ralph. "Creole Identities in Colonial Space: The Narrative of Mary White Rowlandson and Francisco Núñez de Pineda y Bascuñán." *American Literature* 69 (1997): 665–95.

Bennett, Bridget, Hamilton Carroll, and Ruth Mackay. "Imagining the Place of Home." Leeds University. 1 September 2012. Web. 4 October 2013. ⟨http://www.leeds.ac.uk/arts/downloads/download/903/imagining_the_place_of_home⟩.

Bhabha, Homi. "The World and the Home." *Dangerous Liasons: Gender, Nation and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Ed. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ila Shohat. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2004. 445–55.

Blunt, Alison, and Robyn Dowling. *Home*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Bouquet, Henry. *An Historical Account of the Expedition against the Ohio Indians, in the Year 1764*. Philadelphia: Bradford, 1765.

Brown, Gillian. *Domestic Individualism: Imagining the Self in Nineteenth-Century America*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.

Burnham, Michelle. "The Journey Between: Liminality and Dialogism in Mary White Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative." *Early American Literature* 28 (1993): 60–75.

Davis, Robert C., ed. *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500–1800*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle. "Captivity, Liberty, and Early American Consciousness." *Early American Literature* 43 (2008): 715–24.

———. "The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution of Mary Rowlandson's Indian Captivity Narrative in the Seventeenth Century." *Early American Literature* 23 (1988): 239–61.

———. "Puritan Orthodoxy and the 'Survivor Syndrome' in Mary Rowlandson's Indian Captivity Narrative." *Early American Literature* 22 (1987): 82–93.

Ebersole, Gary L. *Captured by Texts: Puritan to Postmodern Images of Indian Captivity*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995.

Edwards, Brian T. "Disorienting Captivity: A Response to Gordon M. Sayre." *Early American Literature* 45.2 (2010): 339–46.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Uncanny." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Signund Freud*. Ed. James Strachey. Vol. 17. London: Hogarth, 1955. 217–56.

Hubbard, W. *A Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians in New-England, from the First Planting Therof in the Year 1607, to This Present Yyear 1677. . . .* Boston: Foster, 1677.

Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity." *American Literature* 70.3 (1998): 581–606.

Kelley, Mary ed. *Private Woman, Public Stage: Literary Domesticity in Nineteenth-Century America*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.

Mack, Arien, ed. *Home: A Place in the World*. Spec. issue of *Social Research* 58.1 (1991): 1–307.

Marangoly George, Rosemary. *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-Century Fiction*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999.

Matar, Nabil. "Introduction: England and Mediterranean Captivity, 1577–1704." Vitkus 1–52.

———. *Turks, Moors and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. New York: Columbia UP, 1999.

McDowell, Linda. "Unsettling Naturalisms." *Signs* 27.3 (2002): 815–22.

Mezei, Kathy, and Chiara Briganti eds. *The Domestic Space Reader*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2012.

Nadje, Al-Ali, and Khalid Koser. *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Naficy, Hamid. "Framing Exile: From Homeland to Homepage." *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media, and the Politics of Place*. Ed. Naficy. New York: Routledge, 1999. 1–16.

Namias, June. *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1993.

Porteous, Douglas, and Sandra Smith. *Domicide: The Global Destruction of Home*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2001.

Potter, Tiffany. "Writing Indigenous Femininity: Mary Rowlandson's Narrative of Captivity." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 36 (2003): 153–67.

Rogin, Michael Paul. *Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 2000.

Rowlandson, Mary. *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God, Together with the Faithfulness of His Promises Displayed, Being a Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson and Related Documents*. Ed. Neal Salisbury. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1997.

Rub, Michael B. *Home: A Place in the World*. Ed. Arien Mack. New York: New York UP, 1995.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism, 1981–91*. London: Granta, 1992.

Ryan, Mary P. *Empire of the Mother: American Writing about Domesticity, 1830–1860*. New York: Haworth, 1982.

Rybczynski, Witold. *Home: A Short History of an Idea*. New York: Penguin, 1986.

Sayre, Gordon M., ed. *American Captivity Narratives*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.

———. "Renegades from Barbary: The Transnational Turn in Captivity Studies." *Early American Literature* 45.2 (2010): 325–38.

Shadid, Anthony. *House of Stone: A Memoir of Home, Family and a Lost Middle East*. London: Granta, 2012.

Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*: *The Arden Shakespeare*. Ed. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.

Tennenhouse, Leonard. *The Importance of Feeling English: American Literature and the British Diaspora, 1750–1850*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2007.

Toulouse, Teresa A. *The Captive's Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2007.

Vidler, Anthony. *The Architectural Uncanny: Essays in the Modern Unhomely*. Cambridge: MIT P, 1992.

Vitkus, Daniel J., ed. *Piracy, Slavery, and Redemption: Barbary Captivity Narratives from Early Modern England*. New York: Columbia UP, 2001.

Voigt, Lisa. *Writing Captivity in the Early Modern Atlantic: Circulations of Knowledge and Authority in the Iberian and English Imperial Worlds*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2009.

Williams, Daniel E., ed. *Liberty's Captives: Narratives of Confinement in the Print Culture of the Early Republic*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2006.

Wood, Denis, and Robert J. Beck. *Home Rules*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994.

Notes on Contributors

MELISSA ADAMS-CAMPBELL is an assistant professor of early American literature at Northern Illinois University. She is currently completing a monograph entitled "New World Courtship: Transatlantic Alternatives to Companionate Marriage," which explores how eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century Anglophone novelists such as Frances Brooke and Leonora Sansay draw on travelers' reports of courtship and marriage customs in the circum-Atlantic world.

EVE TAVOR BANNET is George Lynn Cross Professor of English at the University of Oklahoma. Recent publications include *Transatlantic Stories and the History of Reading, 1720–1820* (Cambridge, 2011); "Charles Brockden Brown and England," in Julia M. Wright and Kevin Hutchings, eds., *Transatlantic Literary Exchanges* (Ashgate, 2011); "Adulterous Sentiments in Transatlantic Domestic Fiction, 1770–1805," in Toni Bowers and Tita Chico, eds., *Atlantic Worlds in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); and with Susan Manning, *Transatlantic Literary Studies* (Cambridge UP 2012).

ASHLEY BARNETT is a graduate student at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. She is writing her graduate thesis on the colonization of indigenous Native American corn as it is represented in early colonial American literature.

BRIDGET BENNETT is professor of American literature and culture in the School of English, University of Leeds. Her most recent book was *Transatlantic Spiritualism and Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). She is currently working on a book on home and crisis in US American literature.

ALLISON MARGARET BIGELOW is assistant professor of colonial Latin American literatures in the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese at the University of Virginia. From 2012 to 2014, she held a postdoctoral fellowship at the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture at the College of William and Mary, where she revised her book manuscript, tentatively titled "Cultural Touchstones: Mining, Refining, and the Languages of Empire in the Early Americas."

ANGELA CALCATERRA is an assistant professor of English at the University of West Florida. She is working on a book project that rethinks stereotypes of Indians in pre-1900 American literature in light of native representational practices, media, and sites of knowledge production.

LORRAYNE CARROLL is an associate professor of English and a member of the Women and Gender Studies Faculty at the University of Southern Maine, where she teaches courses in early American studies, literacy studies, cultural studies,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.