

Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/104090/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Herrmann, Rachel ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1676-7164> 2015. 'Their Filthy Trash': Taste, eating, and work in Mary Rowlandson's captivity narrative. *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 12 (1-2), pp. 45-70. 10.1215/15476715-2837496 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/15476715-2837496>
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/15476715-2837496>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Rachel B. Herrmann, “‘Their Filthy Trash’: Taste, Eating, and Work in Mary Rowlandson’s Captivity Narrative,” *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*, 12, no. 1-2 (March 2015): 45-70.

They came at sunrise. The sound of guns heralded their approach, and soon they reached the house at the edge of the hill. Taking shelter behind the knoll and in the barn, they “shot against the House, so that the Bullets seemed to fly like hail.” They wounded one, “then another, and then a third.” With flax and hemp found in the barn, they set the house on fire. They stationed men at the entrance, “ready to knock us on the head, if we stirred out.” The brother-in-law was the first to try his luck, but “being before wounded, in defending the house,” he died mere steps from the door. The nephew, sporting a broken leg, was killed only seconds later. Her devastated sister cried out, “*Lord, let me dy with them,*” and received a bullet in answer to her prayers. They seized hold of the narrator, pulling her “one way, and the Children another.” “*Come go along with us,*” they said. After being assured that if she proved herself willing, “*they would not hurt me,*” she acquiesced.¹ She was separated from her two older children. Her youngest daughter would breathe her last while lying in her arms, before she herself was sold by her captors.²

The date was February 20, 1676.³ The captive was a Lancaster, Massachusetts, woman named Mary Rowlandson; her abductors were Algonquian Narragansett,

The author thanks Sari Altschuler, Katherine Grandjean, Susan Levine, Steve Striffler, and Chris Woolgar for their comments and suggestions.

1. Mary Rowlandson, *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 (New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 1997), 68–70. All italics are present in the original.

2. *Ibid.*, 10.

3. At the time of Rowlandson’s capture, England observed the Julian rather than the Gregorian calendar, in which the year started on March 25 and reckoned dates ten days earlier. Thus although Rowlandson wrote that she was captured on February 10, 1675, by modern dating the attack on Lancaster took place on February 20, 1676. Neal Salisbury’s editorial note to Rowlandson’s narrative makes the correct date of capture clear. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 63n1, 68n13.

Nipmuck, and Wampanoag Indians. Her children were called Joseph and Mary, her toddler was named Sarah, her future master was known as Quinnapin, and they were all embroiled in the unfolding of King Philip's War (1675–76).⁴ The Indians took her first to the Nipmuck town of Menameset, about twenty-five miles southwest of Lancaster, before marching her through the countryside.⁵ She lived with them for three months until her redemption on May 2, 1676, in exchange for trade goods valued at around £20.⁶

After she was taken, Mary Rowlandson underwent a partial transformation that enabled her to cope with captivity. Food, which she thought about constantly, searched for intermittently, and received occasionally, allowed her to make this transition. Over time, Rowlandson grew accustomed to the Indian victuals that she previously thought of as “filthy trash.”⁷ During other moments, she tried to convince the reader that she remained true to her preferences for eating non-Native provisions. Yet if she described edible goods as a strange hybrid between Native American and English, Mary Rowlandson began to describe her mode of eating in ways that appear more Indian than English.

Rowlandson's articulation of her captivity has received significant attention from previous writers, many of them literary scholars. They have contributed much to historians' knowledge of her life after captivity, her voice as a female Puritan writer, her use of authorship as a form of mourning, her acculturation in captivity, her use of biblical citations, and her sexuality.⁸ Although previous scholars have acknowledged

4. The war stretched until 1678 in Maine. Ann M. Little, *Abraham in Arms: War and Gender in Colonial New England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 1.

5. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 10, 25.

6. For the length of her captivity, see Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 4. For the cost of her redemption, see Teresa A. Toulouse, “‘My Own Credit’: Strategies of (E)Valuation in Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative,” *Early American Literature* 64, no. 4 (1992): 658.

7. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 79.

8. For background on Rowlandson's life, see David L. Greene, “New Light on Mary Rowlandson,” *Early American Literature* 20, no. 1 (1985): 24–38. For Puritanism and gender, see Kathryn Zabelle Derounian, “Puritan Orthodoxy and the ‘Survivor Syndrome’ in Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative,” *Early American Literature* 22, no. 1 (1987): 82–93; Kathryn Zabelle Derounian, “The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution of Mary Rowlandson's Indian Captivity Narrative in the Seventeenth Century,” *Early American Literature* 23, no. 3 (1988): 239–61; Margaret H. Davis, “Mary Rowlandson's Self-Fashioning as Puritan Goodwife,” *Early American Literature* 27, no. 1 (1992): 49–60; Toulouse, “‘My Own Credit,’” 655–76; and Lisa Logan, “Mary Rowlandson's Captivity and the ‘Place’ of the Woman Subject,” *Early American Literature* 28, no. 3 (1993): 255–77. For mourning, see Mitchell Robert Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning: Religion, Grief, and Ethnology in Mary White Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990). For acculturation, see Michelle Burnham, “The Journey Between: Liminality and Dialogism in Mary White Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative,” *Early American Literature* 28, no. 1 (1993): 60–75; Tiffany Potter, “Writing Indigenous Femininity: Mary Rowlandson's Narrative of Captivity,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 36, no. 2 (2003): 153–67. For the Bible, see David Downing, “‘Streams of Scripture Comfort’: Mary Rowlandson's Typological Use of the Bible,” *Early American Literature* 15, no. 3 (1980): 252–59. For sexuality, see Jordan Alexander Stein, “Mary Rowlandson's Hunger and the Historiography of Sexuality,” *American Literature* 81, no. 3 (2009): 469–95.

the extent to which food figures in Rowlandson's narrative, Rowlandson herself failed to see that food exchanges adhered to a clear system.

Rowlandson did not receive food when she refused to work. Her work, which took many forms, reached its apotheosis in her manufacture of clothing. When she offered these products of her sewing and knitting, she received bear, horsemeat, cornmeal, peas, and wheat cakes. Her inability to understand ideas about equitable exchange helps historians understand her clashes with her captors. Caught up in the violence of the war, removed from her friends and family, and unfamiliar with Native Americans, Rowlandson's relationship with food and work marked her as an outsider. Her struggles, furthermore, illuminate the different attitudes toward gender governing both societies.

In this essay I examine how labor and foodways functioned in King Philip's War, as evidenced by their appearance in Mary Rowlandson's captivity narrative. Although numerous other accounts of the war exist, hers is useful for scholars in search of a representative example because of its popularity at the time.⁹ Concerns about food pervaded myriad levels of Indians' and colonists' existence. Indians and Englishmen used food to communicate with each other in ways that simultaneously bridged and solidified the growing gap between Native and non-Native in colonial America. Both groups toiled to maintain food supplies during wartime, and both targeted foodstuffs as a military strategy. Gendered understandings of work, however, had long differentiated Natives from non-Natives. Despite the fact that both groups seemed similar in terms of strategy and destructive fighting techniques, by the war's conclusion violence trumped accommodation.

As the war with the highest number of casualties in American history (in proportion to population), King Philip's War occupies a unique place in the chronology of colonial America.¹⁰ The conflict has gone by several names.¹¹ Most historians agree

9. For primary sources on the war, see Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Knopf, 1998), 50–51.

10. Lepore, *The Name of War*, xi.

11. In addition to "King Philip's War," the conflict has been called a "Puritan conquest" and "Metacom's rebellion." Historians who argue that English colonists' encroachment on Indian lands caused the war thus favor the term conquest because it signifies English aggression. Those who cite Metacom urge historians to use Philip's Algonquian name, appearing variously as Metacom, Metacomet, and Pometacom. Furthermore, they insist that he was not a king, but simply a war sachem. The conflict has been called an Indian civil war because it pitted Indians against Indians; some fought on the side of the colonists and some for Philip. James Drake has even called it a "civil war" generally, rather than an "Indian civil war," because he believes that colonists and Indians shared a common culture before the war and that the conflict thus pitted two halves of the same side against each other. Ian K. Steele and Daniel K. Richter make similar points. I chose "King Philip's War" because Philip referred to himself as Philip, and he called himself a king in his dealings with the English. Lepore, *The Name of War*, xv; James D. Drake, *King Philip's War: Civil War in New England, 1675–1676* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 198; Ian K. Steele, *Warpaths: Invasions of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 80; and Daniel K. Richter, *Trade, Land, Power: The Struggle for Eastern North America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 107.

that war began with the death of a man named John Sassamon, an Indian minister from the New England praying town of Namasket. Praying towns, which constituted no small part of Puritans' evangelical plans to convert Indians to Christianity, were places of predominantly Native populations. Puritans encouraged Indians living in such towns to embrace Puritanism's tenets, avoid alcohol, build English houses, practice monogamy, establish permanent farms, and shun Indian shamans.¹² In January 1675 Sassamon traveled to Plymouth, Massachusetts, to tell the governor that a Wampanoag sachem named Philip, as he sometimes called himself, was trying to convince other nearby chiefs to wage war against the colonists.¹³ Governor Josiah Winslow dismissed Sassamon's warning because Sassamon was an Indian, albeit a Christian one. Sassamon disappeared a week later, only to surface in February, bruised and bloated in a pond not far from his home. Following the discovery of the body, the sachem Philip, son of Massasoit, traveled to Plymouth. The colonial council concluded that he might indeed be fomenting rebellion but, lacking proof, let him go. At the beginning of March an eyewitness appeared claiming to know Sassamon's murderers, and on June 1 the Plymouth court formally charged three of Philip's chief counselors with murder. They were hanged on June 8, and by June 24 Wampanoag Indians had attacked Swansea and killed nine colonists.¹⁴

