THE SPICE OF POPERY:

EUROAMERICANS AND INTERFAITH CONFLICT AND COEXISTENCE ON THE MAINE FRONTIER,

1688 – 1727

by

LAURA M. CHMIELEWSKI

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

2006

UMI Number: 3232042

Copyright 2006 by
Chmielewski, Laura M.

All rights reserved.

UMI Microform 3232042
Copyright 2006 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

LAURA M. CHMIELEWSKI

All rights reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____	_____
Date	Carol Berkin, Chair of Executive Committee
_____	_____
Date	Mary Gibson, Acting Executive Officer

Professor David Jaffee_____

Professor Angelo Angelis_____

Professor Jonathan Sassi_____

Professor Barbara Welter_____
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

THE SPICE OF POPERY:

EUROAMERICANS AND INTERFAITH CONFLICT AND COEXISTENCE ON THE MAINE FRONTIER, 1688-1727

by

Laura M. Chmielewski

Adviser: Professor Carol R. Berkin

The title of this dissertation comes from a quote by the Reverend Increase Mather. The minister was concerned that the Andros faction, now deposed, had brought in its wake long-term religious consequences to all parts of New England that could not be easily undone. "The Spice of Popery" was a seasoning that many New Englanders disdained on their palates, and fear that it was creeping in, from religious subversives both within and without the colony - and especially from the surrounding French colonial territories – was common.

One of the most porous of these boundaries of faith was the Province of Maine. Almost completely surrounded by territory claimed by the French, and home to several Catholic missions in close proximity to the English settlements, Maine was a particularly fragile and vulnerable part of New England. This fragility was made apparent during the three earliest wars of empire and beyond, when the province's English settlements were repeatedly targeted by French and Indian forces.

Maine's geographic state, however, had the ironic effect of making the province a remarkable rich region for interfaith contact. Though much of this contact was born of duress, it did have the ironic consequence of bringing Protestants and Catholics into a close circle of encounter, conflict, and coexistence. The rhetorical world of the Christian "other" flourished throughout New England, and strengthened together with the region's collective borders. But few places in the Atlantic World have left such a varied legacy of real interfaith interaction, and long-term consequences of that interaction, as colonial Maine. The results – mixed-faith families, inheritance confusion, blurred lines of religious orthodoxy, and accommodation based on proximity and need – would remain a hallmark of Maine's colonial heritage. In addition, such contact highlights the similarities as well as the differences between Christian groups in the early Atlantic World. Reformation and Counter-Reformation reinterpreted many of the aspects of Christian spiritual life. These seeped into colonial religious life, and are seen most clearly where the two faiths encountered each other's representatives in the flesh.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I first began down this path, I braced myself for a long and lonely academic endurance race. But the process of creating this study has been anything but solitary. The intellectual insights, editorial acumen, and good will of a host of mentors, colleagues and friends grace almost every page of this work.

Heading the mentor list is Carol Berkin. For years, Carol carefully read and commented on my text and helped me to define the scope of this project, always doing so in the spirit of friendship, fun and hospitality. The lessons in scholarship and leadership I learned from her are ones I will carry with me for the rest of my career. David Jaffee was always giving of his time and intellect. He treated me like a peer long before I earned the right to be considered one. I also owe a debt of gratitude to Barbara Welter, whose engagement in my scholarly career began long before my tenure at the Graduate Center. In addition, I thank the faculty of the History Department of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, especially Jonathan Sassi, for his careful reading of this study. Angelo Angelis of Hunter College read many incarnations of this project and always offered calm and sage advice on all academic matters, most recently when he agreed to serve on my dissertation committee.

Emerson W. Baker of Salem State College kindly fielded my questions via email, and helped me to refine and contextualize my observations. His knowledge of Maine history is staggering, and I am grateful to him for generously sharing his expertise with me. Edwin G. Burrows of Brooklyn College read and commented on parts of this text, and offered valuable advice for improving this study's structure and focus. Our mutual interest in prisoners or war and their narratives led to many lively and fruitful email discussions.

The professional, courteous and knowledgeable staffs of the Maine Historical Society, Maine State Museum, Library and Archives Canada, Massachusetts State Archives, Massachusetts Historical Society, and the New York Public Library all patiently fielded my questions and pointed out potential avenues for exploration. I am indebted to them for helping me work through my research materials in an efficient and timely manner.

I would also like to acknowledge the generous support of the Colonial Dames of America, the Colonial Dames of the State of New York, and the American Council for Polish Culture. In addition, the City University of New York provided me with a two-year CUNY Writing Fellowship that gave me critical financial support at the time I needed it most. Marjorie Madigan of Marymount Manhattan College, Roger Panetta and Patrick Holt of Marymount College of Fordham University, and Lauren Kozol of Manhattanville College all gave this novice teacher ample opportunity to practice her craft. I am also immensely grateful to the faculty of the History Board of Study, School of Humanities at Purchase College of the State University of New York for selecting me to be their new colleague.

A host of friends improved this study immeasurably. Iris Towers and Julie Miller were perfect editorial companions and have become great personal friends. The members of Carol Berkin's writing "salon" – Phil Papas and Cindy Lobel, in addition to Angelo and Iris – were patient readers and kind critics. Betty Einerman of the Graduate Center History Department always kindly looked out for my interests and helped me to juggle my student life at CUNY with other responsibilities.

My family – my father, Stanley Chmielewski, and my sisters, Christine Smith and Mary Kay Hauser and their families – are thanked with love for standing by me all these years and lending moral support and wise counsel. My late mother, Mary T. Jaskowiak Chmielewski, knew well the value of good books, and lovingly fostered my childhood enthusiasm for all things Early American. Maria Theresa Eberhardt, my infant daughter, graciously napped often in the day and slept soundly through the night, allowing her mom to keep her hands free for typing and flipping through notebooks and files at all hours.

Finally, I thank my husband, Herman R. Eberhardt, for making this study possible. I relied heavily on his own brilliance as an historian and writer in all things pertaining to this study. As if this weren't enough, his generous spirit and loving support, and, most recently, his skills as a parent, provided me with the greatest gift one can give an aspiring scholar – time. To say I never could have completed this work without him is a gross understatement. For all these reasons, I dedicate this study to him, with all my love.

CONTENTS

Ackowledgements ……. vi

Brief Chronology ……... x

Introduction …… 1

Chapter 1. "The Land that was Barren … Shall Flourish Like the Lily:"
Christian Encounter and Diversity in Early Maine …….. 32

Chapter 2. "Satan's Prey" or "*l'esclavage de l'heresie Calviniste*?:"
Imperial Battles, Borderland Souls ……..... 82

Chapter 3. "Pits of Hell" or "*ménage des anges*?:" Unredeemed Captives,
Self-Marriage, and Mixed-Faith Families ……. 141

Chapter 4. The Ways of "His Industry:" Men of God and Their Ministries
On the Maine Frontier …… 188

Chapter 5. Protestant Ornaments and Popish Relicts: Maine's Material Culture
of Lived Religion …… 239

Conclusion …… 297

Abbreviations …… 304

Bibliography ……. 305

The Province of Maine, 1688-1727

Brief Chronology*

1688:	Onset of King William's War (War of the League of Augsburg)
1690:	New England forces under the leadership of Mainer Sir William Phips attempts to take Quebec; repulsed.
1691/2:	Candlemas Raid destroys York, Maine.
1695:	Mathew Cary brings twenty-two captives back to New England, many of whom had converted while in captivity.
1698:	Treaty of Ryswick ends King William's War.
1703:	Onset of Queen Ann's War (War of Austrian Succession); Wells is attacked.
1705:	Forces under Winthrop Hilton attack Kennebec village of Norridgewock and its Jesuit mission and destroy its church.
1705-6:	Reverend John Williams and John Stoddard travel to Canada to retrieve captives.
1709-10:	New England forces under Samuel Vetch help seize French Acadia.
1711:	Sir Hovenden Walker attempts conquest of Canada; repulsed.
1713:	Treaty of Utrecht ends Queen Ann's War, but boundary between Maine and French Acadia remains undefined.
1717:	Arrowsic Conference; Joseph Baxter offered as minister to Kennebec Valley Wabanakis.
1722–1727:	Dummer's War rages throughout Maine.
1724:	Norridgewock destroyed by New England militia; Sebastien Rale killed, flock scattered.
1727:	St. George's River Conference marks the end of most of the scattered fighting of Dummer's War.

* Compiled using Charles Clark, *The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763,* Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney, *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield*, and Noyes et al., *Genealogical Dictionary of Maine and New Hampshire.*

INTRODUCTION

In the winter and spring of 1753-54, a young merchant from Massachusetts visited Montreal, Quebec, and a number of smaller villages and towns within the confines of French Canada. The merchant, Nathaniel Wheelwright was impressed with the hospitality that he, a New England Protestant, received from his Catholic hosts. But as he later learned, this hospitality was only extended to his coreligionists when they were not in Canada to stay. Those who hoped to live in the colony were forced to abjure their religion and assent to Catholic baptism or face unpleasant consequences. Among other things, the Protestant Wheelwright learned that, had he the misfortune to die in Canada, his remains would have been "carried without the city & buried, as though the person had been a thief or a murderer."[1] Wheelwright found these revelations of sufficient interest to earn a note in his travel journal.

Wheelwright had stepped into a legally, politically, and theologically polarized world of religion, where general identifications like "Catholic" and "Protestant" meant the difference between the ability to settle in the colony and exclusion, expulsion, or complete denial of legal protection.[2] But this was nothing new to him, for he came from

---

[1] Nathaniel Wheelwright Diary [hereafter "Wheelwright"], 22 December 1753. Collections, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, MA [hereafter "MHS"].

[2] In accordance with the directives of Armand-Jean Duplessis, Cardinal Richelieu and founding member of the Company of One Hundred Associates, only Roman Catholics were permitted to settle in the colony after 1627. Louis IX reinforced this restriction with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. William Eccles, *The Canadian Frontier: 1534 –1760* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press,

a similarly-polarized religious environment. The English North American colonies of Wheelwright's day denied Catholics the rights of civil law and civic participation, and even went so far as to execute an Anglican priest who was suspected of crypto-Catholicism.[3] As Wheelwright's diary suggests, in New France these institutional biases went all the way to the grave. "Protestantism" was a state of soul and state of being. A Protestant body, even one that no longer possessed a soul, ran the risk of polluting ground that was sacred to Catholics.

But the disclosure of the terrible fate that awaited Wheelwright's mortal remains should he die in the French King's realm did not mar his journey. His trek to Canada was not a pleasure jaunt. Its purpose was to help solve a perennial problem that plagued New Englanders, and, in particular, the inhabitants of his family's native Maine.

Wheelwright was in Canada to redeem captives. As a member of a diplomatic mission on behalf of Massachusetts, he was charged with to negotiating the release of several children who had been snatched from the English settlements on the Maine frontier. They were reported to be among various French and Indian settlements, including a Montreal convent and the Iroquois mission at Sault St. Louis.[4] Fluent in French, Wheelwright was an obvious choice for such a mission by virtue of his language skills alone.

1983), 32-3; Peter Moogk, *La Nouvelle France: The Making of French Canada – A Cultural History* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2000), 60; Cornelius Jaenen, *The Role of the Church in New France* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1976), 66-7.

[3] The incident happened in New York in 1741. Mary Augusta Ray, *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), 66; Francis D. Cogliano, *No King, No Popery: Anti-Catholicism in Revolutionary New England* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995), 14.

[4] Wheelwright Journal, Nov. 21, 1753. MHS, Boston, MA.

Nathaniel Wheelwright had a deeper, more compelling connection to the French colony than just an ability to communicate with French-speaking-Native American captors, their priests, and colonial administrators. He had a paternal aunt who lived permanently in Canada. And not just in Canada, but in a convent. Moreover, this aunt's state seemed to be a matter of choice: the convent inmate herself, the one-time Esther Wheelwright, had for decades resisted her family's pleas to return to New England. Instead, she preferred to live life as Soeur Esther Marie-Joseph de l'Enfant Jesus – a contemplative in cloister, surrounded by other celibate women like herself.

These profound religious differences, however, did not keep aunt and nephew apart. Wheelwright visited Soeur Esther several times during his Canada mission. With the blessing of the local bishop – a carefully scrutinized privilege - he gained admittance to the Ursuline cloister. It was there that he delivered gifts to his aunt from extended Wheelwright family members. He took back with him to New England her reciprocating gifts, as well as written greetings (unfortunately now lost).[5]

Esther Wheelwright was in Canada to stay – a fairly common fate for a significant percentage of the captives taken during King William's, Queen Anne's, and Dummer's wars. But captivity such as hers was becoming a relic of the past. Changes in raiding and ransoming techniques, along with a shift in the types of frontier dwellers targeted, was reducing the captivity phenomenon. Captives like the Noble and Mitchell children, who were being held in various Canadian communities and whose release Wheelwright and a fellow emissary were attempting to secure, were by mid-century the exception rather than the rule. While hundreds of settlers on the English frontier were forcibly

[5] Emma Lewis Coleman, *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars* [hereafter "*NEC"*], vol. I (Portland, ME, The Southworth Press, 1925; reprint., Bowie, MD: Heritage Classics, 1989), 428.

taken from their homes during the aforementioned wars, a mere sixty-eight were taken during the period that both preceded and spanned the final intercolonial conflict that pitted New France against New England, the French and Indian War.[6] The reasons for this decline are easily explained. For one, the Maine frontier continued to push northward, increasing the buffer zone for the older settlements to the Eastward and adding safety in numbers. In addition, New Englanders had grown more skilled at protecting themselves and formed understandings and alliances with the indigenous population who for decades had perceived their best interests as lying with the French.[7]

These changes, of course, made little difference to the captives themselves and the families they left behind. Captivity and its attendant evils remained a terrifying prospect for Mainers. During raids, hostages continued to witness the destruction of their homes or communities, the slaughter of valuable livestock, and families dispersed among various Native American and French communities. Still, critical differences separated the later captivity cases from earlier ones. For one, though most later captives suffered the loss of their property and worldly goods, they witnessed virtually no killing of family members and neighbors. English captives, even the infirmed and the very young and old, brought handsome bounties to Wabanaki and Iroquois captors, and the benefits of keeping them alive far outweighed the disadvantages. Thus ritual and "mercy" killings had become an extreme rarity, with captors taking every effort to preserve lives during and after attacks. In addition, with a few notable exceptions (including the elusive Fanny

---

[6] For a complete description of Maine captives taken between 1750 and 1760, See Coleman, *NEC* II: 250–269.

[7] For critical transition points in Wabanaki/French relations through 1760, see Kenneth Morrison, *The Embattled Northeast: The Elusive Ideal of Alliance in Abenaki-Euroamerican Relations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

Noble, one of Wheelwright's targets), most captivities of the period of the French and Indian War were of relatively short duration and were ended through some form of negotiation.[8] Finally, most Mainers who were taken during the later stages of the intercolonial conflicts actually had something to return to after redemption. In previous wars, some communities had been so thoroughly decimated that survivors retreated to the relative safety of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, never to return, and family members remained unaware of the fate of their captive loved ones for decades, and vice-versa.

To these latter-day Maine captives, captivity was a terrible but rarely fatal or permanent fate. Their situation contrasted sharply with that of their predecessors, who had suffered through life in the chronic fear that enemies to their interests lurked on every border. The "sorrowful decades" of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, as Cotton Mather called them, left a fearful legacy of violence, death, and material loss that collectively plagued the communities to the Eastward.

But they also left something far more tangible. The New England Wheelwrights, and families like them who lost kin permanently to Canada, had another legacy: kinship networks that bridged colonial, ideological, cultural and religious boundaries. At age thirty-three, Nathaniel Wheelwright was part of a generation that had been spared from many of the horrors of frontier warfare that had beset its predecessors. As such, he was ideally placed to become the mediator through which the disparate parts of the greater Wheelwright family – the New England Protestant trunk and the small French Catholic

---

[8] See Evan Haefeli, "Ransoming New England Captives in New France," *French Colonial History* 1 (2002): 113–127.

branch – formed new post-captivity understandings of family. And his aunt, Esther Wheelwright was the human "spice of popery." Her very existence challenged Puritan family values and coerced familial affection that transcended the boundaries drawn by monarchs and even those perceived to have come from God Himself.

The situation of the Wheelwrights was a fairly common one for Maine settlers from 1688 through 1727, the years covered by this study. Many of these settlers had faced the religious "other" in the flesh. Prolonged captivities, or those that never ended, created mixed faith families among Maine's early settlers. In addition, the proximity of New France meant that voluntary cross-cultural travelers (in contrast to captives, who were victims of war), were also exposed to alternative Christian religious systems. This provided an opportunity for encounter to which few in northern and eastern New England were privy. And this was but one way in which the "spice of popery" seasoned the palate of colonial Maine.

Between 1688 and 1727, Maine was one of the most active staging grounds for the imperial conflicts that rocked the English colonies. Starting with King William's War and ending with Dummer's War, Maine settlements were among the easiest targets for hostile French forces from *la Nouvelle France*. When combined with frequently-troubled relations with the "half-frenchified Indians" who inhabited Wabanakia (the overlapping landmass that was home to five major northern New England indigenous groups), Maine became an explosively unpredictable place for those who attempted to live, farm, and fish there. Lack of geopolitical definition and settler cohesion further contributed to the problems.

But during the course of the period of this study, Mainers developed a more unified identity as Protestants on English territory. Catholics and their trappings – missions, converted Native Americans, and settlements within safe and easy reach of English Maine – became convenient and easily-recognized targets. The wars that stretched from 1688 to 1727, however, also carried in their wake long-term consequences for the lives of many of the Province of Maine's people. Protestant families with converted French captives among them, like the Wheelwrights, were left to deal with the presence of papists in the family. This led to complications in issues such as inheritance, recognition, and familial intimacy. Jesuit and Sulpician missionaries who continued their ministry to the Wabanakis - and who took on the Protestant ministers who tried to coax their proselytes into embracing English interests - also left a permanent mark on the province. The Wabanakis themselves, would for the most part reject Protestant Christianity when it was offered to them, favoring instead their older French Catholic identity and guaranteeing that its culture remained interwoven into the province's religious life. These religious affinities added one more layer of difference between the colonists and Maine's indigenous people.

One reason for the frequent upheavals in these areas was the type of people who lived there. French Catholics of Quebec and Acadia and their Native American allies watched anxiously as settlements founded by Protestant New Englanders, inspired by new waves of Puritan fervor, pushed up into Maine and ever closer to Canada. These Protestants challenged the prevailing religious climate. Like practically all New Englanders, the first generations of Mainers loathed Catholicism in principle and feared the reality of its influence. At first these fears were limited to the presence of Maine's

Native Americans. But when it became clear that practitioners and allies of Catholic New World interests were not averse to kidnapping their neighbors, spouses, parents, children and grandchildren, these settlers feared much graver consequences. They were right to do so. Catholicism's New World threat was not limited to its centers of power in the Saint Lawrence Valley. It was manifest in countless borderland spaces that nearly surrounded early Maine. One saw evidence of them in missions that operated in contested New England territory, in French-controlled trading posts that extended up the contested Maine coast toward the Bay of Fundy, in Canada and Acadia (French colonies almost as close to Maine as Massachusetts itself), and in coastal waters. In a borderland, and an extremely porous one at that, Protestant and Catholic identifications became a simple, though necessary, shorthand for identifying friend and foe. The explicitness and quantity of language laden with religious terms in sources that describe the situation in Maine between 1688 and 1727 demonstrates the frequency of this usage. The religiously-charged atmosphere that these underlying assumptions created inspired James Axtell to observe in *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America*: "[t]he intercolonial wars between France and England … took on a decisively religious character, particularly in Maine."[9]

Drawing inspiration from this observation, this study aims to identify the key areas in which this religious character made its mark on the lives of people living in an early American borderland. Naturally, questions arise about which element - religious identity or the vagaries of geography - played the more critical role in determining the responses of and long-term consequences to Mainers who lived through the early wars of

[9] James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures In Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford, 1985), 247.

empire. In a place like Maine, however, this interplay was incredibly complex. Rather than adopt a definitive stand, this study will examine the importance of both, and explore how they were related to one another.

Though intrinsic religious differences appear to be simple and clear-cut, a this study will reveal that, like most aspects of the borderland, a more complex story lies beyond the general dichotomies of English and French, Protestant and Catholic, and European and Native Americans. In recent decades, scholars of early American history have called for comparative studies of early America's empires, and this study is designed to respond to that call.[10] Like other peoples throughout the Americas, Mainers did not just simply practice religion, they lived it. How that lived religion was challenged, changed, and adapted, and how it affected Mainers' long-term interests is the key line of inquiry for this study.

The complexly-knit religious fabric created by the intermingling of Catholicism and Protestantism on the Maine frontier began to unravel toward the middle of the eighteenth century. Dummer's War, the last intercolonial war covered in this study, was not the last time Maine suffered during the colonial wars of empire, but it marked a turning point in securing Maine for the growth of Protestant communities. After this war, most of the theological fighting would be between Protestant denominations, not Christian faiths. And the religious consequences became less about power and more about management and containment.

---

[10] Important studies that have influenced this one are Jay Gitlin, "On the Boundaries of Empire: Con*nec*ting the West to its Imperial Past," in Cronon et al, eds., *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past* (New York: Norton, 1992), 71-89; David J. Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven: Yale, 1992); Gordon M. Sayre, *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); and Axtell, *The Invasion Within*.

In general, the experience and consequences of the colonial wars were largely a function of where one lived. Though distant from the local seats of European powers, the borderlands between New England and New France were frequently at the center of these conflicts. Indeed, formal definition of the American border between these two rival powers was not even attempted until the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. Even then, it continued to be a source of contention and friction for many years after.

* * *

To those who lived through and fought in them, King William's (War of the League of Augsburg), Queen Anne's (War of Spanish Succession), and Dummer's (often called Lovewell's or Father Rale's war and a conflict limited to Maine) wars were as much about the desire for one religious culture to reign supreme over a geographical region as they were about more secular forms of control at the behest of more worldly masters.

In its broadest sense, this study is essentially a story of an Atlantic World encounter, in which the range of experiences documented challenges basic assumptions about faith and identity in early American life. But examining religious encounter - at a time in colonial North America when interfaith toleration and diversity existed in some colonies but were far from the overall norm – limits the subjects here to specific types of people in specific places under specific circumstances. In other words, interfaith encounter was not a daily or regular occurrence. It unfolded against a backdrop of

exceptional, and often traumatic, circumstances – the very ones that would spur Protestants and Catholics alike to turn to their respective religions for solace, consolation, and guidance. Thus the key historical actors who populate these pages are chiefly Mainers who experienced captivity, their New England and New French families and their Canadian captors, Protestant ministers, Catholic priests, Christianized Native Americans, frontier "culture brokers," and the few odd voluntary Protestant-born converts to French Catholicism and French culture.

The search for religious culture on a borderland requires casting a wide net for sources. Scholars who write about the religious culture of early America most frequently draw on its textual sources. Some focus solely on intrinsically religious works, such as sermons and pious books. Others have ranged more widely, relying on sources that can convey forms of religious expression. Given the range and availability of a complex set of sources, this study is far more interested in the latter forms of expression – the religious language of correspondence on otherwise mundane matters, descriptions of religious environments, the world of observed gestures, objects, and language – than on more formal materials produced explicitly for engaged audiences in sacred spaces. This is in large part out of necessity. Few sermons by Maine ministers survive. The province was the recipient of many young, untried and inconsistent ministers who were also walking into a particularly volatile zone. When warfare did not destroy written sermons, neglect of paper or other frontier hazards most likely finished the job.

Unfortunately, there are even fewer sources that provide insight into how Christianized Native Americans regarded the place of religion in borderland conflict. Such documents would have allowed for the formation of a rough parity among the

peoples of the borderlands. But relying on the observations of European contemporaries to develop this parity, as one is forced to do given this scarcity, is intrinsically problematic. Take, for example, the belief among cotemporary Euroamerican clergy that Native Americans who battled borderland New England settlers did so out of love for their new religious affinities. For decades, these assertions were taken at face value. Modern scholars, however, have provided numerous alternative explanations for the appearance of religious solidarity and its implications to borderland warfare. These interpretations draw on Native American ethnohistory, political structure and protocols, and long-standing relationships with other indigenous groups – connections for which European contemporaries lacked information or simply failed to make.[11] Unfortunately, however, few sources on the Native American perception of Christianity come directly from Native Americans themselves. Virtually all are filtered through the perceptions of the Europeans who observed them. It is this paucity of source material that makes it all but impossible to assign to Native American Christians equal roles to their Christian European neighbors. Assigning them a secondary, though nevertheless critically important, role in this study is less by desire than by design.

But sources that document Native American peoples do indeed provide other, more discrete services to this study. In part, these sources offer another set of insights into the ways that European religious systems – namely the practices, rituals, attitudes

[11] For an early assessment of the tensions within Native American communities brought on by European encounter, see Francis Jennings, *The Conquest of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1976). For more recent treatments, Denys Delâge, *Bitter Feast: Amerindians and Europeans in Northern North America, 1600-64*, trans. Jane Brierley (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1993), Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and the Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650 – 1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), and Daniel J. Usner, *Indians, Settlers and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley Before 1783* (Chapel Hill and London: UNC, 1992).

and language of Christian beliefs – were reformulated and restructured in the American environment. The Reformation and Counter-Reformation did not encounter each other only in Europe. That encounter spread across the ocean as new territorial conquests paved the way to new souls. Both religious systems offered their own templates for reconciling Christian beliefs with the cultures of indigenous peoples.

This study is hardly the first to demonstrate that the theology and spirituality of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation permeated the North American borderlands of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.[12] However, it does seek to show how these competing interpretations of Christian expression affected daily life in terms of the material world. In the realm of religious rhetoric, these expressions spoke of genuine differences between Catholics and Protestants; in the realm of lived religion, they often point to similarities. Thus, people of the borderlands sometimes found themselves forced to accept, accommodate, or just make sense of oppositional expressions of faith (and the people expressing them). As this study demonstrates, in Maine, such people were very often already family – a feature of borderland warfare that carried long-term implications for the New England families who suffered the misfortune of being pulled into cycles of inter-imperial violence.

Both the Protestantism and the Catholicism of seventeenth century Europe post-dated the initial period of religious upheaval that swept much of the continent. Yet the spirit of reform continued to thrive and spread throughout the Atlantic World. So too did

---

[12] Allan Greer discusses the drive to create a pure version of post-Reformation in Catholicism in *The People of New France* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 150. In *The Role of the Church in New France,* Cornelius J. Jaenen explores the role that Counter-Reformation religious orders played in early Canada. Part I: The Missionary Church, passim. Amos Megged's *Exporting the Catholic Reformation: Local Religion in Early-Colonial Mexico* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), explores the issues from the perspective of Spanish colonizers.

the spirit of religious experimentation. This manifested itself in the growth of new and radical creeds like Quakerism and Baptism on the Protestant side, and new religious orders, missionary tactics, and devotional societies on the Catholic side. All these innovations crossed the Atlantic; all had distinct North American manifestations; all are seen engaging the faithful, or the potential faithful, in the places where New England and New France met, overlapped, and challenged each other for heavenly, as well as worldly, primacy.

Why focus on Maine? For one, the region known as the Province of Maine was one of the few territories where two rival colonial frontiers met. As such, the early English settlers in Maine were practically equidistant between their co-religionists to the south and their religious rivals to the northwest and east. In addition, from its earliest days, Maine attracted a mixture of ethnically, religiously, economically, and socially diverse peoples.[13] This situation was, of course, far from unique in the Atlantic World. But Maine's small population and relative concentration of diverse Protestants, all living on the fringe of the seat of the French Catholic empire in North America, meant that its colonists were universally poised to encounter the religious "other." This encounter at one of the greatest points of contrast – religious culture – was bound to happen even without the frequent outbursts of inter-imperial violence.

The texture of religious experience in Maine was at many points rich and varied, and considered potentially dangerous to observers from areas with a more homogenous, established religious culture. What they saw frequently shocked them. In Maine,

[13] For the most comprehensive treatment of all aspects of Maine's early development, see Charles Clark's classic *The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610-1763* (New York: Knopf, 1970).

"mission Indians," and at times their priests and the occasional *canadien*, came to English settlements for peaceful reasons. Mainers traded with Acadians. Settlers born in Ireland and Portugal could be found in English settlements like Pemaquid and Salmon Falls.[14] French-speaking Channel Islanders who settled on the northern frontiers were also a religiously diverse lot, a fact so universally known that, during the witchcraft crisis of 1692, Mainers and other New Englanders suspected them of being crypto-Catholics and secret allies of the French.[15] As early as 1645, a French Jesuit traveled from his mission on the Kennebec to make regular calls at Cushnoc, a spur of Plymouth Colony in the Penobscot Bay. As late as 1716, another Jesuit made regular visits for treatment of his rheumatism to a Puritan minister and doctor who had set up shop at an English settlement on Arrowsic island.[16]

Thanks to its geographic situation (a curse for this study's contemporaries but a blessing for historians), Maine produced a significant number of "cross-cultural travelers" - people who lived among, learned the culture of, or actively embraced another culture - than most areas of Anglo North America. The largest number of these were captives – involuntary immigrants to New France and the Native American communities in which French influence loomed large. As prisoners of war, their status was of interest not only to their families but to the governments of Massachusetts, Canada and Acadia as

---

[14] The Irish Edmunds family settled in Pemaquid and was taken to Canada in 1695. While John and Marie Kelly Edmunds were most likely already baptized Catholics, their children, who were very young at the time of captivity and probably born in Pemaquid, most likely were not. Antonio Fortado/Hurtado, a fisherman and native of Portugal, and married a Maine woman in 1683. Given that Portugal was dominated by Spain throughout the seventeenth century and had virtually no reformed tradition, it is highly unlikely that Fortado/Hurtado, settled in New England for the sake of Protestantism. *NEC,*I:188; II: 391-2. Also see Euan Cameron, ed., *Early Modern Europe* (New York: Oxford, 1999), 188, 289.

[15] See Mary Beth Norton, *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692* (New York: Knopf, 2002); Louise A. Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprise Among the Puritan Elite, 1630 – 1692* (New York: Oxford, 2001).