Officially the war lasted just more than a year.¹⁵ Attacks continued through the winter of 1675 and stretched into the following summer. Fighting pitted Algonquian-speaking Wampanoag, Nipmuck, Pocumtuck, Narragansett, and Abenaki Indians against English colonists and their Pequot and Mohegan allies, and encompassed Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.¹⁶ Over the course of the war, Native Americans attacked more than half of New England's ninety towns, and as many as three thousand colonists and seven thousand Natives died.¹⁷

Although it is satisfying to tie the cause of the war to the death of one man, its broader origins remained rooted in issues connected to disease, trade, land, migration,

12. For praying Indians see Neal Salisbury, "Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot," *William and Mary Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (1974): 27–54; Steele, *Warpaths*, 98; Edward E. Andrews, *Native Apostles: Black and Indian Missionaries in the British Atlantic World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013): 27; Linford D. Fisher, *The Indian Great Awakening: Religion and the Shaping of Native Cultures in Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Neal Salisbury's introduction to Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, esp. 15; and Lepore, *The Name of War*, 29–41. On conversion efforts, see James Axtell, *After Columbus: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 86–99.

13. Ian K. Steele disputes the idea that Philip had been planning war (despite being repeatedly accused of doing so). I find this assertion unconvincing given the amount of testimony to the contrary but agree that Philip's strategic position would have been less favorable than contemporaries believed. Steele, *Warpaths*, 99.

14. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 21–23.

15. Mary Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 1.

16. Lepore, *The Name of War*, xi–xii.

17. Virginia DeJohn Anderson, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 237.

and shifting alliances. New England Indian populations had fallen by as much as 90 percent as a result of epidemics, such as smallpox, that raged at the start of the seventeenth century.¹⁸ And disease met with warfare to enact further changes; the Pequot War of 1636–37 began as a result of rivaling trade factions and environmental scarcity, and deepened the Indians' ties to colonial economies.¹⁹ Those colonies began to grow exponentially. Lancaster, Mary Rowlandson's town of never more than a dozen or so households from its colonization in 1643 (under the name of Nashaway) to 1653 (the year of its incorporation and renaming as Lancaster) expanded to fifty-four households by 1654.²⁰ Newcomers came hungry for more land and showed little enthusiasm for reviving the Indian praying towns, which had been faltering for some time.²¹ These residents wanted little to do with Indians because cross-cultural relations did not benefit their economic interests. In 1667 the establishment of Swansea, a new town sitting within four miles of Philip's village (a nonpraying town), undermined Indians' unwillingness to sell land.²² Lacking other recourses, former enemies became allies, such as the Narragansetts and Wampanoags did in the 1660s.²³

That Rowlandson's captivity narrative became a bestseller indicates the extent to which these alliances, the war, and Rowlandson's depiction of it captured colonists' and Englishmen's imagination alike. Sometime between May 1676 and November 1678 Rowlandson penned *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, and in March 1682 it was printed in Boston.²⁴ The first printing—of which only a handful of pages survive—quickly gave way to second and third editions in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and a fourth in London (under a slightly different title) by November of that year.²⁵ The book likely sold thousands of copies.²⁶ Although gauging seventeenth-century literacy rates remains a difficult task, statistics suggest that 50 percent of men and 25 percent of women could read.²⁷ In any case, the narrative enjoyed unprecedented popularity. Its reissue in Boston in 1720, 1770, and 1771 (and 1773 in New London, Connecticut, as well) testifies to its staying power.²⁸

18. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 10–11.

19. Ibid., 11–12. For an argument exploring the environmental conditions that preceded the war, see Katherine A. Grandjean, "New World Tempests: Environment, Scarcity, and the Coming of the Pequot War," *William and Mary Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (2011): 75–100, esp. 77–78.

20. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 11.

21. Ibid., 17.

22. Steele, *Wapaths*, 98.

23. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 26.

24. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 125. See also Derounian, "The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution," 240.

25. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 125; and Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, viii. The fourth edition was titled *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*. Derounian, "The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution," 250.

26. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 52.

27. Other scholars believe that even these figures are low estimates. Derounian, "The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution," 255–56.

28. Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600–1860*

(Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1973), 96. The republication of the narrative in the 1770s may

Rowlandson's writing has prompted numerous interpretations of her life and text. In a 1985 article, David Greene established that Rowlandson's death did not precede the publication of her narrative, as previously believed. Although her husband Joseph died in 1678, Rowlandson remarried Samuel Talcott in 1680 and disappeared from the historical record because she changed her name.²⁹ Scholars in the 1990s confronted Rowlandson's somewhat unusual position as a female writer in a Puritan colony that rarely encouraged women to speak up.³⁰ Rowlandson's act of publication became acceptable only because it was vetted by male supporters, particularly by the author of the preface (whom most scholars assume was Puritan leader Reverend Increase Mather).³¹ Some interpretations, however, have claimed that Rowlandson intentionally used the work of writing to challenge her captive position as a female in a male-dominated society.³²

Other readings have imbued the act of writing with additional symbolic meanings, ranging from the psychological to the religious. Mitchell Robert Breitwieser has suggested that Rowlandson's capture occurred too quickly to allow her to mourn and that writing functioned as a way for her to do so.³³ Grief, he argues, resulted in her decision to structure her narrative into a series of "removes" that denote her physical movement from place to place as well as her metaphorical distancing from English towns.³⁴ Michelle Burnham remarks that Breitwieser's interpretation of mourning obscures the degree to which Rowlandson became acculturated to life among Indians.³⁵ Others also agree that her removes accentuate Rowlandson's transformation from colonist to Indian—a shift that Richard Slotkin states became an archetype for early American captivity narratives in part because Rowlandson suc-

also testify to the rise in Indian hating, the history of which is beyond the purview of this article. For relevant works, see especially Patrick Griffin, *American Leviathan: Empire, Nation, and Revolutionary Frontier* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2007); and Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: Norton, 2008).

29. Greene, "New Light on Mary Rowlandson," 24–38. See also Lepore, *The Name of War*, 294n1.

30. Davis, "Mary Rowlandson's Self-Fashioning," 49–60, esp. 49; and Logan, "Mary Rowlandson's Captivity," 255–77, esp. 260–61.

31. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian attributes the Mather argument to an unpublished Yale honors thesis. Derounian, "The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution," 240; and David A. Richards, "The Memorable Preservations: Narratives of Indian Captivity in the Literature and Politics of Colonial New England, 1675–1725" (honors thesis, Yale College, 1967). See also Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity," 153. Mitchell Robert Breitwieser observes that in some scholars' interpretations the author of the preface is referred to as "Ter Amicam." In other works the author is called "Per Amicam" or "Per Amicum." Breitwieser suggests that the contrasting interpretations may originate in the use of different editions or typefaces. Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 198n6.

32. Logan, "Mary Rowlandson's Captivity," 256.

33. He questions, however, whether she successfully finished mourning by the time she concluded the narrative. Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 9, 143.

34. Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 75. See also Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence*, 109; Logan, "Mary Rowlandson's Captivity," 256; and Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity," 175.

35. Burnham, "The Journey Between," 64.

cessfully transitioned back into the form of an Englishwoman.³⁶ This ability to adapt made her what June Namias calls a survivor—the first among a choice of three depictions of captives that early American authors employed, which Namias names *survivor*, *Amazon*, and *frail flower*.³⁷ Kathryn Zabelle Derounian also engages with the idea of survival with her delineation of “survivor syndrome,” a state of mind that she says characterized Rowlandson’s behavior throughout the narrative.³⁸ Like Breitwieser, she contends that writing may have helped Rowlandson combat some of her feelings about captivity. Finally, writers have commented on the religious metaphors and passages dotting the pages of *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, especially those from the Old Testament.³⁹

These scholars do not treat Rowlandson’s text as an entirely accurate depiction of her captivity. Jordan Alexander Stein reads it “less like a historical document” and “more like a literary text, whose world is projected only from textual details.”⁴⁰ Mitchell Breitwieser takes a slightly different tack. He agrees with Stein insofar as he suggests that Rowlandson does not “accurately or adequately” portray Algonquians, English colonists, or the conflict between them but departs from Stein in his assertion that Rowlandson’s narrative “is one of the very few seventeenth-century Massachusetts texts that permit or keep close to a break-in of the real.”⁴¹ Literary scholars, in other words, continue to disagree over the most profitable way to interpret the text. So what are food studies scholars and historians of labor to do when confronting Rowlandson’s prose?

Rowlandson’s narrative remains useful for two reasons: first, because of the extent to which Rowlandson talked about work and food, and second (and relatedly), *because* of its contradictions. Some authors have observed that food figures prominently in *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*.⁴² Heidi Oberholtzer Lee has paid particular attention to the role food plays in early American captivity narratives.⁴³ She argues that Rowlandson’s account advances a “gustatory theology” that allowed her to frame her text in terms of appetite, especially during episodes of “spiritual anxiety, doubt, or growth.”⁴⁴ In this sense food functions as part of the genre of the

36. Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence*, 112; and Davis, “Mary Rowlandson’s Self-Fashioning,” 53.

37. June Namias, *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier* (Chapel Hill: Univer sity of North Carolina Press, 1993), 24 (for the model) and 29 (for Rowlandson as a survivor).

38. Derounian, “Puritan Orthodoxy and the ‘Survivor Syndrome,’” 82–93, esp. 86, 91. For a critique of Derounian’s argument, see Burnham, “The Journey Between,” 63.

39. Derounian, “Puritan Orthodoxy and the ‘Survivor Syndrome,’” 86; Derounian, “The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution,” 250; and Downing, “Streams of Scripture Comfort,” 252. Michelle Burnham notes that Rowlandson’s tone changes significantly from the passages that narrate her captivity to those that analyze it from a religious standpoint. Burnham, “The Journey Between,” 61.

40. Stein, “Mary Rowlandson’s Hunger,” 472.

41. Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 12.

42. For a list of how hunger works in the narrative, see Stein, “Mary Rowlandson’s Hunger,” 470.

43. Heidi Oberholtzer Lee, “‘The Hungry Soul’: Sacramental Appetite and the Transformation of Taste in Early American Travel Writing,” *Early American Studies* 3, no. 1 (2005): 65–93.

44. *Ibid.*, 65–66.

Puritan test narrative. Lee is predominantly concerned with the question of how captivity narratives allowed Catholics, Puritans, and Quakers to use food to forge larger religious communities, though less interested in picking apart captives' understandings of their obligation to labor.⁴⁵ According to Rowlandson, God upheld her faith by transforming her tastes, making the distasteful edible, and providing sustenance when she could not do so herself.⁴⁶ Certainly Rowlandson wrote her narrative during a time when ideas about taste were changing; whereas we recognize five tastes today (sweet, sour, bitter, salty, and umami), people living before Rowlandson's time counted eight or nine (sweet, greasy, bitter, salty, salty like the sea, sharp, harsh, vinegary, and tasteless).⁴⁷

One could also go as far as to suggest that during the moments when Rowlandson discussed food, her contradictions expose the extent to which interactions with Indians remained incomprehensible to her. The work she did to obtain food, then, further underscores her uncertain position as a captive. The text's incongruities are useful for allowing historians to think more extensively about the acculturation that Burnham, Slotkin, and others have described. Some historians, such as Katherine Grandjean, have suggested that early war and captivity narratives such as Rowlandson's describe a clear "divide between 'civilized' English and 'savage' Indians."⁴⁸ Other literary scholars interpret Rowlandson's transformation from English to Indian as a complete one. Food highlights the fact that Rowlandson's transformation was incomplete and shows that she did not separate Indians from English colonists so decisively. Although readers may never know precisely what happened to Rowlandson during captivity, scholars can read her portrayal of it and debate what that representation says about English colonists. The moments when Rowlandson hungered, labored for, received, and wrote about food may reveal some of the episodes when she portrayed events without trying to consciously craft how she depicted them, precisely because she did not understand these situations well enough to do otherwise.⁴⁹

45. *Ibid.*, 93.

46. *Ibid.*, 80.

47. "Salty" and "salty like the sea" were differentiated from each other by consistency; the latter was deemed thicker in the mouth. Each of these tastes was at times broken down into further categories.

C. M. Woolgar, *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), 105–6.

48. Katherine Grandjean, "'Our Fellow-Creatures and Our Fellow-Christians': Race and Religion in Eighteenth-Century Narratives of Indian Crime," *American Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (2010): 927.

49. I recognize that pursuing the idea of "the real" presents several challenges, some of which seem to matter more to literary scholars than they do to historians. Yet historians also worry about the issue of overstating any one interpretation of a series of events, especially when those events involve Indians and are portrayed by non-Native observers. As Daniel K. Richter writes about New Netherland (the region of the Hudson Valley occupied by the Dutch), "Documentary and archaeological sources provide many clues about what Native people *did* as they traded and contended with New Netherlanders. It is a tricky business, however, to try to fathom what Indians *thought* about these interactions and about newcomers. As is often the case, an indirect and imprecise approach is the best that can be attempted. Although seventeenth-century Native ideation may be inaccessible, it is possible to say something about what *Dutch* people thought Indian people thought, and what those thoughts might tell us about intercultural relations in New Netherland in particular and eastern North America more generally." Richter, *Trade, Land, Power*, 42–43. It is

Several crucial moments in the narrative relate to food and eating. Taken together they demonstrate Rowlandson's changing tastes, her transforming eating habits, and her shifting ideas about Native Americans. In brief, the five episodes discussed in this article comprise her assessment of Indian food as "filthy trash," her eating of horse liver, her consumption of a deer fetus, her sampling of horses' hooves, and her theft of food from an English child. These encounters allow for a consideration of how her tastes fluctuated between the English and the Indian, how she increasingly described her eating as Indian, and how the ways in which Rowlandson obtained sustenance failed to conform to an extant labor system.

Food plays an almost immediate role in Rowlandson's tale. On the day she was captured an Indian gave Rowlandson's daughter "a few crumbs of Cake," which the daughter passed to Rowlandson for safekeeping (doubtless not anticipating their separation).⁵⁰ Rowlandson put the item—possibly cake, but more likely a biscuit-like baked good—into her pocket, where "it lay, till it was so mouldy . . . that one could not tell what it was made of; it fell all to crumbs, & grew so dry and hard, that it was like little flints."⁵¹ She remembered numerous moments when, ready to faint from hunger, she relied on these rotting morsels. Such resourcefulness was necessary; during the third remove, while her youngest daughter still lived, she recalled that "not the least crumb of refreshing . . . came within either of our mouths" for several days.⁵² At one point she found her belly so empty that she could not sit still, and during another she bemoaned her "feeble stomach."⁵³

Rowlandson's hunger forced her to consider previously unpalatable commodities and thus to some degree to adopt Native foods.⁵⁴ During her second week in captivity, despite feeling her "stomach grow very faint for want of something," she thought it "very hard to get down their filthy trash." By the third week, however, she found previously revolting food now "sweet and savory."⁵⁵ Some scholars see this shift as evidence of Rowlandson's acculturation, or spiritual acquiescence to captivity.⁵⁶ The

nearly impossible to pin down the thoughts, mindsets, and goals of Indians, and in Rowlandson's case, it is not always feasible to say what *she* thought with any certainty. I am especially grateful to Sari Altschuler for helping me work through some of these ideas.

50. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 93.

51. Editor Neal Salisbury notes that the pocket was more like a small purse that held her Bible, bits of food, yarn, and needles. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 29 (quote), 93.

52. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 73–74. Salisbury observes that Rowlandson later comments that they *were* given at least one small piece of food, 74n25.

53. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 86 (quote), 90.

54. I am disagreeing here with Jill Lepore, who argues that throughout her narrative Rowlandson "made clear that even while she lived among the Indians she had always remained, at heart, thoroughly English." Lepore cites the "filthy trash" passage as evidence of this continuity but does not extensively address the moments when Rowlandson contradicted this impulse. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 130.

55. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 79.

56. For acculturation, see Burnham, "The Journey Between," 66; and Logan, "Mary Rowlandson's Captivity," 270. For spiritual acquiescence, see Lee, "The Hungry Soul," 75.

trope of food changing from bitter to sweet appears regularly in biblical passages, so scholars should not be too quick to dismiss the degree to which Rowlandson (and Increase Mather, who may have guided her hand) shaped her text to appear familiar to Puritan readers.⁵⁷ Her consumption of numerous unfamiliar foods, however, and the fact that she did not always pair those moments with citations from the Bible, suggests that to some extent Rowlandson proved willing to modify her diet.

Mary Rowlandson's depictions of her culinary encounters with the hooves and liver of horses and the fetus of a deer demonstrate the ultimately limited extent to which her tastes changed. These foods, it should be noted, comprise only a portion of the things she consumed.⁵⁸ But it was the offal—the hooves and liver—and the unclassifiable deer fetus that presented Rowlandson with the most imposing challenges. Horse liver was one of the first foods that Rowlandson reported eating. After she spent a day plundering English fields for grain alongside the Indians, a Native man passed by carrying “a basket of Horse-liver.” Of her own volition, Rowlandson requested some. “*What, says he can you eat Horse-liver?*” she reported him asking, before she told him she would try it. After roasting it on the coals, she reflected on its savory taste.⁵⁹ Rowlandson's readiness to taste the liver surprised the Indian, but the idea of eating horse would not have seemed entirely alien.