[16] Mary R. Calvert, *Black Robe on the Kennebec* (Monmouth, ME: Monmouth Press, 1991), 172-3.

well. The purpose of their captors was, first and foremost, to keep them within the captor culture.[17] The primary means of doing so was to bind their captives to them through the creation of common religious bonds.[18] This meant that religious culture was on the frontline of these encounters. Scholars are made aware of this thanks to the writings of the redeemed captives themselves, several of whom left narratives.[19] Their descriptions of religious encounter contain their observations on faith practices across a broad spectrum of "others" – on the frontier and beyond, as it was, in French Canada. This study is not about captivity narratives – not exclusively, that is. As a literary form, captivity narratives have received much attention of late from modern scholars in a wide array of disciplines. Because of their conventions and objectives as works of didactic literature, however, they are limited in their usefulness as completely reliable, authentic voices of captives and other cross-cultural travelers.[20]

---

[17] The most recent analyses of the complexities of captor/redeemer relations are Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney, *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 2003) and William H. Foster, *The Captor's Narrative: Catholic Women and Their Puritan Men on the Early American Frontier* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 2003) .

[18] Alden Vaughan and Daniel Richter demonstrate that the captives most likely to refrain from returning to New England were those who had become acculturated French Catholics. "Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 90:1 (1980): 23-99.

[19] Hannah Swarton and John Gyles were taken from Maine. Other captives, such as Quentin Stockwell and the Reverend John Williams, reported on the condition of Maine captives during their confinement. Swarton's, Gyle's, Stockwell's and William's narratives have all been reproduced in Alden T. Vaughan & Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1981).

[20] Recent scholarly studies of captivity narratives include Rebecca Blevins Faery, *Cartographies of Desire: Captivity, Race, and Sex In the Shaping of the American Nation* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma, 1999); Christopher Castiglia, *Bound and Determined: Captivity, Culture-Crossing, and White Womanhood from Mary Rowlandson to Patty Hearst* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), June Namais, *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), Annette Kolodny, *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1984) and Lorrayne Anne Carroll, "'Taken From Her Own Mouth': Women's Captivity Narratives and the Uses of Female Authorship" (Ph.D. diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1997).

In addition, not all cross-cultural travelers were captives. Many of these travelers were drawn from the ranks of culture brokers – those whose forms of livelihood depended on dealings with multiple early American cultures – and clergy, who were eager to help the adherents of rival Christian visions see the errors of their ways. These frontier diplomats were forced to negotiate with their rivals over such issues as ransoming captives, trading and making treaties with Indians, and defining and reinforcing colonial boundaries. They frequently saw their work in religious terms. Contemporaries often described Maine settlers as less worldly than English colonists in more settled parts of New England, using terms like "poor," and "simple." But if the first waves of settlers manifested these attributes, those who survived the wars and returned to the province quickly learned to turn frontier challenges into strengths. It is not surprising to find Mainers, especially ex-captives, filling the ranks of interpreters and militia leaders as they matured.

For most of the colonial period, the territory known as Maine was a province of Massachusetts. For decades, scholars took for granted that the two regions had a rough parity in terms of political, cultural, and religious affinities. However, a major trend in early American scholarship of the last three decades stresses the inherent differences between frontiers, metropoles, and the vast array of indigenous and Euroamerican peoples in between.[21] To suggest that Mainers did not experience the same centrality of

---

[21] See James Axtell, *Invasion,* and *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford, 1981); Colin Calloway, *New Worlds for All: Indians and Europeans and the Remaking of Early America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1997) and *After King Philip's War: Presence and Persistence in Indian New England* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1997); John Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America* (New York: Knopf, 1994); Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Vintage, 1999), Kenneth Morrison, *Embattled Northeast*, Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1992), Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans and the Making of New*

religion that other New Englanders did is to miss the point. Mainers were religious, but their early denominational battles indicate that the province was attractive to colonists who were already prone to experiment with religious beliefs and practices. Following the precedent of the great waves of religious experimentation that flooded England during the Commonwealth, many of these movements were marked by an attraction to extremely radical interpretations of the Divine, human power, the soul, and society.[22]

Thus, this study follows up on the suggestion that many people who were attracted to Maine were already "half way out the door" of Protestant orthodoxy, or at least averse to the implementation of Massachusetts Bay-versions of Puritanism throughout the region. A suggestive case in point is that many of the families who would later produce acculturated captives had participated in anti-Massachusetts agitation or had professed unauthorized Protestant creeds. Their captive family members left Protestantism altogether, and many seem never to have looked back – even when offered their liberation.

The culture of religion in early America was not limited to churches, meetinghouses, personal devotions and prayers, or days of the week.[23] Like their contemporaries in Europe, colonists saw religion as a fully-integrated daily reality, with applications that reached far beyond their circumscribed times and spaces. With this in

---

England, 1500-1643 (New York: Oxford, 1982); Daniel Usner, *Indians, Settlers and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: the Lower Mississippi Valley Before 1783* (Chapel Hill: UNC, 1992) and Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires and the Great Lakes Region, 1615 – 1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). All of these works have made critical contributions to the study of this perspective, but together, they represent only a small percentage of the historians who are examining the parameters of intercultural contact in early America.

[22] For the variety and ramifications of religious experimentation in England in the era of the English Civil War, see Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (New York: Penquin, 1972).

[23] See Patricia U. Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society and Politics in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford, 1986).

mind, this study draws on sources that address both sacred and secular themes in pursuit of evidence that helps to distinguish cultural parameters. It relies heavily on two published collections of primary documents, the 24-volume *Documentary History of the State of Maine* (ed. James Phinney Baxter) and the 71-volume *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (ed. Reuben Gold Thwaites). The *Documentary History of the State of Maine* is the product of exhaustive collecting of province and state documents by Maine's first state archivist, James Phinney Baxter. Baxter traveled throughout New England collecting and copying documents that pertain to Maine's early development, and also culled copies of pertinent materials from collections in Canada, London and Paris. After his death, Baxter's work was continued by his colleague Mary Farnsworth, who added a substantial portion of the material to the collection. Thwaites's *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* is perhaps the best source of documentary evidence from the French perspective. First published in 1895, the *Relations* contain both the original French or Latin text and Thwaites's translation of that text on the opposing side. Having the original is invaluable for checking and, at times, reinterpreting some of Thwaites's word choices, which reflect the understanding of historical French circa 1895. Because they contain so many candid assessments of matters pertaining to religion, and practical descriptions of lived religion, these two collections form the intellectual core of this study. These materials are supplemented by additional collections, including the *Collections of the Maine State Historical Society, New England Historical and Genealogical Register, Province and Court Records of Maine* (ed. Charles Thornton Libby, Robert E. Moody, and Neal W. Allen, Jr.), and *York Deeds* (ed. William Sargent). These collections were compiled by generations of scholars and antiquarians who

doggedly traced down a wealth of detail about Maine's earliest settlers. All these sources (with the understandable exception of *York Deeds*), consider Maine from a broad geographical perspective – a tremendous asset to anyone studying the region's dual Protestant/Catholic history. Last, Sybil Noyes, Charles Thornton Libby, and Walter Goodwin Davis's exhaustive *Genealogical Dictionary of Maine and New Hampshire* and Emma Lewis Coleman's *New England Captives Carried to Canada* contain a wealth of genealogical and biographical detail. These volumes serve as serious reference works for anyone who studies the complex lives of early Mainers, particularly those whose life choices, or misfortunes, took them outside of the province's English settlements.

Four repositories - the Maine Historical Society, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Massachusetts State Archives, and the National Archives of Canada (Ottawa) - provided manuscript sources for this study. Two key collections at the Maine Historical Society are the massive Miscellaneous Manuscript collection and the Doggett Family Papers. The Massachusetts Historical Society houses the papers of several important Maine families, including the Wheelwrights and Storers. It also contains the Francis Parkman Papers and an unprocessed collection of research notes created by Gerald Kelly, an independent scholar who was preparing a biography of Esther Wheelwright at the time of his death in the early 1980's. The Massachusetts State Archives is home to the monumental "Massachusetts Archives" (also known as the "Felt Collection"), an thoroughly-indexed collection of more than 300 volumes of early documents that touch on the colonial government of Massachusetts (and by extension, Maine). And the National Archives of Canada contains extensive correspondence of colonial officials,

including papers related to captive negotiations. Also in the collection are copies of sacramental records dating from the French period.

In addition to these historical collections, this study pulls together four bodies of historical literature - studies of religious culture, encounter in North America, material culture, and the social history of the intercolonial wars – to describe the long-term consequence of religious encounters in the region that became Maine. To a lesser extent, this study addresses scholarship on Maine's colonial period, New England captives, and life and identity in New France.

Again, why Maine? Historian Alan Taylor has put it best:

> The elusive border that so frustrated national and imperial officials in the early nineteenth century, holds a lesson for historians of Maine. Fundamentally, that porous border reveals that Maine had long been much more than the northeastern margin of the United States. Instead of accepting more marginal status within a national-centered story, we should recognize that Maine has long been an international crossroads. We can avoid the marginalization of Maine history (and of Maine identity) by recognizing that, as a borderland, it is a region that draws people together, rather than one that keeps people apart."[24]

Interfaith relations of the period covered in this study help prove Taylor's point. They also demonstrate the limits of this encounter, as well as the adaptations that occurred when these encounters resulted in long-term, permanent consequences.

In recent studies, historians assert that one of the most vibrant areas for encounter in the Atlantic World were the borderlands and frontiers, where disparate peoples often intermingled out of necessity and the need to survive. In addition, the self-identities of borderland dwellers were often malleable or flexible in a ways that might not have been

[24] Alan Taylor, "Centers and Peripheries: Locating Maine's History," *Maine History* 39:1 (2000): 2-16, 12.

accepted by those who lived closer to the established centers of power and set the standards for community.[25] While many of these studies examine European encounters with Native Americans and Africans, few apply the same principles to Europeans who encounter *each other* in the New World. While it is thoroughly understandable that historians would show more interest in points of greater contrast and retrieving the voices of traditionally marginalized populations, it is important to note that the explicit Eurocentrism of earlier studies of colonial frontier life frequently failed to identify the richness and complexity of that was part and parcel of European encounters throughout the Atlantic World. My study seeks to join the ranks of those works that fill this gap by applying new historiographical tools to old constructs.

Scholars have already identified the intercolonial wars between English and French possessions as an excellent point of focus for accomplishing this task.[26] Maine

---

[25] This study draws much of its inspiration from James Axtell's *The Invasion Within,* which comes closest in defining a tripartite relationship between Native Americans, French and English players. In *The Middle Ground Indians, Empires, and the Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), Richard White identifies the borders and frontiers as places where Native Americans and Europeans could meet and negotiate on an equal footing. White argues that, while doing business or traveling through the *pays d'en haut*, Europeans were often at a disadvantage, or out of their element entirely in these areas, and therefore reliant on Native American groups. See also Daniel K. Richter's *Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992). John Demos's study of the Williams family (or, perhaps more accurately, John Williams's and his sons' reactions to the life choices of their captive female kin) covers all three subjects pertinent to my study: war, religion and the people of the frontier. Though *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America* (New York: Knopf, 1994) deals with Deerfield Massachusetts captives, not Mainers, Demos crafts a plausible and intriguing scenario that draws on material culture, ethnohistory, and religious culture.

[26] This study ends before the Seven Years' War, but Fred Anderson's work on that conflict, *Crucible of War* (New York: Vintage, 2000), sets a new standard of comprehensiveness for treatment of an American conflict prior to the Revolution. For a religious perspective, see Walter Edmond's *The Musket and the Cross* (New York: Little, Brown, 1968). The age of this monograph suggests that reevaluation of this critical theme will be welcome. Jill Lepore's *The Name of War* focuses King Philip's War and therefore predates the period covered by this study, but is unparalleled in its frank discussion of the brutality of border warfare. John G. Reid's article "Unorthodox Warfare in the Northeast, 1703," describes unconventional practices (by European standards) of border conflict during Queen Anne's War and questions whether Native Americans or Europeans were the actual architects of these techniques (*Canadian Historical Review* 73:2 (1992): 211-20). An article that the same author co-wrote with Emerson W. Baker's article, "Amerindian Power in the Early Modern Northeast: A Reappraisal" offers a broader

again provides a particularly rich region to contemplate. Not only was it virtually surrounded by territory claimed by the French, it even had its own indigenous war of empire, Dummer's War. As the end point of this study, Dummer's War provides the context for a particular set of events that helped close Maine's period of religious cultural mingling. But before that happened, the French and the English both used the tools of their enemies to assist in their goals of claiming – for keeps – important geographic zones that now comprise modern Maine.

Recent studies in religious culture strive to identify the parameters of this rather elusive and chimerical field.[27] In terms of sources, they cast a wide net. Some look at the culture of print, with an emphasis on sermons and pious writings. Others investigate evidence of the persistence of pre-Reformation and even pre-Christian beliefs. Still others look at the artifactual record, which suggests that Mainers' forms of Protestant Christianity intermingled with other forms of belief. Recognizing that these forms of

---

chronological and geographical view of similar events. *William and Mary Quarterly* 61:1 (January 2004): 77-106.

[27] In *The New England Soul: Preaching and Religious Culture in Early New England* (New York: Oxford, 1986), Harry Stout defines religious culture as primarily written, oral and aural. My study adopts a broader view to include the artifacts of religious life – buildings, objects, and religious folklore – in an attempt to develop a rough parity of lived religion among borderland dwellers. In *The Invasion Within*, James Axtell asserts that, for a variety of reasons, French religious orders produced more successful missionaries to the Native Americans, in large part because they eventually adopted a policy of cultural adaptability. Evidence of these attitudes remains in the artifactual record, as well as period descriptions of missions. Jon Butler's *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1990) examines the syncretic roots and material culture of Protestantism in the English colonies, but considers the topic from the perspective of other ethnic groups. See also David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1989); Robert Scribner, "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World,'" *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 23:3 (Winter 1993): 475-494; Charles Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982); Richard P. Gildrie, *The Profane, the Civil and the Godly: The Reformation of Manners in Orthodox New England, 1679-1749* (University Park: Penn State Press, 1994). For encounters between Euroamerican Protestants and Catholics in both the colonial and revolutionary periods, see Cogliano, *No King, No Popery: Anti-Catholicism in Revolutionary New England* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995), Charles P. Hanson, *Necessary Virtue: The Pragmatic Origins of in New England* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1998), and Louise Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprise among the Puritan Elite, 1630-1692* (New York: Oxford, 2001).

religious expression were present on the Maine frontier, my study takes a broad view of what constitutes religious culture. It also argues for a more nuanced understanding of what constituted orthodoxy, and how much identification with orthodoxy mattered to religious settlers, in Maine and other frontier regions. Last, it hunts for hints of religious culture in the details of daily life – in mundane correspondence, in family affairs, in simple as well as complex negotiations with "the other" – to expose similarities and differences among borderland Christians.

New England captives and the phenomenon of captivity continue to fascinate scholars. Several new studies have appeared within the past decade.[28] These studies generally fall into three categories. In the first category, the scholar opts for a microhistorical approach, closely examining one or several lives to determine the range of possibility of the encounter elements of captivities. In the second, he or she adopts an opposite approach, looking at major events surrounding captivity and using their complexities to add context to the human components. In the third, the author considers

[28] A tremendous body of literature on this topic has been produced in recent decades. Many of these studies rely on two classic, exhaustively researched antiquarian works, Charlotte Alice Baker's *True Stories of the New England Captives During the Old French and Indian Wars* (Portland, ME: The Southworth Press, 1897; reprint Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1990) and Emma Lewis Coleman's *New England Captives* for their evidence. Using Coleman's work, Alden Vaughan and Daniel Richter started the trend toward demographic studies of captives in their article "Crossing the Cultural Divide." Other studies that rely heavily on Baker and Coleman include Demos, *Unredeemed*; Foster, *Captor's*; Barbara E. Austen, "Captured … Never Came Back: Social Networks Among New England Female Captives in Canada, 1689 – 1763," and Alice N. Nash, "Two Stories of New England Captives: Grizel and Christine Otis of Dover, New Hampshire," both in ed. Peter Benes, *New England/New France 1600 – 1850,* Annual Proceedings of the Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife, Vol. 14. (Boston: Boston University, 1992), and Linda Breuer Gray, "Narratives and Identities in the Saint Lawrence Valley, 1667 – 1720," (Ph.D. diss: McGill University, 1999). Another important reference source is Marcel Fournier's *De la Nouvelle-Angleterre à la Nouvelle France : l'histoire des captifs anglo-américains au Canada entre 16 et 1760* (Montréal : Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française, 1992). Additional important works that focus on the experiences of specific demographic groups or individual captive stories include Evan Haefeli, "Ransoming"; _____. and Sweeney, *Captors*, and Ann M. Little, "The Life of Mother Marie-Joseph de l'Enfant Jesus, or, How a Little English Girl from Wells Became a Big French Politician." *Maine History.* 40:4 (Winter 2001-2002), 279-308.

captives as falling into one of *several* categories of New Englanders who, due to circumstances of time and place, found themselves on the front lines of cross-cultural encounter. Because my focus is a form of encounter – not Maine captives themselves or Maine's development as a colonial province – the last approach suits my purposes better than the others. It is true that captives are well represented in this study. But this is for the very practical reason that it was captives who most often crossed cultural boundaries for sustained periods of time. Furthermore, because captivity was tied to peace negotiations and legislative concerns, the records that deal with captives are particularly rich. But my use of captives as but one device in lieu of a centerpiece does not mean that I believe the importance of the individual stories has been overstated. On the contrary, adding them to a pool of people who left records of encounter situates them in the fuller range of events that created the climate for religious encounter and left a permanent mark on the province's settlers.

Maine's inhabitants during the colonial period – English, Native American, and French – also left records in artifacts.[29] Dismissing them as inferior to the written word devalues a potentially significant body of historical evidence. The use of objects in

---

[29] Emerson W. Baker, an archeologist as well as an historian, has written extensively on the artifact record of 17th century Maine. He is one of the editors of, and his work on Thomas Gorges is included in *American Beginnings: Exploration, Culture and Cartography in the Land of Norumbega* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1994). Neill de Paoli's "Life on the Edge: Community and Trade on the Anglo-American Periphery, Pemaquid, Maine, 1610–1689 (Ph.D. diss: University of New Hampshire, 2001) is a close examination of artifacts and daily life in an early Maine community. Alaric and Gretchen Faulkner provide the same for Maine's most significant French settlement. *The French at Pentagoët: 1635-1674: An Archaeological Portrait of the Acadian Frontier* (Augusta, ME: Maine Preservation Commission, 1987). Other studies the consider the material culture of religion include Colleen McDannell, *Material Christianity: Religion and Popular Culture in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); Peter Moogk, *La Nouvelle France: The Making of French Canada – A Cultural History* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2000); Gordon M. Sayre, *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

religious life was not the exclusive demesne of Catholics and their converts. As several modern studies demonstrate, many New England Protestants relied on a rich collection of objects to enhance their devotional practices. These collections speak of a pan-Christian kindred that linked both colonial cultures, despite the pervasive anti-Catholic and anti-Protestant language that pervaded their rhetoric and print cultures. Many of these objects have been preserved in family collections. Others still play a role in modern liturgical practices. Still others were excavated from archeological sites. But regardless of their origins or method of discovery, the material culture of religious encounter helps to develop a parity between societies that had high rates of literacy and those that did not.

For the French, the "language" of material culture provided a valuable bridge for proselytization. But its successes suggest that it had more to offer potential religious and cultural converts. Some scholars argue that this additional *je ne sais quoi* was French colonial culture's ability to meld and adapt select "outsiders" who were willing to adopt Catholicism and French ways, even if this acceptance was superficial. As scholars have already pointed out, this does not mean that the French adopted a relativist stance toward all non-French.[30] Like the English, they had their limits, which changed and, over time, came to privilege Euroamerican origins.

---

[30] For a recent, thorough discussion of the evolution of racial prejudice in colonial Canada, see Saliha Belmessous, "Assimilation and Racialism in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century French Colonial Policy," in *The American Historical Review,* vol. 10, no. 2 (April, 2005), 322 – 349. Marcel Trudeau's *L'Esclavage au Canada Français* (Québec: Les Presses Universitaires Laval, 1960) is an in-depth study of another cluster of outsiders in Canada – African slaves - and, shows that it shared many attributes with the systems in other parts of the Atlantic World, even when those slaves converted. The point is brought home by William H. Foster, who demonstrates the difference in treatment between white captives and an African slave, all of whom were converts to Catholicism and live in servitude under the same roof. See Foster, *Captor's Narrative*. Even more recent is Allan Greer's *Mohawk Saint: Catherine Tekakwitha and the Jesuits* (New York: Oxford, 2005) which argues that this Mohawk Christian holy woman, revered by Indians and Europeans alike after her death, was bound by her Indian identity during life by the Jesuits, whose actions toward Kateri severely curbed her aspirations to live a contemplative life and found her own order of religious women.

But these limits were not impediments to the complete cultural assimilation of other white Christian Europeans. And "white European Christian" is a description that applies to just about every early settler that the Province of Maine attracted. However, pre-conversion captives and cross-cultural travelers were subject to the same laws and restrictions that informed the treatment of other outsiders. My work, therefore, builds on the work of those who study outsiders in French colonial culture by demonstrating that religious difference was something to be purged, or changed by force if necessary, to craft the New England Protestant into a French *canadien/ne*, and hence encouraged a dilution of Catholic sacrament through temporary conversions. The drive for assimilation, or at least decent treatment, came with high costs to both cultures.

Chapter Overview:

Given the nature of this subject – the complex Christianities of people, objects, and places - this study adopts a thematic rather than a chronological approach. Each chapter, however, addresses change over time within the context of its own theme. This study relies heavily on data derived from the experiences of New England captives. But this is only because captives were the most obvious, and consistent, of the Province's religious cross-cultural travelers. Clergymen and culture brokers figure heavily in the story as well, as do the objects for worship that all Europeans built or brought with them, which became some of the least obvious, yet most curious of the religious cross-cultural travelers to come out of the Province of Maine.

Chapter One, "'The Land that was Barren … Shall Flourish Like the Lily:' Christian Diversity and Encounter in Early Maine," provides the context for Maine as a

place of religious encounter. The discussion starts at the beginning of the seventeenth-century, when neither England nor France had reinforced their claim to Maine with a critical mass of civilians or military. In addition, the province attracted various fractious Protestant groups, preventing the province from forming a monolithic denominational identity. This chapter describes how the European Christians who poured into the region fought with, but just as often accommodated, each other in terms of religion as the century wore on.

Chapter Two, "'Satan's Prey' or '*l'esclavage de l'heresie Calviniste*?:' Imperial Battles, Borderland Souls," explores the world of religious acculturation among Maine Protestants who were brought by force into the one of the most important centers of New World Catholicism – Canada. It was in Canada that these captives were exposed to the French Canadian interpretation of post-Reformation Catholicism. Because early Maine lacked a uniform Christian vision (despite the best efforts of Massachusetts), the region's captives responded in a number of diverse ways, ranging from outright rejection of religious acculturation to complete embrace of a new faith. Tellingly, and unlike captives from other regions of New England, Maine produced a higher percentage of adult and male captives. This chapter argues that the way to acceptance of the religion of the "captor culture" was paved by Maine's mixed religious traditions, counting among them a legacy of experimentation with radical forms of Protestantism. It also argues that, for many Mainers who lived difficult and dangerous lives in hardscrabble communities, accepting Catholic sacraments in New France brought worldly blessings as well – and were often the product of the generosity of clerics and religious orders.

The third chapter, "'Pits of Hell' of '*ménages des anges*?:' Unredeemed Captives, Self-Marriage, and Mixed-Faith Families" examines relationships between family members where one or more members stayed with their captors. Though the decision to remain was not always their own, these captives, once they reached adulthood, often eventually married into the captor culture. To their families, these "self-marriages" (marriages that were not endorsed by parents), foreclosed any possibility of return to New England and, by extension, Protestantism. This reality altered traditional New England kinship bonds. However, the vagaries of imperial politics had the power to sweep captives into places they never anticipated – including back into the arms of their New England families. In this world, outcome mattered much more than intent or effort, or, as in the case of the Storer family, respectability and affluence attained in the captor culture.

Chapter Four, "The Ways of 'His Industry:' Men of God and Their Ministries on the Maine Frontier" shifts focus away from captives to another of Maine's cross-cultural travelers: the clergyman. The competition between France and England encouraged both faiths' men of the cloth to become active players in proselytizing, not only among the native Wabanakis but among each other's congregations as well. This chapter examines how Puritan ministers and Catholic priests attempted to counteract the other's spiritual successes to create the extended borderland religious kinships which had served the French well in the early years of conflict. Observing each other's tactics, ministers and priests sometimes rejected using them out of religious principle or because they learned from the failures of their rivals. But this chapter also considers the extent to which they did the reverse. Thus I suggest that these clergymen recognized that in addition to

profound differences, Catholicism and Protestantism shared some stunning similarities that could be exploited to the advantage of their cause.

The final chapter, "Protestant Ornaments and Popish Relicts: Maine's Material Culture of Lived Religion" deals with the buildings and objects that comprised the religious material culture of the borderlands. Special attention is paid to items which were "recycled" throughout the borderlands and neighboring colonies. This suggests that both Protestants and Catholics recognized the value of liturgical objects, not only for their content of valuable metals and workmanship, but for pan-Christian devotional and liturgical purposes. It also examines how the existence of these Catholic branches of New England families posed a challenge to some of the most practical assumptions of the transfer of wealth from generation to generation, and argues that these worldly objects of moveable goods, money and real estate were thus transformed into sacred objects in the process. Protestant New Englanders recognized their children through bestowing patrimonies. Children who had become acculturated French Catholics were treated to a range of responses regarding patrimony that ran the gamut from legal challenges of a "papist" to inherit to the bestowal of cherished family items to furnish a New French convent. Within this range, however, loved ones strategized to win their kin back to New England – and, by extension, Protestantism – through the promise of money and material goods. Thus these items became tools of religious change.

The conclusion considers the aftermath of the wars of empire and the closing of the "frontier of religion" in the borderlands. It describes how religious culture in Maine changed after 1727 and ends more than a decade after, when sentimentalism and renewed interest in early New England history combined to create a brief period of literary

experimentation in which the old villains became complex heroes. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and Nathanial Hawthorne, in addition to several others, were responsible for bringing these old tensions back to life and offering new interpretations of borderland relations. But at the same time, old religious biases continued to die hard in Maine, and their long-term outcomes remained difficult to reconcile, even when they were cloaked in beautiful poetic language or idealized encounters.

CHAPTER ONE

"THE LAND THAT WAS DESOLATE … SHALL FLOURISH LIKE THE LILY:" CHRISTIAN ENCOUNTER AND DIVERSITY IN EARLY MAINE

Sylvanus Davis came to Maine early in the second half of the seventeenth century. He promptly took possession of a stretch of land on the Damariscotta River that he had purchased from the local Wabanaki Indians.[1] Davis was a young man at the time of this transaction (about twenty-four), with a long, profitable career in the Province of Maine in front of him. When he finally departed the province for good, Davis was almost seventy-five and had lived and conducted business in Maine for almost half a century.

Davis had chosen a particularly eventful half century. Like many Mainers, his successes alternated with downturns in fortune that often accompanied the outbreak of hostilities among the English settlers, the French to the north and east, and the Native Americans who had first called the region home. For Sylvanus Davis, the trials provoked by these hostilities started during King Philip's War. He narrowly escaped capture, or worse, when the Arrowsic Island compound of his employers at the time, the Clarke and

[1] Sybil Noyes et al, *Genealogical Dictionary of Maine and New Hampshire* [hereafter "*GDMNH"*], (Portland, ME: n.p., 1928-35; reprint Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1972), 187.

Lake Company, was attacked by Wabanaki forces.[2] Also like many of his fellow Mainers, however, Davis persevered – at least for a very long while - despite the unpredictability of frontier life.

Maine's economic promise provided a compelling reason for such perseverance. But that promise was by no means realized solely through hard work – not in Sylvanus Davis's time, and certainly not for many decades after. Settlers like Davis, who were determined to cast their lot in the rich region, had to resign themselves to the fact that climate, geography, and, perhaps most importantly, geopolitical alignments might, in theory, challenge its attractiveness for English settlement. And again like Davis, many of these seventeenth century settlers overlooked the potential for trouble, and forged ahead in adapting themselves to life on the edge of the English North American empire.

Sylvanus Davis's life in the province encompassed a nearly-complete range of experience for an English settler who staked one of these early claims. During his tenure, Davis traded with Indian, English and French partners. He filled civic posts for colonial governors from Thomas Danforth to Joseph Dudley. He ran a trading post, a sawmill and a warehouse. He farmed and traded in livestock.[3] All these activities were made possible by the relative peace of the frontier, at a time when, for the most part, productive economic enterprise took precedence over religious or political rivalries. For a man like Syvanus Davis, who had not come to the region for any discernable reason other than

---

[2] Emerson W. Baker and John G. Reid, *The New England Knight: Sir William Phips, 1651 – 1695* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1998), 18. For the purposes of this study, I adopt Alice Nash's comprehensive definition of the term "Wabanaki," which includes the five eastern groups – the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, Passamaquoddy, Penobscot and Abenaki – that comprised the Native American groupings of northern New England, southeastern Quebec, and the Maritimes. See Alice Nash, "The Abiding Frontier: Family, Gender and Religion in Wabanaki History, 1600-1763," (Ph.D. diss: Columbia University, 1997): 1.

[3] *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* [hereafter "*DCB*"] (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966), 2:172.

economic gain, the challenges of life were grounded in corporal, not spiritual, concerns. His diverse trading partners and ability to navigate among the many groups in Maine indicate that Davis wore neither his ethnic nor his religious identities on his sleeve in his dealings with others.

It was not to last. As the century wore on, religious and political rivalries challenged Davis's peaceful coexistence with his diverse neighbors. These events compelled Davis to side more forcefully with his English identity. Increasing hostilities between the French-supported Wabanakis, French proximity to Casco, and news of ominous religious divisions both abroad and in the English colonies themselves led him to take command of Fort Loyal at Casco Bay. When the fort was sacked in 1690, he witnessed the slaughter of many of the Fort Loyal fighters. The French aggressors justified their attack by arguing that the Casco English had taken up arms and rebelled against their rightful king, the Catholic James II, and armed Englishmen like Davis and his fellow soldiers were thus fair game.

One of the few to survive the violence at Fort Loyal, Davis was taken captive and lived as a prisoner among both the Wabanakis and the French who, just a few years earlier, were regarded as trading partners. His importance as a hostage was recognized when he was called to meet with Louis Buade de Frontenac, the governor of New France, to discuss the state of other English captives who remained in Wabanaki hands. Ransomed in a prisoner exchange, he returned to Maine 1690.