Horses were European animals. New England Indians would have only recently adopted them into their lives and their diets. They consumed horsemeat, but so too did English colonists during times of war or scarcity, when people had to be willing to give up the horses that transported foodstuffs in exchange for immediate meat supplies.⁶⁰ The man's surprise, and the fact that Rowlandson had to ask for the liver, suggests that English people (and perhaps English women in particular) did not regularly consume horses' liver. It is not possible to say whether the liver was actually one of Rowlandson's first meals; she may have depicted this moment first to prepare the reader for descriptions of more troubling fare.

Rowlandson's consumption of horse offal and additional items that defy categorization *could* be read as signaling her transforming palate. When Indians ran out of horse meat, they turned to horses' hooves. In one such instance Rowlandson encountered an Indian man using a hoof to make some broth, and again asked to be fed. He proffered some samp (cornmeal mush made from dried corn kernels and broth) and “a piece of the Ruff or Ridding of the small Guts,” which she “broiled on the coals.”⁶¹ Rowlandson pronounced the meat from the horse's hoof “pleasant” and

57. Lee, “‘The Hungry Soul,’” 69. See also Woolgar, *The Senses in Late Medieval England*, 114.

58. Among other items, she also reported eating a wheaten “Pancake . . . fried in Bears grease,” and bear meat (which she admitted that “the *English*” ate, although before her captivity the thought of doing so “made [her] tremble.” Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 83 (for the pancake fried in bear's grease) and 85 (for the bear).

59. Italics present in the original. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 81.

60. For a discussion of hippophagy (horse-eating) among Europeans, see Marvin Harris, *Good to Eat: Riddles of Food and Culture* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 1998), 88–108, especially 88–89.

61. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 95.

“refreshing,” though at any other time it “would have been an abomination,” and she coupled her description with another biblical quotation.⁶² She also remarked that when the Indians “killed a *Deer*, with a young one in her,” she thought that her “piece of the *Fawn*” was “young and tender,” and “very good”—so good, in fact, that she found herself able to “eat the bones as well as the flesh.”⁶³ Historian James Merrell has tackled a similar moment in which European observers noted that Catawba Indians sometimes offered their South Carolinian traveling companions “fawns ‘taken out of the Doe’s Bellies, and boil’d in the same slimy Bags Nature has plac’d them in.’”⁶⁴ Likewise, Mary Rowlandson knew that some of these foods would have been disgusting in thoroughly English environments, but she ate them to survive in captivity.

Although Mary Rowlandson was willing to sample a deer’s fetus, she also deemed some items untouchable. The morning after eating the unborn fawn, the Indians took the deer’s blood, “put it into the Paunch,” or stomach, “and so boyled it.” “I could eat nothing of that,” she admitted, although the Indians “ate it sweetly.”⁶⁵ It is unclear from the text why she chose to eschew this particular item. Although she did not describe the Indians adding any sort of cornmeal or flour, it still seems somewhat similar to the idea of black pudding. By contrast, there seem to be two possible explanations for the eating of the fawn: the fact that hunting was considered the purview of gentlemen, and so her eating of deer meat identified her as a gentlewoman, and the fact that younger animals were more tender and expensive, and thus more highly prized as food.⁶⁶

Although Mary Rowlandson consumed less familiar and even entirely foreign items, it seems clear that she attempted to hold fast to established ideas about acceptable English tastes. Her roasting the liver betrayed an attempt to make it seem more English. The horses’ guts were also somewhat strange (though colonists would have used guts from other animals, such as pigs, to make sausage), which is why she broiled them. Her refusal of some foods, like the blood pudding, may have represented her effort to cling to what she thought of as an English sensibility. Aspects of this sentiment come through in her narrative, such as in her discussion of pork. She paused to dwell fondly on the moment when a woman offered her “a piece of fresh Pork,” which she thought of as “a sweet, pleasant, and delightful relish.”⁶⁷ As one

62. *Ibid.*, 95–96.

63. *Ibid.*, 93. For an analysis of this moment, see Potter, “Writing Indigenous Femininity,” 160–61.

64. James H. Merrell, *The Indians’ New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (New York: Norton, 1991), 2.

65. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 93.

66. On hunting, see Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975), 64; Nancy Shoemaker, *A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in Eighteenth-Century North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 107. On baby animals, see Trudy Eden, “Food, Assimilation, and the Malleability of the Human Body in Early Virginia,” in *A Centre of Wonders: The Body in Early America*, ed. Janet Moore Lindman and Michele Lise Tarter (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2001), 33; and Christina J. Hodge, *Consumerism and the Emergence of the Middle Class in Colonial America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 89.

67. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 101.

scholar suggests, although captivity threatened to change Rowlandson's tastes, "ultimately they remained distinct from the tastes of the Narragansetts."⁶⁸

One could say that the *way* that Rowlandson ate, however, suggests a further step in the direction of what she conceived of as Native eating habits. Here, a distinction between food and foodways is useful. Whereas food simply constitutes what goes into one's mouth, foodways include anything related to the production, distribution, or consumption of food.⁶⁹ If Mary Rowlandson balked at eating some things, she nevertheless began to consume food in a way that she depicted as more Indian than English.⁷⁰

Signs of this change are present in her encounter with the horse guts and liver. Although Rowlandson broiled the guts and roasted the liver, her captors "got half of" the latter "away" from her before it finished cooking. Nervous that she would lose the remainder, she ate it half-raw, even describing the blood around her mouth afterwards.⁷¹ Elsewhere in *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, she reflected on her "Wolvish" appetite, remembering that when she received hot food, she "was so greedy," that she would burn her mouth badly enough "that it would trouble [her for] hours after." Pain notwithstanding, she repeatedly did "the same again" in similar circumstances.⁷² Fear of not receiving food or losing it prompted impatient and messy eating.

The episode in Rowlandson's narrative that has struck scholars time and again is her theft of food from an English child—a moment during which Rowlandson embodies these foodways. The theft occurred during the same moment when Rowlandson ate meat from a horse's hoof. She received the meat from a Native woman, who was also feeding two English children. The woman gave some meat to Rowlandson and one of the children, and "Being very hungry," Rowlandson quickly finished her portion. The child, meanwhile, "Sucking, gnawing, chewing, and slobbering," failed to bite the "tough and sinewy" meat. "I took it of the Child, and ate it

68. Lee, " 'The Hungry Soul,' " 79.

69. The earliest citation of "foodways" appears in the *Oxford English Dictionary* in 1941, as "the traditional customs or habits of a group of people concerning food and eating." In a PhD dissertation, Jay Allan Anderson traced the term to an earlier 1948 dissertation by John Honigmann (itself published in 1968), *Foodways in a Muskeg Community*. By contrast, Lucy Long, in an entry in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Food and Drink in America*, claims that folklorist Don Yoder coined the term much later, in 1970. Yoder described foodways as "the total cookery complex, including attitudes, taboos, and meal systems—the whole range of cookery and food habits in a society." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, search under "Foodway, n.," especially def. 2, oed.com; Jay Allan Anderson, "A Solid Sufficiency: An Ethnography of Yeoman Foodways in Stuart England" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1971), xl; John Honigmann, *Foodways in a Muskeg Community* (Ottawa: Northern Coordination and Research Centre, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, 1961); and Lucy Long, "Myths and Folklore," in Andrew F. Smith, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Food and Drink in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1:134.

70. For a discussion of how authors of captivity narratives use food to chart bodily transformations as proof of physical and spiritual maturation, see Lee, " 'The Hungry Soul,' " 66–67.

71. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 81.

72. *Ibid.*, 93.

myself, and savoury it was to my taste,” commented Rowlandson coldly. Then, she quoted a passage from Job, observing, “*The Things that my soul refused to touch, are as my sorrowful meat.*”⁷³

This episode is a complicated one. The Native woman did not prevent the theft. The second English child apparently received nothing. Rowlandson stole from a toddler who did not possess teeth effective enough to chew, commented on the tastiness of the meat, and then suggested that to go hungry would have been too sorrowful. Numerous scholars have discussed Rowlandson’s robbery. Some have commented on the detached nature of her authorial voice, in her description of the theft as well as in her transition to another biblical passage.⁷⁴ Others have viewed this instance as evidence of Rowlandson’s changing identity; because she leveled charges of self-indulgence at Indians, she felt justified in humoring her insatiable appetite at the expense of an English child.⁷⁵ It is also possible that Rowlandson intended to chew the food before feeding it to the child but became too hungry to spit it out. Medieval nurses prepared infants’ food in this manner, and the practice remained common among Stuart nurses, and likely among mothers.⁷⁶ Her “babe” was more than six years old when she died, but that does not mean Rowlandson was unfamiliar with the practice. Ultimately there is no way to know why she stole food from the child; it is perhaps more fruitful to emphasize that Rowlandson’s depictions map a change in foodways. Increasingly in the narrative, she ate her food raw, quickly, and ruthlessly—and was never satisfied.

Sometimes Rowlandson ate food that seemed English, and during other episodes food that seemed Indian. Distinctions between Indians and English colonists remained murky. It is ironic that in Rowlandson’s description of her captors as cannibals, she rediscovered aspects of their humanity. After being separated from her two older children, Rowlandson inquired into their whereabouts and well-being whenever she found a likely conveyor of news. When one Indian told her that her son’s “master roasted him,” that the storyteller “himself did eat a piece of him, as big as his two fingers,” and that he tasted like “very good meat,” Rowlandson immediately doubted him. Considering “*their horrible addictedness to lying,*” she professed herself unconvinced that her son had been cannibalized.⁷⁷ These Indians did not eat human

73. *Ibid.*, 95–96.