Despite his experience as a captive – an event that drove many of those who survived and returned out of Maine permanently - Davis seemed convinced that life in the Province of Maine was worth the risk. Four years after his return in 1690, Davis and

William Phips purchased substantial tracks of land in the Saint George's River Valley, far north of the English line of settlement.[4] Such a purchase suggests that Davis clung to the hope that stability and commerce would flourish in a region where English trade could flourish, provided there was peace.[5] But such assurances were not to be had in the Maine of Sylvanus Davis's lifetime. And Davis himself, who had doggedly pursued the twin ideals of peace and prosperity in Maine for more than forty years, finally retreated from the region for the relative safety of island of Nantasket, where he died in 1703.[6]

If the young Sylvanus Davis had prospered with the help of French and Indian trading partners, the older one emerged from captivity convinced of the perniciousness of their presence in the region. He warned the Massachusetts General Court that, if left unchecked, they would come "from the southward from quabage … [and] will settell throw the Country farther & farther upon the Backs of the English." If this unfolded, however, he hoped that God himself would "prevent [the] Jesuiticall Bloody Designes" of New France's leaders.[7]

The English, Davis argued, should take proactive measures and check the French themselves. He came to believe that God Himself had appointed them to the task. "The only way to prevent [the French] from their Bloody Desing is to subdue theire Country," Davis insisted.[8] Hesitation meant more death and destruction at the hands of the papists and their allies.

---

[4] *GDMNH*, 188; Baker and Reid, *New England Knight,* 171.

[5] Baker and Reid, *New England Knight,* 171-2.

[6] *DCB* 2.172

[7] "Captain Sylvanus Davis: his Narrative at his Return from Canada, November 1690." *Massachusetts Archives*, 36: 212, Massachusetts State Archives [hereafter "MSA"], Boston, MA.

[8] Ibid.

At the end of his letter, Davis disclosed that he prayed that "the Lord will finde ought a way for the subdoing those Blood thursty rechess that have joynd with the Cruell heathen to bucher soo many poore Innocent lambes."[9] If the English failed to recognize their divine responsibility to the appointed task, there would be nothing left to do than to pray that God would prove that he was on their side, not that of their enemies.

Before the wars of empire engulfed the Maine frontier, Sylvanus Davis had profited from alliances that transcended differences of faith. Yet he emerged from his ordeals in these wars as a different type of colonist – one with a fully-realized militant Protestant identity who also now felt that Maine could not, and should not be shared.

The events that galvanized this identity were the capstone of nearly a century of extraordinary religious interactions on a New England frontier. But why did Maine become the setting for such interactions?

The most obvious reason was the province's vague boundaries. What actually constituted the Province of Maine remained a point of dispute for the French and English for much of the seventeenth century. Virtually no one knew for certain where New England ended and New France began. This lack of definition was born out of an overarching reality – the province's location as a New England outpost with vaguely defined borders in a wider Atlantic World – which affected a broader array of related issues, including patterns of migration and settlement, the needs and imperatives of local Native American groups, and the drive to control the region's rich resources. Furthermore, French and English Christians pushed ever farther – and ever closer

[9] Ibid., 36:216.

together – to lay claim to souls and territory. Neither group was able to assert its vision completely: thus Maine's geographical fate contributed to its religious fate. Its intrinsic vagueness allowed for the interfaith interactions and challenges to denominational hegemony that were commonplace in the province during the period that ended with King William's War – and more prevalent than in any other place in New England.

The Maine of Davis's earliest years was surrounded by neighboring colonies which, driven by self-interest and concerns for security, hoped to claim large portions of the landmass as their own. To the south, beyond a small sliver of New Hampshire seacoast, lay Massachusetts Bay, already a massive colony by the standards of the settled regions of mid-seventeenth century New England. Throughout the century, Massachusetts Bay agitated to lay claim to the entire Province of Maine. This prospect was welcomed by some Mainers, but by no means all of the province's religiously-diverse settlers. Earlier in the century, some of these same settlers had fled the Bay Colony because their own beliefs deviated from the accepted religious practices of Massachusetts colonists.[10] Others were simply disinterested.

To the east lay the French colony of Acadia, which, though far less settled and developed than other French areas of North America, was capable of exercising control over vital coastal waterways. Acadia's location lent logistical support to the Catholic missionaries who had already made significant evangelical inroads among the region's Native American populations. These same missionaries turned a blind eye to, and sometimes even encouraged, hostility toward the English communities to the south.[11]

---

[10] Clark, *Eastern Frontier,* 58.

[11] Kenneth M. Morrison, "Sebastien Rale vs. New England : A Case Study in Frontier Conflict" (master's thesis, University of Maine at Orono, 1970), 14. This study formed the basis for Morrison's later book, *The Embattled Northeast.*

But despite these activities, and their association with troublesome Catholic missionaries, most of Acadia's settlers were busily engaged in their own corporeal concerns. They farmed, fished and trapped and were cooperative trading partners (when the opportunities presented themselves), with English merchants from Portsmouth to Boston. Self-preservation and self-interest were more important than ideological or theological disputes, so much so that most Acadians strove to live their lives as they always had, even in times of conflict. Though unsuccessful in their bid to live peaceably under English rule in 1755, they had managed to successfully demonstrate the precedent when the English occupied their largest settlement, Port Royal, from 1654 to 1670.[12]

But exchanges of peace for trade seemed less likely to come from French holdings on Maine's western flank. This far more substantial piece of French territory, Canada, was the largest colony of *la Nouvelle France* during the 17th century and a near-chronic antagonist to English interests in the Atlantic World. Its dangers were, in theory (if not reality), always palpable. Yet the force at the root of discord between this colony's settlers and those of New England – religion – did not always result in combative behavior between Mainers and Canadians either. Other factors needed to be in place before full-scale hostilities erupted.

One might question whether alliance with France would have made much of a difference to Mane's Wabanakis. To develop a relationship with the land that preserved Wabanaki interests, the English would have had to disavow most of the enterprises that attracted them to the region in the first place. The Wabanakis too, more often than not, filled out the ranks of the perceived troublesome neighbors.

---

[12] For a detailed account of daily life in 17th century Acadia that explains the origins of its settlers' neutrality, see Carl Brasseaux, *The Founding of New Acadia: The Beginnings of Acadian Life in Louisiana, 1765 – 1803* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), 9–13.

How close did these various neighbors come to exerting their exclusive will over the Province of Maine? Actually, none of them did (except for, eventually, Massachusetts), simply because what actually constituted the Province remained undefined and vague for most of Maine's colonial period. Even the English colonies themselves periodically competed for slices of the province, with New York claiming part, Massachusetts another, and other areas remaining relatively independent.[13] Massachusetts succeeded in laying jurisdictional claim to York County and most of the old colony of Laconia by the end of the seventeenth century. The Sagadahoc territory to the north remained part of New York until 1691.[14]

To many Maine settlers, Massachusetts' drive to assert control was far less objectionable than that of other neighboring territories with more alien populations. The prospect of its control brought with it the pleasing possibility of security and economic prosperity. But religious control was a different issue. Despite common Protestant origins, many of Maine's original families had fled Massachusetts under threat of persecution for their radical interpretations of Puritanism or because they adhered to different denominations altogether. Others shared the Puritans' English heritage but had come almost directly to Maine from the English West Country to work in the northern coastal fisheries, and thus bypassed the Puritan colonies altogether.[15] Their motivations

---

[13] This is Sagadahoc, a region comprised of a large portion of the contested region running northeast from the Kennebec River, including the fishing community of Pemaquid. De Paoli, "Life on the Edge," 110.

[14] Clark, 64.

[15] Daniel Vickers discusses work and its relationship to land ownership in late 17th century Essex County in *Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1850* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 97.

were purely economic, and they had little interest in or patience with Puritan proselytizers from the south whose practices threatened to interfere with the fisheries' regular cycles.

For their part, Massachusetts ministers prayed that the Bay Colony's incursions would produce a rich harvest of the souls among the "men whose gods were fish and pine."[16] More worldly authorities hoped to harvest the fish and pine as well. But despite the bonds of ethnicity and Protestantism and the protection that the larger colony promised, many Mainers did not look upon the prospect of a lasting "Puritan Conquest" with a friendly eye.[17] Their neighbors in New Hampshire set a precedent, preferring royal rule to that of the Puritan elite. Many in Maine wanted alternatives too.[18]

Settlers like Sylvanus Davis had a vested interest in maintaining harmony with the nearby French, whose colonies were not equally menacing. Acadia had a tiny population of farmers and fishermen. Tied to their land and local, small-scale commerce, these farmers accepted trade relationships where they could find them, and therefore offered little tangible threat to Maine's English coastal settlements. The fictive border that Maine shared with Acadia was chronically "dangerously undefined," in the words of one historian – so dangerously undefined, in fact, that there was little agreement on even the parameters of the contested zone.[19] For more than a century, the French had claimed that this colony began at the Kennebec River. The English pushed this boundary much farther to the east, all the way to the Saint Croix River to an area the French considered

---

[16] Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1702; reprint New York: Arno Press, 1972), 15.

[17] Another Puritan conquest had already been gained and lost: Massachusetts Bay claimed the Province from 1649 to 1658, lost during the early years of the Restoration, then reclaimed it by purchasing all rights to the propriety from the heirs of Sir Ferdinando Gorges in 1668. The purchase price was £1,250. Clark, 63-4; Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 85

[18] New Hampshire accepted the extension of royal rule over the province in 1677. Clark, 56-7.

[19] Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 297.

part of *l'Acadie*, which would place at least one important French post (Pentagoët) in the English zone.

But if Acadia's existence caused theoretical problems for the English in terms of land claims and spheres of influence among Native American groups, the day-to-day realities of its proximity offered partnership rather than competition. Acadia's small population, tucked into tiny villages and farms, was content to invest vast amounts of effort into turning marshland into productive soil, and engage in both legal and illegal trade with Boston, Portsmouth, and Kennebec traders when the opportunities presented themselves.[20] In the world of rhetoric, Catholic Acadia was dangerous. In the world of lived lives, its presence on the province's easternmost flank was rarely a cause for concern to the Mainers of Sylvanus Davis's early years.

The threat posed by Canada was of a different nature. As the crow flies, the province was dangerously close to France's major New World metropoles. Though thinly populated, the colony was home to a large professional military force. With Native American assistance, this force had mastered the intricacies of the borderland terrain that separated empire from empire. Much to their disadvantage, Mainers failed to cultivate the skills that were vital to conquering the terrain, but the Canadians – traders, soldiers, and priests – managed this conquest wit the help of Wabanaki allies.

One example in particular helps illustrate the different approaches that the two European cultures brought to using the landscape to strategic purposes. By 1640, the French had learned how to navigate the system of inland water routes and portages that linked the Saint Lawrence Valley to the mid-Maine coast. The English, however, were

[20] Greer, *People of New France*, 95.

reluctant to use this route until as late as 1760, when John Montrésor, a British army officer on an official mission for the Crown, led a scouting party through the snow from Quebec to New England.[21]

And where Native Americans went, Catholic missionaries were bound to follow. Canadian missionaries blazed the trails and portages that linked the Kennebec and Chaudiére rivers even before French soldiers did. The religion they carried with them was tied inextricably to French interests. Thus these passages became conduits for ideology, another potentially dangerous force from Canada. The reason for this is simple: though they frequently traveled alone and made due with the spaces and objects of worship they had at hand, these missionaries did have power support mechanisms back into Canada. [22]

Canada's religious emissaries to the borderlands represented only a small percentage of the clergy and religious who ministered to greater Canada. Their tireless labors meant that Canada's cultural and institutional development far exceeded anything in seventeenth century Maine. With religious diversity officially banned and strong institutions to support and bolster the population's Catholic identity, Canada was far ahead of New England's closest offshoot in forging a religiously-cohesive society that could be harnessed, especially during times of war, to combat an equally-strident anti-Protestantism. These three factors – a uniform religious identity, strong institutions to

---

[21] Paul David Nelson, "John Montrésor," in John A. Garrity and Mark C. Carnes, eds., *American National Biography* [hereafter "*ANB"*] (New York: Oxford, 1999), 15:716 The route remained unpopular with New Englanders and British alike until Benedict Arnold used it in the 1775 campaign against Quebec. Even still, Arnold and his men lacked the skills to navigate the terrain quickly and efficiently, and the "shortcut" took a toll on his forces and progress. Vincent A. Lapomarda, *The Jesuit Heritage in New England* (Worcester: College of the Holy Cross, 1977), 4.

[22] The Church in New France was so fundamental to the colony's early development that it ended up, at least in some places, exceeding need. Given its relatively small population, William Eccles concludes that the colony was "over-institutionalized. "Eccles, *The Canadian Frontier*, 57.

support and foster that identity, and a mobile group of missionaries with their eyes on Maine's Wabanakis, and, if they could manage it, a heretic settler or two – were the religious corollaries to the secular forces that compounded the threat.

Such was the literal "situation" of the Province of Maine in the decades preceding the outbreak of King William's War. Sporadic fighting associated with this conflict plagued the English settlements to the Eastward from 1688 to 1698. Queen Anne's War brought another wave of violence to the English settlements. This war ended with major geographic realignments in 1713. But because of imperfect understanding of the terrain and terms of the treaty, it failed to solve the territorial conflicts that wreaked such havoc on Maine. Continued confusion over boundaries led directly to the final war – Dummer's - covered in this study. Although this Maine-specific conflict is usually considered to span from 1722 to 1725, important components of the local fight remained unresolved until 1727, and even beyond.

Maine's communities continued to be targeted during King George's War (The War of Austrian Succession) and the Seven Year's War, but they would never again witness frontier wars on a vast scale. This was due, in part, to sustained growth in the Province's population that began after the Treaty of Utrecht and continued in spite of Dummer's War.[23] But another component was the "taming" of certain aspects of religious culture that had hitherto found much freer, and at times more pernicious (by Massachusetts standards), expression within the Province. Likewise, during Dummer's War, New England forces destroyed the substantial Jesuit mission at Norridgewock, an establishment that had stood for decades as a powerful symbol that Maine's Protestant

[23] On the retrenchment and growth of Maine communities in the wake of Dummer's War, see Clark,, 144-98.

destiny was by no means assured. The mission's destruction was celebrated in Boston, an indication of its importance as a symbol of conquest.[24]

The effects of Dummer's War on Maine's religious future were at once both liberating and factious. By 1727, religious encounter and squabbling would exist primarily between Protestant sects, a strangely triumphant indication that the English, through sheer numbers and wars successfully waged, were now sufficiently confident that they had secured the region for Protestantism. The result was that Protestants were now freed to fight for denominational, rather than faith-based, hegemony. They no longer needed the help of a generally-defined Protestant mass to be on guard against a palpable Catholic menace in the Province of Maine.

But Maine of the seventeenth century had been a far different place in terms of religious culture. Its lack of geographical definition led to a theological one as well, creating a stage for inter-confessional tension and interfaith contact that was virtually unprecedented in early New England.