74. Potter, “Writing Indigenous Femininity,” 160–61; and Davis, “Mary Rowlandson’s Self-Fashioning.”

54. Derounian suggests that the theft constituted a symptom of hypermesia, itself a symptom of the “survivor syndrome” she describes. Derounian, “Puritan Orthodoxy and the ‘Survivor Syndrome,’” 89.

75. Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence*, 110; Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 141; and Lee, “‘The Hungry Soul,’” 79. Another interpretation concludes that Rowlandson declined to disclose her motives for stealing because “her narrative is only if oddly concerned with evaluating taste.” This point is not persuasive insofar as Rowlandson’s narrative is also clearly invested in evaluating *eating* as well as taste. Stein, “Mary Rowlandson’s Hunger,” 476.

76. Nicholas Orme, *Medieval Children* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 66; and Woolgar, *The Senses in Late Medieval England*, 109. I am grateful to my colleague Chris Woolgar for suggesting this additional interpretation and for his recommendation of relevant citations.

77. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 87.

flesh, but were, rather, people capable of deception.⁷⁸ In other words, the line separating Indians and Englishmen was not clear-cut, a fact that Rowlandson came to realize as she remained in captivity.

If Rowlandson's changing tastes denoted her tendency to try to retain her Englishness, and her transforming eating habits represented her acculturation to new foodways, then her attitude toward work engendered similarly mixed results. Some of the work she did reflected Indian labor patterns, but her production of clothing continued to mark her definitively as an Englishwoman. During captivity, furthermore, Mary Rowlandson remained largely unable to learn the norms governing work etiquette. Only in retrospect does it become clear that obvious patterns governed captives' treatment among this Indian confederation.⁷⁹

When Rowlandson worked, she received food; when she did not, she went hungry. Because these moments when she failed to eat expose contradictory moments in the narrative, they allow the reader a more comprehensive understanding of bifurcated Indian and English attitudes toward work. Native Americans' work was shaped by gender divisions that deviated from the English society with which Rowlandson was most familiar.⁸⁰ Her inability to abide by their system not only left her without sustenance but also created conflict between Rowlandson and her Indian mistress, Weetamoo.

To be sure, Rowlandson's narrative contains some references to food that resist easy analysis. Some Indians gave her food without explaining why, and Rowlandson remained frustratingly silent on many methods of food production and preparation. After crossing the Connecticut River, she reportedly sat down and wept, whereupon someone gave her "two spoon-fulls of Meal to comfort" her, while another proffered "half a pint of Peas."⁸¹ When Rowlandson first ate bear, she did so because a woman gave her a piece. Unable to find a way to prepare it, Rowlandson kept it overnight in her "stinking pocket" before returning the next day—whereupon the woman let her boil it in her kettle.⁸² Shortly thereafter, she went into a wigwam to escape from the

78. For other analyses of this moment, see Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 114; and Lee, "The Hungry Soul," 77–78. It is important to note that English colonists also employed cannibalism tropes to describe the war. In the bloody English attack on the (still neutral, at that point) Narragansett's Great Swamp in December 1675, one Benjamin Tompson was said to remark that "had we been cannibals here we might feast." Lepore, *The Name of War*, 89 (quote); and Steele, *Warpaths*, 102 (for Narragansett neutrality).

79. It is difficult to say with certainty whether Rowlandson's situation was representative of captives' experiences as a whole, given that hers is one of the few surviving narratives from the time.

80. For a description of women's work in early American history, with an emphasis on the nineteenth century, see Jeanne Boydston, *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

81. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 82. See also Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 77.

82. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 85.

cold, where another woman told her to sit, fed her groundnuts, “and bade [her] come again.”⁸³ After being expelled from a different wigwam, an older man approached her, invited her to *his* wigwam, and instructed his wife to give Rowlandson groundnuts.⁸⁴ People may have performed these unexplained acts of generosity simply to make her feel better.

It is not always apparent who was responsible for the task of cooking. Rowlandson’s tendency to lump the Indians together led to pronouncements such as “they fell to boyling of Ground-nuts,” or “they were boyling Corn and Beans,” without revealing who, exactly, made these arrangements.⁸⁵ In mixed groups of Indians traveling with Europeans, women usually prepared food.⁸⁶ The fact that Rowlandson noted when a man or woman was cooking alone indicates that when she used the word *they* she was referring to a gathering of both genders, suggesting that the conflict disrupted gender norms. Methods of cooking also remain difficult to uncover. Cookware may have been sparse, given the fact that Rowlandson had to borrow a kettle to boil her bear and the fact that the Indians boiled deer’s blood in its stomach to make a large meal for several people.

It is likely that New England Indians’ work—including food procurement and distribution—followed a number of unspoken rules. The need to obtain edible and merchantable commodities drove this labor; farming yielded crops, and hunting supplied meat to eat and furs to trade. Native New England women traditionally tended crops, whereas men hunted and waged war.⁸⁷ Had it been peacetime, Rowlandson likely would have worked in the fields. Had she been a male captive this expectation would not have changed—captives among Algonquians were generally expected to contribute to agricultural production, though in male captives’ cases this work would have seemed doubly humiliating.⁸⁸ Given the fact that it was wartime, it seems apparent that more Indians’ attention turned to food procurement and that everyone became more physically mobile.

The key point is that Rowlandson’s background blinded her to these new work divisions. English women, especially in self-sufficient New England, would have shared family farm labor—grinding grain, assisting with butchering, milking cows, and pressing cider—but colonists’ ideas about land use deviated from those of Indians.⁸⁹ Indians conceived of land as commonly owned, and though crops produced on land were private, Indians frequently shared food. When someone replaced the

83. *Ibid.*, 85.

84. *Ibid.*, 87.

85. *Ibid.*, 83, 95–96.

86. James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: Norton, 1999), 137.

87. Little, *Abraham in Arms*, 13–14, 99.

88. Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slavery in New France* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 19, 57.

89. James E. McWilliams, *A Revolution in Eating: How the Quest for Food Shaped America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 10.

spoonful of cornmeal in her pocket for “five *Indian Corns*,” Rowlandson deemed it theft rather than exchange.⁹⁰ But from a Native perspective it is possible that ears of corn constituted a fair trade for the grains. The treatment of animals was also different. Indians rarely used domesticated animals to plow fields, and when they raised pigs, they were raised in the woods.⁹¹ Colonists fenced their fields and domesticated animals, claimed individual tracts of land, and usually exchanged food only for personal gain.

Rowlandson haltingly performed several different types of work in the narrative. She cleaned, walked long distances, carried things while moving between camps, and prepared food. Even on the day of her capture, Rowlandson walked a mile.⁹² On other days her group traveled five miles or more, fording rivers and climbing hills so steep that she had “to creep up upon [her] knees, and to hold by the twiggs and bushes to keep [herself] from falling backward.”⁹³ Such exertions understandably resulted in filth. When she encountered her son, Rowlandson spent time combing “his head . . . for he was almost overcome with lice.”⁹⁴ Nowhere else in the narrative does Rowlandson groom anyone, although her job of carrying water does indicate that she may have taken part in other washing activities.⁹⁵

To some extent, Indians also worked in ways that mirrored Rowlandson’s work habits. They joined her in the fields gleaning corn, and some of them cooked like she did. After meeting King Philip after an extended absence, he asked Rowlandson when she last bathed, and when she “told him not this month,” he “fetcht [her] some water himself, and bid [her] wash.”⁹⁶ This may have been unusual; Rowlandson was close to being redeemed from captivity, and Philip may have been cognizant of the fact that a reeking Rowlandson might have reflected poorly on the Indians’ treatment of her.

Much of this labor, such as carrying things, differentiated Rowlandson from her captors. She did not know how to replace food she took with something equivalent, she rarely kept her complaints to herself, and she did not appear eager to work. Even her corn gathering differed from that of other Indians. Whereas her master’s servant went off for three weeks to harvest corn, Rowlandson was not permitted to take long journeys in the woods by herself.⁹⁷ When traveling in the woods, colonists would have expected to bring quite a lot with them: kegs of wine and rum, casks of butter, bread, and cheese, and beef, bacon, salt, and rice. Many found room for delicacies such as chocolate, sugar, and tea. Indians, by comparison, traveled light, carrying a weapon, a tobacco pouch and pipe, and sometimes a kettle and a bag of cornmeal

90. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 83.

91. Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*, 213.

92. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 70.

93. *Ibid.*, 85.

94. *Ibid.*, 90.

95. *Ibid.*, 84, 93.

96. *Ibid.*, 96.