During most of the 17th century, Maine's religious identity was as amorphous as its borders. Throughout the century, settlement under English auspices grew haphazardly – a byproduct of the single-minded goals of its early settlers and proprietors to develop, harvest and process the province's natural riches. These patterns of settlement persisted

[24] Rale's numerous misadventures with Massachusetts authorities are described in Chapter 4 of this study. See also Chapter 4 of Thomas Kidd, *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism* (New Haven: Yale, 2004), and Morrison, "Sebastien Rale vs. New England," passim.

even after Massachusetts finally gained a firm toehold in the southern settlements in 1658 and contributed significantly to the battering that Maine endured during King William's, Queen Anne's, and Dummer's wars.[25] As Charles Clark notes,

> Had the Maine towns been settled compactly and adjacent to one another, according to the Puritan ideal that was supposed to govern the settlement of Massachusetts, they might have been less vulnerable to Indian attack than they were, despite their location on the frontier. But the settlers had lacked the sense of community that came with close religious and social ties, and had felt no necessity for the consolidated arrangement by which the Puritans to the south had tried to foster moral and civic responsibility, church attendance, and public education.[26]

But though they lacked the institutional and civic mechanisms that enforced and fostered religious homogeneity in other parts of New England, individual Mainers were not lacking in religious zeal. All versions of Protestant Christianity on the Maine frontier were products of the powerful religious movements of the previous century that emphasized new modes of personal and collective religious expression. Many early Maine settlers were descendants of dissenters who had crossed the Atlantic themselves for that reason. Indeed, some were so radical that they found Massachusetts oppressive and sought relief from another oppressive environment by fleeing to the weakly settled upper reaches of New England. As a result, contemporaries often viewed the Province of Maine as a "dark corner" of piety.[27] Given the presence of multiple, often clashing denominations, religious radicals, "romish" missionaries and "papist" Indians in the "dark corner," these critics were not mistaken.

---

[25] All Maine settlements from Kittery to Falmouth submitted to annexation by Massachusetts in 1658 and became York County. Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, 50.

[26] Ibid., 66.

[27] I am indebted to Emerson W. Baker for this insight. Personal correspondence, 09/03/2004.

In custom, tradition, and in print culture (not to mention, of course, religious practices), Protestantism and post-Reformation Catholicism were frequently defined in comparison to and in opposition to each another. In standard rhetorical expressions of this opposition, early modern Catholics called Protestants "heretics" and Protestants called Catholics "papists".[28] Ironically, however, adherents of neither group would have recognized the late-medieval faith from which both had sprung two centuries before, for both colonial Protestantism and Catholicism had, by this time, formed and reformed themselves.[29] Most Protestant creeds revolutionized Christianity and introduced radical changes to theology, piety, liturgy, and daily life. But the Counter, also called Catholic, Reformation had likewise reoriented, redefined, and occasionally jettisoned some elements of medieval Catholicism that the first waves of Protestant reformers had also found insupportable. In some cases, Catholic reforms were strikingly similar to those advocated by early Protestants.[30] Included among these were changes to Church-based education, greater efforts to spread literacy, and more use of vernacular translations of sacred and spiritual works. Explorations and the encounters with the Americas' indigenous peoples that created a Catholic sphere of influence within the Atlantic World that was based almost exclusively on post-Reformation principles, and drive helped enormously by missionaries of new Counter-Reformation religious orders. Many of these missionaries, both men and women, relied on conversion techniques that were

---

[28] In his study of anti-Catholicism in 18th century New England, Francis Cogliano provides a detailed analysis of the cultural origins of the numerous derogatory terms used by Protestant colonists to describe Catholics and Catholicism. *No King, No Popery*, 5-18.

[29] Gildrie, *The Profane, the Civil, and the Godly,* 58.

[30] Hambrick-Stowe, *Practice of Piety,* 27. For example, see H. Outram Evennett's discussion of post-Counter Reformation Catholic education in *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), 78-9.

predicated on some of the most radical features of post-Reformation *Christianity*, let alone Catholicism, yet to be seen.

Despite these affinities, however, key differences between Catholic and Protestants remained on every level. Even the very nature of a congregation, and the legitimacy it could claim as a Church of God, was in doubt. To most Protestants of early New England, a church in its ideal form was composed of members who lived sin-free lives and who, in turn, possessed an intimate understanding of the doctrines of Christianity and deferred to the judgment of the church.[31] In contrast, Catholicism professed no such exclusivity in membership, and thus created the possibility for a much more extensive body of the faithful, not born to salvation but capable of attaining it, leaving it sufficiently flexible to aggressively incorporate a more diverse lot of borderland peoples into its sphere of influence.[32]

When the two faith systems collided in a real geographical sense, reformed Protestantism's exclusivity became a potential handicap. Such was the case in Maine, where mission Catholicism was by its very nature more flexible and adaptable than the mission Protestantism that arose to challenge it.[33] Most of the elements of Catholic practice were anathema to Protestant Puritans of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and reinforced the perception that the Church of Rome was not a true Christian church at all. Similarly, other Protestants like the Anglicans, and later the Presbyterians who clustered in the Piscataqua region, regarded Catholicism in America as a political

---

[31] Edmund S. Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1963), 53.

[32] Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 71, 77, 80.

[33] David Murray, "Spreading the Word: Missionaries, Conversion, and Circulation in the Northeast." In Nicholas Griffiths and Fernando Cervantes, eds., *Spiritual Encounters: Interactions Between Christianity and Native Religions in Colonial America* (Birmingham, UK: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 43-60.

and social movement (in addition to a spiritual one). They saw Catholicism's contemporary adherents as heirs to a post-Reformation history whose key purpose was to destroy God's visible churches, and through them the states that protected Protestantism.[34] To New England Protestants as a group, therefore, professed Catholics not only bore the historical stain of a corrupt set of theological and moral principles, but also the stain of an historical past that included the primacy of foreign potentates, the rapines of the barbarous Catholic Irish, and the bloody campaigns in France and Spanish-controlled parts of Europe that had used military might to crush Protestantism.[35] Writing from a comfortable distance in 1702, Cotton Mather drew a clear connection between Catholic practice and anti-Protestant warfare in a preface to a description of the borderland atrocities of King William's War was in *Decennium Luctuosum*: "A *Spaniard*, that was a Soldier, would say, *That if we have a good Cause, the smell of Gunpowder in the Field is as sweet as the Incense at the Alter.*" [36]

Nevertheless, early Puritan thinkers struggled to come to terms with the fact that the nature of election meant that the possession of true, saving faith could not be limited to their ranks alone. Christians of non-reformed churches, like Anglicans and Roman Catholics, could also be saved if God predestined that path for them.[37] Election is a theme that runs through most captivity narratives, but it also emerges as a theme in the scattered evidence left by Maine captives who did *not* return home. Even as converts to

---

[34] For an excellent description of the symbolic iconography of triumphal Protestantism used as interior decoration in the home of an early Piscataqua merchant, see Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun: Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth* (New York: Knopf, 2001), 95–98.

[35] Ray, *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism,* 211.

[36] Cotton Mather, *Decennium Luctuosum: An history of remarkable occurrences, in the long war, which New-England hath had with the Indian salvages, from the year, 1688* (Boston: B. Green and J. Allen, 1699), 62.

[37] Morgan, *Visible Saints,* 53.

Catholicism, they found it difficult to escape the predestinarian impulse that was fundamental to so many early modern Protestant creeds. And Protestants, and in particular Puritans, who would later lose family to captivity and popery, this sliver of the hope of Providence's wonder-workings must have provided at least a modicum of comfort. In addition, others who encountered Catholics both before and during the wars saw that some could be reasonable, even helpful, when they felt pan-Christian purposes were at stake.

There was precedence for the latter experience in Maine's pre-King William's War history. As William Lucey noted, Maine is the only New England state with a Catholic history that spans its entire colonial period.[38] Some of its religious plantations became permanent. Others were more fleeting or, in the case of the Jesuit mission of Saint-Sauveur, carried greater long-term importance despite the actual brevity of their existence. This set the terms for the interfaith conflict and coexistence that would ebb and flow throughout colonial Maine for more than one hundred years, and beyond.

French Catholics had always had some relationship to the region. More than a decade before Charles I awarded the Maine patent to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, Samuel de Champlain claimed for France the entire coast of Maine east of Penobscot Bay for France, and proactively christened the large island at the bay's mouth *Isle des Monts Deserts.*[39] Desolate and seemingly infertile to the first French to record their impressions, it nevertheless attracted a small band of Jesuit priests and brothers. Armed with missionary zeal and a royal commission, the men attempted to found a mission on

[38] William Leo Lucey, *The Catholic Church in Maine* (Francestown, NH: Marshall Jones, 1957), 1.

[39] Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, 4.

one of the coast's islands in 1613.[40] Part of a general French plan to occupy the coastal regions near the Bay of Fundy, this first Jesuit mission was located in territory claimed by England, which was disinclined to turn a blind eye to French occupation.[41]

The founding of this mission undoubtedly took the same form and liturgical significance as other French foundations, thus cementing a sacramental claim to the territory. In the process of claiming the land for king and church, French clergy enacted a set of elaborate ceremonies that literally "baptized" the land which confirmed Champlain's sacrament by proxy and made the land fit for Catholic worship and habitation. This "ceremony of possession," as Patricia Seed calls it, was an elaborate ritual that combined Catholic liturgy, French political ceremony, and the participation of indigenous people to create a symbolically-unified set of subjects. Through these public spectacles, the French demonstrated the grandeur of their spiritual power wherever they went in the New World.[42] Such processions echoed biblical sentiments. As the Jesuit Joseph Jouvency noted, "The land that was desolate and un passable shall be glad, and the wilderness shall rejoice, and shall flourish like the lily."[43] Even the name chosen for the mission, Saint-Sauveur ["Holy Redeemer"] reflected the belief that the wilderness and its inhabitants were indeed in need of redemption, and that said redemption was at hand.[44]

---

[40] "Jouvency's Account of the Canadian Mission," in Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791*, 73 vols. [hereafter "*JR*"], (Cleveland: Burrows Brothers, 1896-1901), 1:227.

[41] This was the Popham Colony at the mouth of the Kennebec River, the brainchild of Sir John Popham whose partner, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, chose to encourage settlement farther to the south. Clark, 5, 16.

[42] Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640* (London: Cambridge, 1995), 41-2.

[43] "Jouvency," *JR* 1:193.

[44] Ibid., 1:227; Lapomarda, *Jesuit Heritage in New England*, 1-3.

Like the enormous wooden cross that they symbolically planted "by way of consecrating the place," the Jesuits set out to apply themselves to redeem New World souls through the literal planting of Christianity, tying its presence to specific places and rendering that landscape holy through the use of objects of veneration and sacramentals - everyday objects that were consecrated by a priest to perform certain religious functions.[45] With these items, they were primed for a harvest of souls.

Liturgical performance of this nature carried another message. The sacred ceremony "consecrated" the ownership of the land to the young king of France, Louis XIII. Thus the Jesuit missionaries, as they were in so many other places of the Atlantic World, became simultaneously evangelists and agents of a European crown, claiming territory for God and King with one ceremony.[46] This pattern would persist until the order's suppression in 1773.

With the priority of planting post-Reformation Catholicism in a region close to territory claimed by England, Saint-Sauveur did indeed become the backdrop for a complex interfaith encounter, though not the kind its founders had originally envisioned. Had it had more time to develop, the mission would have cemented French Catholic claims to the mid-Maine coast and stood as a territorial bulwark against English expansion up the North American coast. Success among the local Indians would drive French roots even deeper. Before any of this could happen, however, it became the focal point of a rivalry between the English and the French over fishing rights. In what would become common practice in Maine, the sacred and the worldly were often inextricably tied.

---

[45] *JR* 2:247-9.

[46] Seed, 56.

Like other encounters during the seventeenth century, the mission's genesis and fate left a mixed legacy of religious petulance and accommodation, combat and negotiation. This particular interfaith interaction began before the Jesuit missionaries who were to found Saint-Sauveur left France. Upon contracting with a ship to take them to Acadia, the priests were challenged by the vessel's Huguenot owners who refused to allow them passage on their ship. The Jesuit author of *Rerum Gestarum*, the document that describes the Saint-Sauveur enterprise, dismissed the owners as "churlish Heretics." Yet he and his companions could not ignore the fact that, without the Protestants' assent, they would go nowhere that season.[47] Desperate to secure passage (the Protestant-owned ship was the only one being fitted out for travel to New France that year), the Jesuits turned to a wealthy and devout laywoman, Madame de Guercherville, to purchase a partnership in the venture and transferred it to the priests.[48] Thereafter, the Jesuits were not mere passengers of the Protestant ship owners, but coequals in what became an interfaith seaborne venture.[49] Initially uncomfortable, the arrangement worked, suggesting that in this case, the need for cash and safe transport trumped the need to exercise religious principles.

The planting of Saint-Sauveur took place after the Jesuits had explored several other possible sites around the Bay of Fundy and the St. Lawrence. But *Isle des Monts Deserts*' stark beauty, natural concealments, and welcoming Penobscot Indians convinced the priests that they had found a blessed site that preordained the mission's

---

[47] "Rerum Gestarum," *JR* 2:207-9.

[48] Ibid., 2:213.

[49] 2:213.

success.[50] Other portents were less promising and sprang from disagreements not between the missionaries and their proselytes, but among the professed Christians themselves. This discord left the ersatz settlement dangerously underdefended. And when an English fleet discovered the Jesuits perched so close to valuable fishing grounds, the missionaries and laypeople of Saint-Sauveur were unable to organize a coherent defense against their assailants, who in turn swiftly destroyed the mission.

These forces came from Virginia. In the summer of 1614, less than a year after the mission's founding, Samuel Argall, an English captain sailing out of Jamestown, was trolling the northern cod fishery and caught sight of the hapless Saint-Sauveur. Under authority from Captain John Smith and, through him, the Council for New England, which had already laid claim to the territory and considered its defense a patriotic and moral duty, Argall proactively attacked the settlement.[51] With little warning, Argall fired on the ship that housed the Jesuits and the laymen, killing Gilbert du Thet, a Jesuit brother.

The priests feared that the English crew would kill them too, and desecrate their belongings. With little left to lose but their lives, the Saint-Sauveur Jesuits decided to reveal their identities as Catholic priests and plead for clemency. As they reported,

> our brethren approached the Captain; frankly revealed themselves to him, as he was still ignorant of their identity; and begged him not, in elation over his easy victory, to adopt severe measures against their colony; they earnestly warned him to remember the conditions of human life, saying that just as he would wish his own interests mildly handled, if a similar calamity had fallen upon him, so he ought to act humanely in the case of others; moreover, that he should especially consider that he was dealing with innocent men, to whom no fault could be charged beyond the fact

[50] 3:223.

[51] Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, 16.

> that, because of their blamelessness, they had been too careless in a peaceful spot.

To their surprise, however, "They were heard somewhat kindly by the Captain, and received with respectful address; the only thing of which he disapproved being that Fathers of the Society, who had commonly so good a reputation for piety and wisdom, should be among a band of runaways and pirates.[52]

The Jesuits' line of reasoning, and even their reputations, found fertile, sympathetic ground. Instead of violence, the English captain and his crew accepted their pleas and agreed to preserve their lives. This was the first example of a pattern that would be repeated again and again in early Maine. Technical, state and religiously-sanctioned biases notwithstanding, the encounter of fellow European Christians often ended with empathy and accommodation – in spite of the ease with which real violence, sanctioned by the same tendencies that kept Europe itself locked in interfaith conflict, could have been exploited for glory, material gain, or bloodlust.

Argall's raiders resisted the lure of bloodlust. Indeed, the situation was the opposite. In the process of transporting the French captives to Virginia, the English captain extended courtesies to the survivors, offering the services of an English Catholic doctor to the wounded and inviting the captive priests to dine at his table. In a more extreme version of interfaith cooperation, a French-speaking Calvinist who was part of Argall's crew even offered to help the missionaries jump ship.[53]

In the end, the Jesuits succeeded in converting Argall – not to Catholicism, but to the belief that they, as missionaries, had come in peace and posed no threat to English

---

[52] *JR* 2:257.