97. *Ibid.*, 84.

mixed with sugar.⁹⁸ But they also paradoxically carried more at times: because they relied less on domesticated animals, the younger Indians in Rowlandson's narrative carried the sickly, the older men and women, and those of high status.⁹⁹ Colonists, of course, would have used domesticated animals to bear their baggage, and as a female traveler Rowlandson would not have expected to carry much herself. Although the Indians had some horses, women, who constituted the majority of Rowlandson's party, "travelled with all they had, bag and baggage."¹⁰⁰

Throughout the course of the narrative, Rowlandson tried to position her labor in ways that conformed to English concepts of female roles: she sewed, knitted, and cooked.¹⁰¹ These differences made it difficult for her to fit in, and consequently she ate when she labored but hungered when she malingered. She usually grumbled when asked to carry baggage, and she tried to avoid working on Sabbath days. "Sometimes I met with favour, and sometimes with nothing but frowns," she complained.¹⁰² During the fifth remove she was "somewhat favored" in her carrying load because of a wound she had procured during the attack on Lancaster. Consequently she "carried only . . . knitting work and two quarts of parched meal." Upon asking her Indian mistress, Weetamoo, for "one spoonful of the meal," the woman refused her.¹⁰³ Rowlandson may have thought she was favored with a light burden, but had she labored more diligently she may have enjoyed a fuller stomach.

The narrative is dotted with instances of Rowlandson refusing to labor, which explains her constant companion, hunger, as well as other Indians' reactions to her work ethic. She encountered trouble on the Sabbath day, when she "desired them to let me rest," telling her captors that she would resume laboring the following day. They responded that if she refused to work, "they would break my face."¹⁰⁴ Rowlandson did not elaborate on the outcome of this interaction, perhaps because if she worked on the Sabbath she may not have wanted to admit it. Even when she toiled hard but complained, her captors threatened her. Upon setting off one day "with a good load" but bemoaning the fact that "the skin was off [her] back," they told her, "*That it would be no matter if my head were off too.*"¹⁰⁵

Most commonly the Indians criticized her verbally. Rowlandson was claimed by Quinnapin, the man she referred to as her master, and his several wives. On the day that she stole food from the English child, Rowlandson returned to one of the wives' wigwams, only to be told that she "disgraced [her] master with begging." "If

98. Merrell, *Into the American Woods*, 141.

99. When Indians used a structure to carry others, they used a bier, or a framework for a corpse or an exalted person. The practice of carrying sachems this way was more common in the Southeast. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 78–79, 78n34.

100. *Ibid.*

101. Davis, "Mary Rowlandson's Self-Fashioning," 55; and Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity,"

15

8. 102. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 85.

103. *Ibid.*, 79.

104. *Ibid.*, 79.

105. *Ibid.*, 87.

I did so any more,” she recalled, they threatened to “knock me in the head.” Defiant, she told them that “they had as good knock me in the head as starve me to death.”¹⁰⁶ Rowlandson failed to see an alternative to begging; she knew only that if she ceased doing so she would go hungry. It is interesting that the Indians’ scolding of her occurred on the same day that she purloined food from the English toddler. It is possible that the Indians recognized the monstrosity of her crime even when she did not. Alternately, it is possible that by neglecting to offer something in replacement for the horsemeat, Rowlandson crossed an invisible boundary. But it is also crucial to note that even though the Indians threatened violence, they did not harm her, possibly because they hoped she would recognize that she had to work for food.

Ultimately, it was Rowlandson’s production of English clothing that set her work apart from the Indians. At various points in *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, Rowlandson inadvertently received food in exchange for her inconsistent production of garments.¹⁰⁷ It is worth stating that there is quite a lot about this labor that Rowlandson simply never shared. She did not say where she obtained yarn and needles—though it is probable that they were in her pocket when she was taken captive.¹⁰⁸ She did not describe how long it took for her to complete a shirt, cap, or pair of stockings, although one gets the sense that she was capable of building a waiting queue.

Rowlandson first mentioned knitting stockings for one of her master’s wives, but did not at that point receive anything in return.¹⁰⁹ The production of the stockings even created conflict because she paused in her labor on the Sabbath. An exchange occurred shortly thereafter at the behest of King Philip himself, who asked Rowlandson “to make a shirt for his boy.” Using the knitting and sewing materials stowed away in her pocket, Rowlandson complied. The sachem gave Rowlandson a shilling, which she offered to her master, Quinnapin, but he told her to keep it. “With it I bought a piece of Horse flesh,” explained Rowlandson.¹¹⁰ These transactions continued throughout the narrative. After the shirt, Philip asked her to manufacture a cap. Then, he invited her to dinner, where she ate a parched wheat pancake fried in bear grease. “I never tasted pleasanter meat in my life,” she declared.¹¹¹ Although King Philip did not always give Rowlandson food, he gave her the means to procure it, as evidenced by the fact that her master would not accept the money she offered to him. It is curious that the “I” in the description of her purchase of horseflesh is the only word in the sentence she chose to highlight. Perhaps she felt some burgeoning sense of pride in her capacity to provide for herself. On the other hand it is dangerous to attribute

106. *Ibid.*, 96.

107. Several scholars have noted that Rowlandson traded the products of her knitting for edible goods. See Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 158; Burnham, “The Journey Between,” 66; Logan, “Mary Rowlandson’s Captivity,” 267; and Little, *Abraham in Arms*, 122.

108. See note 51.

109. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 79.

110. *Ibid.*, 83.

111. *Ibid.*, 83.

too much significance to seventeenth-century italicization, given its randomness; in the main Rowlandson remained ignorant of the wider implications of her industry.

Word of Rowlandson's cloth-making skills nevertheless spread. For a shirt, one woman gave her broth thickened with tree bark meal.¹¹² She made a pair of stockings in return for peas, and another shirt for someone's husband, for which she received bear meat. She used her earnings to cook supper and invited Quinnapin and Weetamoo to dinner.¹¹³ Indians' knowledge of Rowlandson's abilities may even explain those previously inexplicable moments when she received food in exchange for nothing. Late in the narrative, one of her master's wives told her that if she "wanted victuals," Rowlandson "should come to her."¹¹⁴ When Rowlandson took her up on the offer, she was greeted by a parade of other Indians, all of whom wanted clothing. One wanted "three pairs of Stockins," another "a shift."¹¹⁵ The older woman could invite Rowlandson into her wigwam because she was no longer a useless mouth incapable of reciprocity.¹¹⁶

Rowlandson's knitting and sewing to obtain sustenance demonstrate the awkward position she inhabited. Her manufacturing of English-style clothing marked Rowlandson as a non-Indian.¹¹⁷ Algonquian Indians remained aware that the English dressed differently; their word for Europeans was "Wautaconaug," or "Coatmen," deriving from "Waûtacome," or "one that wears clothes." Indians sought out English clothing when they could; those who attacked New England towns stripped dead colonists for their garments to wear or to trade.¹¹⁸ Rowlandson's labor thus fit within an established system that placed a dissimilar value on English-made garments. The fact that she did so little besides make clothes did not enhance her position, either.

Nowhere is this divide between Indian and English notions of labor more apparent than in Rowlandson's fraught relationship with Weetamoo, which remained contentious because the two women donned different gender roles.¹¹⁹ Weetamoo was what scholars have called a *squaw sachem* of a group of Wampanoags known as the Pocasset Wampanoags.¹²⁰ Her marriage to Quinnapin was designed to strengthen

112. *Ibid.*, 87.

113. *Ibid.*, 83.

114. *Ibid.*, 97.

115. *Ibid.*, 97.

116. In the last instance these Indians offered her clothing rather than food in return, but the point is that word of Rowlandson's skill had spread.

117. This line of argument disagrees with Michelle Burnham, who suggests that Rowlandson's work provides evidence of her acculturation within the Indian community. See Burnham, "The Journey Between," 66.

118. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 80; and Little, *Abraham in Arms*, 56–90, esp. 59.

119. Here I am disagreeing with Jordan Alexander Stein, who argues that "one thing that hunger surely does not do in this narrative . . . is gendering." As other scholars of Native American history have suggested, it is nearly impossible to guess what Native people were thinking because their actions are filtered through the eyes of colonial observers such as Rowlandson. Stein, "Mary Rowlandson's Hunger," 471. The best essay on Weetamoo is Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity," 153–67.

120. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 26.

Quinnapin's power, as his other marriages had (one of his wives was King Philip's sister). So too was it calculated to advance Weetamoo's position. Her first marriage had been to Wamsutta, King Philip's older brother—their union had brought the Pocasset and Pokanoket Wampanoags together, but Wamsutta died more than a decade before the war.¹²¹ Weetamoo's sister had strengthened the union by marrying Philip.¹²² Weetamoo's second husband, however, supported the English when King Philip's War broke out, and so she married the Narragansett Quinnapin. Her marriage reinforced the Wampanoag-Narragansett alliance against the colonists.¹²³ Reverend Increase Mather repeatedly called Weetamoo a military threat in his correspondence with London.¹²⁴ She was a ruler in her own right, imbued with more political power than any of the English women Rowlandson would have known.

Rowlandson and Weetamoo labored in gendered ways that made them fundamentally unable to understand each other and thus likely to come to loggerheads. Rowlandson depicted herself as submissive to the men in the narrative. She unquestioningly called Quinnapin her master, assuming that like other males, he held the power in Indian towns and villages.¹²⁵ There are two contrasting depictions of females in the account: the women who remain recognizably feminine in terms of their work and their willingness to feed Rowlandson and women like Weetamoo, with whom Rowlandson struggled.¹²⁶ Rowlandson remained much less willing to cede Weetamoo power over her because her previous position as a Puritan minister's wife meant she was used to acting as the female head of an important household.¹²⁷ Curiously, neither woman seemed explicitly responsible for growing or producing food. But wartime changed things.