[53] 2:253, 255, 257.

interests.[54] Upon arrival in Virginia, Argall openly sided with the Jesuits against the colony's governor, Thomas Dale, who was prepared to deal harshly with the priests. Argall's defense won the priests their freedom.[55]

The Jesuits' North American odyssey did not end there. Instead, they were launched into an Atlantic World of devastating storms, accusations of piracy, and near-destruction by a Spanish treasure ship. But these adventures – the result of a comedy of errors, not organized persecution - post-dated the encounter with the English Virginians and the beginnings of interfaith accommodation on the remote coast of Maine.

Pierre Biard, one of the Saint-Sauveur Jesuits, later returned to Maine to continue his ministry. By this time, however, the Jesuits had plenty of secured mission territory. The French had cemented their claims to Acadia, which by their definition encompassed all of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and northeastern Maine as far as the Penobscot River. After the Treaty of Ryswick, the claim was declared to extend even farther to the southwest, all the way to the Kennebec River.

It was there that another Jesuit mission – far closer to English settlements – was established both to convert the local Kennebec Indians and check English expansion.[56] In the years following Saint-Sauveur's demise, individual Jesuits were joined in their ministry by another order, the Capuchins, who occasionally worked the Maine coast from Acadian outposts.[57] In 1646, a Jesuit who had already been long established in the

---

[54] 2:267.

[55] 2:265.

[56] Gerald E. Morris, ed. *The Maine Bicentennial Atlas: An Historical Survey* (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1976), 5, fig. 9.

[57] Morrison, *Embattled Northeast,* 80.

Canadian missions, Gabriel Druillettes, made his way to the Kennebec Indians and established the precursor to the mission of Narantsouak (Norridgewock). Unlike its predecessor, this Jesuit mission would manage to exist in some form for almost eighty years. This is remarkable, given the fact that the mission came much closer to land that was already being settled by the English than its Mount Desert forerunner had been.

This paradox is best explained by a close look at the mission's staffing. Gabriel Druillettes came to the Kennebec region at the request of the Indians themselves. Decimated by disease and addicted to the alcohol sold to them illegally by English traders, the community sought regeneration through alliance with the French and their spiritual representatives.[58] But Druillettes was careful not to assign blame. Instead, he navigated around the tricky issues that stood to divide the area's Europeans and instead cultivated alliances.

Though his visits to the mission were sporadic (the Jesuits wanted his services elsewhere and were anxious to avoid conflict with their missionary co-religionists, the Capuchins), Druillettes made it his personal goal to promote the interests of the Wabanakis in Canada and win protection for them against their enemies, the Iroquois, who hoped to exploit the Kennebecs' vulnerabilities.[59] His visits also gave him an opportunity to observe the activities of the inhabitants of Cushnoc, the Plymouth-owned trading post several miles down river.

It was there that Druillettes developed an unlikely, and very warm friendship with the manager of the colony's post, John Winslow. How Druillettes, an undisguised French

---

[58] The English ban against the selling of liquor to the Wabanakis was strictly worded but proved almost impossible to enforce. Ibid., 77, 80.

[59] 81.

missionary priest, became friendly with a man of impeccable Puritan Separatist credentials (Winslow's brother, Edward, was one of the founders of the colony and had been imprisoned in England for preaching in opposition to the high-church archbishop, William Laud), is yet another indication that religious ideology in early Maine could easily be overlooked if a greater good was served.[60] In the case of Druillettes and Winslow, that greater good lay with the Kennebecs, who were their best spiritual and trade customers, respectively.

The fact that Druillettes, the Jesuit, whose presence in territory claimed by England was still technically treasonous, was selected to present the interests of New France to the colonies of Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth and negotiate terms of trade and mutual protection against the Iroquois, indicates that the priest had indeed succeeded in winning the confidence of his English neighbors. It further suggests English confidence that the Jesuit would not, or had no reason to, use his influence among the Kennebecs to turn them against the English.[61] John Winslow stated as much when he welcomed the diplomat Druillettes to Cushnoc. He told the priest's Indian companions "I love and respect [Druillettes] … I will lodge him in my home and treat him as I do my own brother; for I know very well the good that he does among you, and the life he leads there."[62]

The friendship between Druillettes and John Winslow was fostered by interest in the Wabanakis themselves. Winslow confided to the priest that he had a "special zeal for the Conversion of the Savages, as also has his brother, Edward … who is trying to

---

[60] "Edward Winslow," *ANB* 23:648.

[61] Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1867; reprint, Lincoln: NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 422.

[62] *JR* 36:85.

institute a brotherhood to train and instruct the Savages, just as is practiced with the poor by the charity of London."[63] In later decades, even the most zealous Puritans considered a corrupt form of Christianity better than no Christianity at all. Whatever he felt for the Jesuit personally, Winslow had found in the priest someone who could lay the Christian groundwork for later missionary enterprises. Where John Winthrop, writing from a comfortable distance in Boston, saw Puritan evangelization as "a bulwark against the kingdom of Antichrist, which the Jesuits labor to rear up in all places of the world," John Winslow, far from home and surrounded by potential enemies, saw accommodation as the best service to his – and Cushnoc's - interests.[64]

Druillettes' mission to New England was going to take him far beyond the welcoming security of this local Euroamerican outpost, which provided easy and protected cover for an outlaw clergyman. Given Winthrop's sentiments about the order, and the existence of laws that sanctioned death by hanging for persistent unauthorized Jesuit interlopers, the dispatching of one of that order into the very heart of New England, and as a representative of the French Crown no less, seems strange indeed.

Given this particular priest's skills, the choice was actually quite savvy. The Jesuit possessed the linguistic acumen to move throughout multiple frontier environments. Druillettes' knowledge of French, English, and a smattering of Native American dialects rendered him an important potential ally with diverse borderland groups in matters that far exceeded trade alliances. In addition, Druillettes came to New England not only with the recommendation of, *but in the company of*, his friend Winslow, whose well-respected brother had played a critical role in New England's

---

[63] Ibid.

[64] Qtd. in Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America,* 422.

founding and development. The Jesuit was also a natural diplomat, who used the language of pan-Christian unity to press his case. He wrote to John Winthrop, Jr. that the Iroquois "not only have long harassed Christian Cannadians near Kebec … but they intend by a general massacre to destroy my akenebek Catechumens dwelling on the banks of the Kennebec River, because they have been for many years to the Cannadian Christians."[65] The implication was clear: the alliance would save the lives not only of fellow Christians, but of local ones, who, in terms of trade, were better off living than dead.

Druillettes and Winslow set sail from Merry Meeting Bay on November 25th, but not before they encountered a group of English fisherman, some of whom complained to Winslow about his squiring a Frenchman (but not a Jesuit per se) along the coast. Ten days later, they rounded Cape Ann ("Kepane," as Druillettes called it), and proceeded to Charlestown, directly across the Charles River from Boston itself.[66]

During his diplomatic mission, Gabriel Druillettes was consistently touched by the courtesies extended to him by members of the Puritan elite. These acts of sufferance even extended to allowing the priest to celebrate Mass – a religious act outlawed in old and New England alike. The Jesuit likely had a portable alter and Mass kit with him, which were "standard issue" for Catholic missionaries, who were frequently forced to improvise Catholic liturgies in places that lacked consecrated chapels.[67] Upon arrival at the house of magistrate Edward Gibbons, the priest was given a key to a chamber that

---

[65] Qtd. in Morrison, *The Embattled Northeast*, 81.

[66] *JR* 36:86.

[67] For a description of a Catholic mass adapted to "wilderness" celebration, see "Missions of the Montagnais or Lower Algonquians during the years 1673 and 1674," *JR* 59:33.

was placed exclusively at his disposal.[68] Jesuit and Puritan understood each other clearly: the Puritan would tolerate Catholic liturgical practices in his home, and the Jesuit would carefully lock himself away so that the Puritan did not have to look at them.

Further accommodation was to come. When Druillettes dined at Plymouth Governor John Bradford's house on a Friday, he was served fish as a main course. Though fish were certainly plentiful in seventeenth century Plymouth, Druillettes interpreted the menu as a kindly gesture of deference to Catholic dietary practices.[69] Druillettes received an additional honor when the Reverend John Eliot, Massachusetts Bay's "Apostle to the Indians," invited the Jesuit to winter with him at his home in Roxbury.[70] Though learned men were certainly not in short supply in Massachusetts, Eliot must have found the Jesuit's company particularly appealing. Three years earlier he had started his own mission to the local Algonquians. The Jesuit's work among Native Americans must have spurred his interest. Perhaps Eliot's missionary zeal even extended to the Jesuit himself.

Throughout his numerous meetings, Druillettes consistently represented himself as "an ambassador for my Catechumens of the Kennebec."[71] But the New Englanders perceived a deeper motive to preserve French interests, and they were naturally wary. The 1650s would prove to be a turbulent time for general Catholic-Protestant relations, such as they were. It was during this decade that England, under the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, would strike at Spanish holdings in the Caribbean in the name of

---

[68] Parkman, *Jesuits*, 423.

[69] *JR* 36:91. On New England dietary practices during the colonial period, see Peter Benes, ed., *Foodways in the Northeast: The Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife Annual Proceedings, 1982* (Boston: Boston University Press, 1984), passim.

[70] *JR* 36:91.

[71] Ibid., 36:89.

removing the Catholic menace from the region. New England had begun its own missions among the Pequot and Massachusetts peoples.[72] The laws against Jesuits in old and New England would be reinforced in 1651. And in that same year, Massachusetts would annex the settlements of southern Maine and christened them York County.

Though Catholics and Protestants would continue to mingle with, fight, and accommodate one another in Maine, the Druillettes mission was an apotheosis of interfaith cooperation. Members of both faiths were willing to overlook the intrinsic differences that in theory should have kept them separate from and fearful of one another. Subterfuge, which would have been perceived as a special "gift" of the Jesuits in the early part of the century, was not necessary. Though hardly a golden age, the brief era of friendship between Winslow and Druillettes, and the subsequent gracious welcome the Jesuit received in New England thanks to Winslow's *entre*, is an important relic of a period in borderland history when religious difference was not perceived to be the most challenging hurdle to the Euroamericans who lived there.

Twenty-five years later, another Maine Jesuit missionary was emboldened to visit Boston. But in what was probably a critical sign of the times, Jean Pierron did so in disguise. Pierron was en route to a meeting with English members of the Society, who were living in Maryland, likewise in disguise. Traveling by sea, he was forced to disembark in Massachusetts. Instead of keeping a low profile until he could move on, he decided to stay in New England and attempt to make some converts – or at least enjoy the sport of disquieting some Protestants. He spoke openly about theological matters to Puritans in towns surrounding Boston. Though he complained of "naught but desolation

---

[72] Richard Middleton, *Colonial America: A History, 1607- 1760* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 67.

and abomination among the heretics," he still managed to secure a few abjurations of Protestantism.[73] His reputation for his learned debates started to precede him, and he found the doors of various Boston ministers open, their occupants eager to engage in lively religious dialogue. It was in one of these ministerial households that Pierron reported to have been treated with "much civility." Somewhere along the line, however, his lines of inquiry made him suspect to his hosts, and they reported his presence to he General Court. Summoned to respond appear to answer questions about his true identity, Pierron wisely chose to flee.[74] His successes around Boston had not been sufficient to encourage martyrdom. And there were interesting challenges to be had in Maryland, where Catholics - even clandestine ones - were numerous. Pierron's adventures demonstrate that suspicions of infiltration into New England by disguised Jesuits, by sea or land, were not merely the stuff of paranoid Puritan fantasy.[75]

Given the difficulty of travel between the Maine frontier and New England, and the dangers to which this Jesuit submitted himself, it is unlikely that he dawdled in Boston solely to indulge in idle theological jesting. Instead, the timing of this audacious mission suggests that the missionary, even in his remote corner of *l'Acadie*, was familiar with events in England that spoke of an opportunity to challenge the "Calvinist heresy" in the New World. By 1674, the year of Pierron's "mission" to Boston, England was rife with rumors that Charles II, who had strong Catholic sympathies, had engaged in secret diplomatic conferences with the French and had encouraged a "Popish Plot" to restore

---

[73] *JR* 51:71.

[74] Ibid., 51:72.

[75] For a description of one such episode, see Philip Gura, *A Glimpse of Sion's Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620-1660* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan, 1984), 203.

Catholicism to England.[76] Perched on the edge of the Atlantic World, Pierron was nevertheless probably aware that the future of Christianity in England was at a crossroads with its established church under the later Stuarts – and that his services might prove handy to those in New England the Jesuit hoped would welcome such change.

The extent to which Pierron interacted with the inhabitants of Maine's English settlements, if at all, is not known. But even if they were infrequent, such interactions probably would have given him hope that the Calvinist heresy could be swept from the region, if not the globe itself. Almost from the start, Maine's settlers were an ethnically, and therefore religiously, diverse lot. Religious diversity was born out of the settler pool, which was also ethnically diverse. Many Mainers would eventually attend whatever church was at hand, if there was one at hand at all, and their own religious roots were in diverse forms of European Christianity that ran the gamut from Eastern Orthodoxy to radical Protestantism. By the middle of the seventeenth century, Greeks, Scots, French, Portuguese, Channel Islanders, Dutch, Walloons, Irish, West Indians, West Africans, and Welsh had all come to Maine to work in its maritime and forestry enterprises.[77] The Puritan Conquest of the latter part of the seventeenth century increasingly tipped the scales in favor of English Puritans, but settlers in the first half of that century spoke diverse languages and had, at least in their countries of origin, practiced diverse religions or been subject to diverse established churches. Even after the Puritan Conquest was well underway, the fringe settlements and fisheries of New Hampshire and Maine continued to attract groups of people who came for the maritime enterprises and timber,

---

[76] John Cannon and Ralph Griffiths, *The Oxford History of the British Monarchy* (New York: Oxford, 1988), 408-9.

[77] See examples in *GDMNH* 64, 83, 93, 90, 101, 121, 133, 140, 148, 212, 290.

not religion. Though most of these groups (with the possible exception of the Channel Islanders), failed to make a lasting cultural imprint on colonial Maine, they still constituted a presence outside of the boundaries of Puritan orthodoxy that Massachusetts hoped to enforce. Though small in number, the diverse European population scattered throughout the Eastward's communities is evidence that Mainers of the post-Puritan Conquest were aware of the wider movements within the Atlantic World, not isolated from these movements in homogenous outposts.

Still, most of these settlers lived under the auspices of English settlement, which brought with it a connection to Protestantism. "Catholic" Maine was created through ceremonies of possession. Establishing distinctly "Protestant" territory was a different procedure for the English, though laden nonetheless with its own symbolic understandings. Among the diverse population that coalesced in the English settlements, the avowed Protestants were working with a different set of beliefs when it came to sacred space and land. Emphasizing "grace over place," as Jon Butler terms it, communities of the Protestant faithful were driven by a desire to collect a church of visible saints.[78] It was the presence of people who had been converted through grace, and not the buildings, trappings of liturgy, or the presence of the sacramental technicians who formed the Catholic priesthood, that made a place Protestant.

The ideas that fed this concept of Godly community were of course the modus operandi of the Puritan colonies of New England. But many other Maine Protestants, from England or points elsewhere, were not enamored of the New England Way.

---

[78] Jon Butler, "Historiographical Heresy: Catholicism as a Model for American Religious History," in Thomas Kselman, ed., *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion* (Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame Press, 1991), 296.