Weetamoo's job (and again, it is not possible to know how it shifted during times of less strife) according to Rowlandson "was to make Girdles of *Wampom* and *Beads*."¹²⁸ Wampum, strung together from shells, played a significant role in Native American diplomacy. Indians used wampum belts to deliver messages accompanied by elaborate speeches.¹²⁹ Weetamoo's work was intricately bound up in these

121. *Ibid.*, 26.

122. Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity," 154.

123. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 26.

124. Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity," 154.

125. Davis, "Mary Rowlandson's Self-Fashioning," 54; and Little, *Abraham in Arms*, 91.

126. Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity," 153, 163.

127. Davis, "Mary Rowlandson's Self-Fashioning," 55. For an extended discussion of Rowlandson's relationship with Weetamoo, see Little, *Abraham in Arms*, 121–23.

128. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 97.

129. Nancy L. Hagedorn, "'A Friend to Go between Them': The Interpreter as Cultural Broker during Anglo-Iroquois Councils, 1740–70," *Ethnohistory* 35, no. 1 (1988): 68–80; Jane T. Merritt, "Metaphor, Meaning, and Misunderstanding: Language and Power on the Pennsylvania Frontier," in *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750–1830*, ed. Andrew R. L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 60–87; Steele, *Warpaths*, 89; Gregory Evans Dowd, "'Insidious Friends': Gift Giving and the Cherokee-British Alliance in the Seven Years' War," in Cayton and Teute, *Contact Points*, 131, 136; Jane T. Merritt, *At the Crossroads: Indians and*

diplomatic customs and may even have enhanced her power. Rowlandson, however, interpreted this effort as an act of vanity; instead of serving a functional purpose, the wampum was shaped into a fashion accessory that supplemented Weetamoo's "Neck-laces . . . Jewels in her ears, and Bracelets upon her hands," powder in her hair, and the paint on her face.¹³⁰ In Weetamoo's case Rowlandson deliberately set out to depict indigenous femininity as a failure to adhere to English conventions.¹³¹

Rowlandson's unwillingness to work under certain circumstances and her propensity to beg for food set her at odds with Weetamoo.¹³² They clashed when Weetamoo threatened Rowlandson, physically punished her, withheld food supplies, and declined to take prepared food from Rowlandson once she became able to obtain and prepare it herself. After one of the times when Rowlandson expressed her discontent, Weetamoo responded with one of the few acts of violence against Rowlandson in the narrative. During the twelfth remove, when Rowlandson complained that her carrying load "was too heavy," Weetamoo gave Rowlandson "a slap in the face, and bade [her] go."¹³³ It is plausible that Weetamoo reacted this way because she had just returned from the burial of a Native child, and her patience had worn thin—especially given the fact that her own baby, which dies later in the narrative, may already have been ailing.¹³⁴ It is also possible that Weetamoo could slap Rowlandson because she was trying to reform Rowlandson's lazy behavior. She could do so as Rowlandson's mistress and in her capacity as a female leader. Weetamoo had already refused to provide Rowlandson with cornmeal during a previous remove in which Rowlandson shirked her carrying load; perhaps the slap was another, different effort to modify her mindset.

The most singular difference between Rowlandson and Weetamoo is Weetamoo's reluctance to accept food when offered it. After Rowlandson obtained bear and peas in exchange for manufacturing a shirt and stocking, she boiled her "Pease and Bear together, and invited my master and mistress to dinner." Rowlandson complained that Weetamoo, "the proud Gossip, because I served them both in one Dish, would eat nothing, except one bit" that Quinnapin "gave her upon the point of his knife."¹³⁵

Empires on a Mid-Atlantic Frontier, 1700–1763 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 210; and Carolyn Eastman, *A Nation of Speechifiers: Making an American Public after the Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

130. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 97.

131. Potter, "Writing Indigenous Femininity," 153, 156, 161.

132. On her begging, see Davis, "Mary Rowlandson's Self-Fashioning," 55–56.

133. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 86.

134. *Ibid.*, 86 (for the burial) and 91 (for the death of Weetamoo's baby).

135. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 83. Mitchell Breitwieser unconvincingly reads this moment as one in which Rowlandson violated "a culinary prohibition"—which is to say, that she mixed "the bear meat and the peas" and cooked them together. If Rowlandson had violated a culinary taboo, Weetamoo would have declined to eat the dish entirely and so too would have Quinnapin. It seems likelier that Rowlandson believed she erred in mixing *eaters*, not edible items; she fed Weetamoo and Quinnapin out of the same dish. Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 155.

Yet the act of eating out of a single dish enjoyed a long history in Indian diplomacy, and it is entirely possible that Rowlandson misinterpreted the exchange. European observers regularly misunderstood Indian eating customs. Earlier descriptions of Indians in the area around Virginia, for example, usually exaggerated Indian periods of dearth and famine instead of admiring Indian self-sufficiency.¹³⁶ Historian Richard White's Algonquian-speaking Indians in the *pays d'en haut* spoke of having to "To eat from a common dish" when they wanted to convey feelings of alliance, friendship, and peace.¹³⁷ Lisa Brooks's work suggests that the metaphor traveled to New England.¹³⁸

Rowlandson may have violated a tacit dictum about feeding men and women together, but the rule was not inviolable, given the fact that Weetamoo accepted some of the dish when Quinnapin fed it to her. It seems possible that although Rowlandson deemed Weetamoo too proud, Weetamoo refused the meal because she was still skeptical of Rowlandson's ability to feed herself. Rowlandson's use of the word "gossip" inadvertently imbued Weetamoo with some of the power that English Puritan women enjoyed as established figures in the private and public community.¹³⁹ Unlike Rowlandson, Weetamoo could refuse food because of her assuredness of her ability to procure it. Rowlandson had made enough clothes to obtain provisions—but maybe Weetamoo abstained to encourage Rowlandson to maintain access to them in a planned and careful manner. The two women remained fundamentally incapable of understanding each other. Their conflict is representative of the burgeoning divide between Indians and English in colonial America.

If food and work in King Philip's War—as depicted in Rowlandson's narrative—tell historians anything, it is that they occupied ambiguous roles in seventeenth-century Indian-English relations. To some extent they epitomize the degree to which these two societies looked like each other on the eve of war, as well as in its wake. Food also, however, illustrates how profoundly different these two groups of people became

136. Robert Appelbaum, *Aguecheek's Beef, Belch's Hiccup, and Other Gastronomic Interjections: Literature, Culture, and Food among the Early Moderns* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 270. Thomas Hariot proclaimed that "these people, putting nothing aside, roast and eat everything." This assertion was immediately undermined by an accompanying engraving by artist Theodor de Bry, which depicted Indians roasting and drying fish to preserve them. Another engraving from the same publication portrayed a man and woman eating together, just as Weetamoo and Quinnapin did. Thomas Hariot, *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia: The 1590 Theodor de Bry Latin Edition Facsimile Edition Accompanied by the Modernized English Text* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 149, plate XIII.

137. Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 441–42. See also Shoemaker, *A Strange Likeness*, 86.

138. Lisa Brooks, *The Common Pot: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), xl, xli, 3–4.

139. Mary Beth Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society* (New York: Vintage Books, 1997), 222–39.

as violence proliferated. Rowlandson's narrative demonstrates that as time went on food itself became a site and means of aggression—and in ways that remained tied to labor.

To a small degree, food served to bridge the gap between Indians and colonists.¹⁴⁰ Before the war, the fur trade drove Europeans' contact with Natives, and Indians' desires for cloth, glassware, and metal facilitated exchange.¹⁴¹ By the time Rowlandson wrote her narrative, these types of exchange had expanded to encompass wampum-giving and trade in other commodities. Probate inventories from the period suggest that some New England Indians were adopting English agricultural practices (and by inference, hoes), as well as English furnishings—possibly with attendant cookware.¹⁴²

Even during the moments when violence broke out, it could be said that Indians and colonists resembled each other in their concerns about scarce provisions, the destruction of foodstuffs, and the starvation of noncombatants. Natives and colonists both contended with the logistical battle of maintaining foodstuffs. The preface to Rowlandson's narrative revealed that the English struggled to keep themselves well supplied. After three days in pursuit of the Narragansetts in February 1676, they found their "provision grown exceeding short," so much so that the men gladly killed "some Horses for the supply."¹⁴³ During wartime, the horsemeat that Rowlandson herself had initially shunned fed the English who tried to rescue her. She even attributed the Indians' attack on Lancaster to the army's inability to adequately provision itself, and consequently, to protect the town. She connected the fact that the army had run low on supplies with the fact that "the very next week the *Enemy* came."¹⁴⁴

Indians encountered similar issues. Rowlandson commented on their tendency to live "from hand to mouth," many times eating "up all they had."¹⁴⁵ Some aspects of Rowlandson's hunger may indeed have stemmed from Indians' problems supplying themselves during the war. She also, however, admitted that they could make methodical plans. When some of the Native force was preparing to attack Northampton, they prepared parched corn and boiled groundnuts for provisions on the way.¹⁴⁶ The two groups, in other words, confronted analogous issues.

140. This familiarity is apparent during the opening scene in Rowlandson's narrative, in which the Indians explained to Rowlandson that if she "*were willing to go along with them,*" they would not harm her. The Narragansetts, Nipmucks, and Wampanoags clearly understood enough English to convey their intentions to Rowlandson, or else they were capable of communicating effectively with sign language. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 70.

141. *Ibid.*, 11.

142. On probate inventories, see Lepore, *The Name of War*, 185. On hoes versus plows in New England, see James H. Merrell, "Second Thoughts on Colonial Historians and American Indians," *William and Mary Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (2012): 474n104. See also Jane Mt. Pleasant, "The Paradox of Plows and Productivity: An Agronomic Comparison of Cereal Grain Production under Iroquois Hoe Culture and European Plow Culture in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Agricultural History* 85, no. 4 (2011): 460–92.

143. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 63.

144. *Ibid.*, 105. See also Logan, "Mary Rowlandson's Captivity," 271.

145. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 106.

146. *Ibid.*, 83.

Indians and English both used food to interpret the enemy's movements, and they targeted foodstuffs as a military strategy—which is why both sides had to repeatedly forage for corn.¹⁴⁷ The Narragansetts' attack on Lancaster was motivated by the fact that they had exhausted their own food supplies, as well as those of their Nipmuck hosts.¹⁴⁸ The pursuit of crops and animals formed an integral component of military planning.¹⁴⁹ After the Lancaster strike, Rowlandson described “the waste” the Indians made “of Horses, Cattle, Sheep, Swine, Calves, Lambs, Roasting Pigs, and Fowls . . . some roasting, some lying and burning, and some boyling to feed our merciless Enemies.”¹⁵⁰ In keeping with contemporary practice, the Indians butchered and ate what they could carry, and maimed or killed outright what they could not. Attacks on animals fed the Indians at the same time that they sent colonists a symbolic message of violence (as historian Virginia Anderson has suggested).¹⁵¹

Crops, too, drew the attention of belligerents. During Rowlandson's seventh remove the Indians “spread themselves over the deserted *English* fields, gleaning” the wheat, corn, and groundnuts.¹⁵² Rowlandson even participated in the theft, reporting that she “got two ears of *Indian* Corn,” which someone stole from her.¹⁵³ The “crime” bothered Rowlandson because she considered the corn her property, even at the same time that she failed to recognize that she was participating in a well-established form of warfare. Rowlandson termed the behavior of killing animals “waste,” whereas during moments when *she* participated in stealing corn she called it gleaning, suggesting that as aggressors the English would have approved of the action but condemned it when their enemies practiced similar behavior. The Indian who took her corn may have done so because he or she considered the act of reaving a communal activity and the spoils the collective belongings of the Indians.¹⁵⁴ Rowlandson's inabil-

147. By the time of King Philip's War, the English had codified acceptable modes of warfare, taking their cue in part from Dutch theorist Hugo Grotius. Grotius distinguished between two different sets of rules governing warfare: one for non-Christians and one for Christians. But the problem was that he failed to tell readers which set of laws was applicable when a Christian nation waged war against a non-Christian nation (or, in the case of the Christian Indians, when some enemies were potentially Christians whereas others were not). Lepore, *The Name of War*, 107–11; Wayne E. Lee, *Barbarians and Brothers: Anglo-American Warfare, 1500–1865* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 188.

148. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 64, 64n4.

149. Ian K. Steele remarks that “as the war continued,” raiding for food “yielded few cattle and less grain,” and “the hungry, retreating English” simply proved “better able to find food than their now migratory enemies.” Steele, *Warpaths*, 106.

150. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 71.

151. Mitchell Breitwieser incorrectly states that the Indians “cook all the animals.” Breitwieser, *American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning*, 136. For more on the practice of attacking animals, see Anderson, *Creatures of Empire*. I depart from Anderson's methodology to some extent insofar as I also see these attacks on animals as attacks on edible sources of meat.

152. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 81.

153. *Ibid.*, 81.

154. In a fairly recent article James Merrell spends time picking apart the terms that historians have used to differentiate colonists from Indians, and takes particular issue with the use of the word *settlers*. He argues that the word implies agricultural practice, and that historians' tendency to assign it to colonists elides

ity to see the Indians' behavior as a strategy is strange, given the fact that the English also directed attacks against Indians' crops—a point which Rowlandson recognized. “*It was thought, if their corn were cut down, they would starve and dy with hunger,*” she wrote, and so all the “*Corn that could be found,*” the English “*destroyed.*”¹⁵⁵

Similar foodways do not make peaceful societies. Ultimately the war was a battle over English encroachment on Indian lands, justified in part by the idea that Indians did not labor in acceptable, productive ways: their men did not farm, and as a whole they relied overmuch on hunting. In the main, King Philip's War illustrated the growing divide between colonists and Indians in seventeenth-century New England. Despite living among Indians, eating with them and *like* them, Rowlandson also expressed deep hostility toward her captors. Part of the problem with the similarities between Indians and English was that they also engendered a sense of difference.

Mary Rowlandson was eventually redeemed from captivity. In August 1676 Philip was shot to death near his home. Colonists removed his head and placed it on a tall pole outside of Plymouth, where it lingered for decades until the bones had been bleached by the sun.¹⁵⁶ At this unofficial end of the war, twenty-five English towns, more than half of all the colonists' settlements in New England, had been ruined. Their losses left them bound to the coast and desperately dependent on England for support. They signed no peace. English colonists would enslave and sell Indian captives—including Philip's nine-year-old son—to the West Indies, and Algonquian and Iroquoian Indians would continue to attack English towns throughout the eighteenth century.¹⁵⁷ Warfare, too, had changed, widening the gap between English and Indians, and ensuring that in the future paid (and sometimes trained) colonists would wage an extirpative mode of war-making against Indian enemies.¹⁵⁸

Although some scholars have noted the extensive references to food in Rowlandson's narrative, no one has systematically assessed the ways in which Rowlandson traded her labor for food. After a period of acculturation that left her tastes an odd and uneasy mix between Native and non-Native and her eating more recognizably

the extant agricultural practices of Indians. This erasure is important because colonists' claims that Indians did not farm provided part of their legal justification for seizing Indians' lands. *Reavers* is one of the alternate terms Merrell suggests that historians use to refer to colonists. Given that part of Merrell's aim is to illuminate similarities between Indians and colonists, I have used the word here to denote the actions of Indians. Merrell, “Second Thoughts on Colonial Historians and American Indians,” 473–76 (for settlers) and 476 (for reavers).

155. Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, 105. The English also employed more insidious methods. Fearful that the Christian Indians loyal to the English would turn on colonists, in the fall of 1675 most of them were relocated to deserted islands, where many of them died of starvation. Lepore, *The Name of War*, xiii.

156. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 174.

157. Lepore, *The Name of War*, 177, 185; and Steele, *Warpaths*, 107.

158. Steele, *Warpaths*, 109; John Grenier, *The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier, 1607–1814* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 24–26.

Indian, Rowlandson began to sew and knit in exchange for edible commodities. Rowlandson's production of clothing enabled her to feed herself but prevented her complete acculturation because she produced decidedly non-Indian clothing. In failing to learn how to labor correctly, Rowlandson did not explicitly make the connection that working earned her sustenance. She remained mystified by food etiquette, and the length of time it took for her to learn to work created conflict with her mistress Weetamoo, exposing their different gendered approaches to labor. Oddly, neither woman seemed responsible for producing food—a fact that underscores the degree to which war disrupted work patterns.

Seventeenth-century New England Indians and colonists imbued food with many meanings. Food allowed them to trade and to communicate peaceful intentions. Strategies of theft and destruction of foodstuffs, however, also provided a scaffold for warmongering. Food studies scholars have toiled over the task of describing food's connection to war in later periods, and writers of Native American history have delineated conflicting Native and European concepts of labor.¹⁵⁹ If, as historians have suggested, notions of landholding differed, so too did ideas about food produced on that land. Nowhere do those ideas become clearer than during times of colonial wars. Rowlandson's narrative illustrates that Indians and English entertained fundamentally opposing ideas about the acceptable means of feeding themselves. Food traded for labor enabled peaceful relations with some Indians at the same time that it engendered violence with others, especially powerful Native women. These small-scale conflicts mirror the larger issues of increasing violence during a time when Europeans increasingly cultivated designs on Indians' lands.

159. For food and war, see Kristin L. Ahlberg, *Transplanting the Great Society: Lyndon Johnson and Food for Peace* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008); Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010); Andrew F. Smith, *Starving the South: How the North Won the Civil War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2011); and Lizzie Collingham, *The Taste of War: World War II and the Battle for Food* (New York: Penguin, 2012). For studies of land, see William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 62–74; Steele, *Warpaths*, 40; Daniel K. Richter, “‘Believing That Many of the Red People Suffer Much for the Want of Food’: Hunting, Agriculture, and a Quaker Construction of Indianness in the Early Republic,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 19, no. 4 (1999): 601–28; Shoemaker, *A Strange Likeness*; and Richter, *Trade, Land, Power*, 144.