One of them was Sir Ferdinando Gorges, the first proprietor of what had come to be known as the Province of Maine. In 1622, James I granted Sir Ferdinando and his business partner, Captain John Mason proprietorship over the stretch of land above Massachusetts Bay. In 1629, the partners divided the patent, which had originally stretched from the Merrimack to the Kennebec rivers. Mason took control of the area around the Piscataqua River that would become New Hampshire; Gorges got the rest.[79]

From the beginning, both proprietors were contemptuous of their Puritan neighbors to the south. Gorges was a good friend to the high church Stuart monarchs and himself a high Anglican. Indeed, his plans for the region even included a lord bishop to oversee the spiritual development of his province.[80] According to one historian, Gorges saw in Maine "a chance to build medieval England anew, to bring back the past." And he planned to do so with the blessing of the English king himself. Charles I's own idealized vision for province he bequeathed to Gorges included encouraging settlement among high church English nobleman. He hoped these settlers would act as a buffer to Massachusetts Bay Puritanism, and if necessary, bring its more radical elements to heel.[81]

The very name of Gorges' manor – Point Christian – lent pious meaning to the proprietor's ambitions for the area. It also conjured England's pre-Reformation past, where places carried with them the names of saints and other sacred affiliations.

But Sir Ferdinando never even so much as set foot in his province, sending in his place a young, yet capable, cousin, Thomas Gorges, to administer the colony as deputy

---

[79] Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, 17-18.

[80] Ibid., 19.

[81] Emerson W. Baker, "The World of Thomas Gorges" in Baker et al, eds., *American Beginnings: Exploration, Culture and Cartography in the Land of Norumbega* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1994), 262-3.

governor.[82] Though the younger Gorges' primary commitment was to family interests in the region, he diverged from Sir Ferdinando in religious sensibilities at a time when such divisions in families could lead to permanent rifts. A Puritan-leaning Anglican, Thomas Gorges encouraged his uncle to adopt a policy of religious tolerance in the colony in order to spur settlement.[83] In a letter to antinomian refugee John Wheelwright, the younger Gorges assured the minister that he "[forced] no man to the common prayer book or to the ceremonies of the Church of England but allowed the liberties of conscience in this particular."[84]

When Thomas Gorges left Maine in 1643 to take a commission with the Parliamentary cavalry during the English Civil War, he vacated his post as the province's most powerful Puritan protector and left the door open for an Anglican resurgence.[85] As the first established religion in the province, Anglicanism had a substantial role presence to play in Sir Ferdinando's plans for his province. Its physical presence was evident as early as 1635, when a Anglican chapel was built at the proprietor's seat, Gorgeana (later York). Sir Ferdinando hoped that this simple building would eventually become the see of a provincial bishop, brought over from England to guide and direct the spiritual life of the settlements to the Eastward. Kittery too had an Anglican Church, and a later, settlement, Falmouth, would be established as an "Anglican" town for merchants from predominantly Anglican Portsmouth.[86]

---

[82] "Robert Gorges, William Gorges, and Thomas Gorges," *ANB* 9:302.

[83] Baker, "The World of Thomas Gorges," 276.

[84] Ibid.

[85] "Gorges," *ANB* 9:302.

[86] George Francis Marlowe, *Churches of Old New England: Their Architecture and Their Architects, Their Pastors and Their People* (New York: Macmillan, 1947), 207.

Early Maine attracted prominent Anglicans who were anxious to share in New World bounty but sufficiently committed to the Church of England to be unwelcome in most other parts of New England. One of these was Richard Vines, who came to the province as a servant of Sir Ferdinando and later became a proprietor of Arundel (Kennebunkport). Vines shared his master's commitment to the Church of England and may himself have had sympathetic relations with old Catholic families in England.[87]

Anglicans of more modest means also continued to feel welcome in the province during the first part of the seventeenth century. These included Robert Jordan, "an Orthodox Deane for the Church of England," who settled on a large and particularly choice piece of land near Spurwink (later Scarborough).[88] Outspoken in his opposition to Puritan hegemony, Jordan and his ministry eventually ran afoul of Massachusetts authorities after Maine was finally permanently annexed in 1668.[89] And members of later generations of Puritans, like merchant and mariner John Alden, would have suspicion cast upon them for consorting too intimately with the province's mix of Indians, Anglicans, French Catholics and Quakers.[90]

By the middle of the seventeenth century, Puritans and Anglicans were vying for control of the guiding Protestant vision for the province. This was clearly a spillover of the Gorges family's own religious fractiousness. It was, after all, Thomas Gorges, the Puritan member of the proprietor's family, who offered refuge to the banished Ann Hutchinson associate John Wheelwright. Wheelwright and his little group of followers

---

[87] *GDMNH* 705-6; Marlowe, *Churches*, 210.

[88] *GDMNH* 391; James Phinney Baxter, ed. *Documentary History of the State of Maine,* 24 vols. [hereafter "*DHSM*"] (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1889-1916), 4:151.

[89] *GDMNH* 391; Edward Bourne, *History of Wells and Kennebunk* (Portland: B. Thurston, 1875), 66.

[90] Alden was the grandson of Plymouth settler John Alden and son of Captain John. He was related through marriage to Anne Hutchinson. Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds* 197-8.

had first settled in Exeter, New Hampshire, but were again on the move when the colony was annexed by Massachusetts for the first time during the early 1640s.[91] Though Wheelwright's group was, at least for a time, composed of *persona non grata* in the Puritan societies envisioned by Massachusetts, it soon formed the basis for a more substantial migration of Puritans of various levels of commitment from the Bay Colony to the Eastward. Compared to Anglicans or the men of nondescript practices whose gods may indeed have been fish and pine, the Puritans of Massachusetts were relative latecomers. Nevertheless, when they came, they came to stay.

Quakers too were attracted to Maine's remoteness and tolerated in Maine communities, especially in Kittery. Here a substantial number of the townspeople were converted by Quaker missionaries.[92] Among these converts was Nicholas Shapleigh, a prominent merchant and magistrate, and a member of numerous civil and military commissions.[93] Quakers were a source of annoyance in any territory claimed by Puritans. But in places like Maine and neighboring New Hampshire, officials frequently failed to enforce orthodoxy except among the most outspoken Friends. Discrete Quakers were badly-needed warm bodies for populating Maine and New Hampshire and were for the most part tolerated even during the years of Massachusetts Bay's government.[94] But aggressive Quakers had their own allure, too, for persecuting them produced revenue in the form of fines. Some, however, were so obnoxious to Puritan sensibilities that the

---

[91] Clark, 46.

[92] Ibid., 80.

[93] *GDMNH,* 624.

[94] Emerson W. Baker, "Lithobolia: Frontier Prelude to Witchcraft in Salem," (paper presented at the American Historical Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, January 2001), 2. "Lithobolia" is also a chapter of a book in progress. I am indebted to Emerson Baker for graciously sharing portions of his manuscript with me.

General Court considered execution.[95] The border wars with the French and Indians did not soften Puritan attitudes toward these fellow Protestants, despite the numbers they contributed to the English towns. As late as 1708/9, Governor Joseph Dudley complained to the Board of Trade of people inhabiting the eastern parts who were "Living Disorderly, and some of them being Quakers," as though all were one in the same.[96]

Even less desirable than Quakers were Baptists, who began to appear in the Eastward as early as 1681. A year later, a bold Baptist minister named William Screven, who was licensed to preach by the Baptist church in Boston, built a thriving congregation at Kittery.[97] But Screven's alternative services offended a local magistrate, Francis Hooke, who fined the Baptists and eventually tried to run their minister out of town.[98] Contempt for this particular Christian vision is evident in the case of George Burroughs, the Wells minister who was executed as a witch in Salem in 1692. Among the many accusations made against him was the assertion that he was a secret Baptist.[99] To Puritans, this accusation was serious enough to rate mention with the graver sins of cavorting with Satan and murdering one's spouse.

Enforcing Puritan orthodoxy among Maine settlers would have presented a challenge to even the most experienced, zealous, and skilled New England minister. Zeal among the settlers could not be taken for granted, or even, for that matter, expected.

---

[95] This was Richard Nason, a trustee for the Gorges family and Kittery selectman. *GDMNH,* 505.

[96] "Joseph Dudley to the Board of Trade," 1 March 1708/9. *DHSM,* 9:264.

[97] Baker, "Lithobolia," 3.

[98] Thanks to its proximity to the more permissive New Hampshire, Kittery was a hotbed of religious experimentation (and deviation) during the late seventeenth century. When New England Puritans attempted to enforce orthodoxy on the town, the settlers simply retooled their church to conform to the basics of Congregational worship. Clark, 81.

[99] Edward E. Bourne, *A History of Wells and Kennebunk* (Portland: B. Thurston & Co., 1875), 176.

Many Mainers became Puritan in terms of law and custom only. A congregation at Kittery, for example, simply swapped Anglicanism for Congregationalism when the province submitted to Massachusetts' control. This was done with a more worldly purpose in mind: the Kittery settlers were much more interested in wresting control of the town's environs away from the grip of Gorges' patentees than they were in points of religious principle.[100] Adopting Puritanism, even in name only, provided additional grist for that mill.

Confessional diversity was not the only stumbling block to forming a cohesive Protestant identity in the Province of Maine. In addition to the challenges posed by aggressive members of other sects, even Mainers who professed Puritanism were in general not as well educated or informed about their faith as their fellow colonists in Massachusetts. Many possessed a less than intimate knowledge of Scripture and were thus bereft of a key theological underpinning of Puritanism. When Massachusetts first gained control of Maine in 1649, the General Court stipulated that "all gode people within the Jurisdiction of this province who are out of a Church way and be orthodox in Judgment and not scandalous in life" should "gather themselves into a Church estate, provided they do it in a Christian way." and select and ordain officers who were "able, pious, and orthodox."[101] Charles Clark notes that "able, pious, and orthodox" comes directly out of Massachusetts statute books, with one important exception: in crafting the

[100] Bourne, *Wells*, 61; John G. Reid, *Acadia, Maine and New Scotland: Marginal Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 1981), 13.

[101] Charles Thornton Libby et al, eds. *Province and Court Records of Maine,* 6 vols. [hereafter "*MPCR*"] (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1928-1975), 1:136.

law, Massachusetts substituted "pious" for "learned," as it appeared in the Bay Colony's own requirement.[102]

The province's paucity of schools and well-educated congregants in its early years is also telling. If the spirit to form the congregation was willing, Mainers would accept church officers whose knowledge of Scripture and holy texts were comparatively weak when compared to their fellow settled ministers in more stable Puritan colonies. Literacy was not only useful in terms of conveying the tenets of reformed Protestantism. It was also the key means of cultural transmission that perpetuated the English anti-Catholic tradition, which, given Maine's proximity to so much French Catholic power, would have proved useful indeed to galvanizing the faithful against the enemies of God and Englishman. The prevalence of John Foxe's *Actes and Monuments,* among the first texts printed in New England, and one critical to the argument that popery and Protestant-defined Christianity were intrinsically incompatible, hints at the enduring popularity of anti-Catholic tropes to an educated Protestant readership. *Actes and Monuments* was the frequent source of fuel that fired the passions of many Massachusetts ministers.[103] So too did John Cotton's sermons, which were printed and widely distributed in both London and Boston. Cotton's works affirmed the "anti-papal persuasion," and used current events in Catholic and Protestant Europe to predict that "Christian Princes, and State shall powre out the wrath of God, upon Popish Superstition and Idolatry."[104]

---

[102] Clark, 48.

[103] In many Anglican churches, *Actes and Monuments* (more commonly known as *The Book of Martyrs*) had a place on the lectern next to the Bible. Cogliano, *No King*, 6-7; Hambrick-Stowe, *Piety,* 117.

[104] Qtd. in Stout, *The New England Soul*, 49. For a detailed analysis of the anti-papal persuasion, see also Cogliano, *No King*, 17-18. The implications for New World, pan-Christian literacy have yet to be evaluated, though in *Popular Culture and Early Modern Europe*, Peter Burke takes a step in that direction by identifying the basic assumptions regarding literacy as "more [Europeans] could read in 1800 than in 1500; that craftsmen were generally much more literate than peasants, men than women, Protestants than

Print material, regular ministry, and schools – these were all instruments that disseminated anti-popery throughout the more established regions of New England. But the communities to the Eastward experienced few means at their disposal to transmit these messages. Anti-papal rhetoric was not uncommon in seventeenth century Maine, and was used to describe conflicts with non-English neighbors, most of whom were at least nominally Roman Catholic. But anti-popery gained even greater currency where print culture thrived. If not passed and perpetuated in print or by word of mouth to many listeners, its potency as a tool for militant Protestantism became diluted. In Maine's case it was further mitigated by circumstances specific to life on the edge of New England.

With this scarcity of reading material and the practical means to disseminate information in print, Mainers had more in common with the colonists of Canada and Acadia than they did with other New Englanders. Despite the development of the cities and institutions compared to the English settlements of Maine, New France lacked a single printing press until well into the eighteenth century.[105] Peter Kalm claimed that throughout his travels in New France, he never once saw a Bible in a private home, despite the fact that Catholic vernacular bibles had been in print for over a century.[106] While Roger Magnuson believes that the Protestant Kalm's observation smacks of both exaggeration and old stereotypes, it is important to note that books of any kind were

---

Catholics, and Western Europeans than Eastern Europeans." Burke asserts that this evidence is "precise, yet fragmentary" and relies on "signature literacy," a riskily inaccurate assessment tool that relies on one task alone – the ability to sign one's name. Nevertheless, the author notes that rising rates of literacy throughout Western Europe started to transcend sectarian lines once Protestantism became deeply rooted and Catholicism responded to some of its more challenging initiatives – and these initiatives were more often than not became cornerstones of the development of New World Christian communities.

[105] Though the Jesuits repeated requested a printing press to aid in the teaching of Indian languages, New France was prohibited from having a one of its for fear that local book production would undermine the mother country's lucrative trade in supplying print material to its colonies. Magnuson, *Education in New France*, 107-8.

[106] Ibid., 107.

indeed rarely found in the homes of Canada's frequently-illiterate lower classes.[107] Thirty-two percent of the members of the ruling and professional classes, however, did possess them, with one personal collection surpassing three thousand volumes.[108] In comparison, a survey of Maine estate inventories between 1678 and 1685 indicates that books of any kind, including Holy Scripture, were found in less than one-third of the province's households. Of these, only one in three was identified as a Bible or "practice of piety."[109] Furthermore, owners of these precious objects were often loath to submit them to the dangers of frontier life. For example, the Reverend John Wheelwright, who inherited a sizeable library from a relative, sent the volumes to Boston for safekeeping, and thus took them out of possible circulation to the reading public of his own community.[110]

Unlike its French and English neighbors to the south and the west, Maine was also severely under-institutionalized in terms of education. If literacy rates were reasonably consistent with other areas of mid-seventeenth century New England, most of Maine's settlers were able to read.[111] Many, however, did not, or more likely, could not take their education to the next level, which entailed going to a school to learn to write

---

[107] Ibid.

[108] Ibid., 105.

[109] Assessment made by author using volume 3 of William A. Sargent, ed. *York Deeds*, 18 vols. [hereafter "*YD*"] (Portland: John T. Hull, 1887-1910).

[110] William A. Sargent, *Maine Wills, 1640-1760* (Portland: Brown, Thurston & Co., 1887), 131.

[111] The ability for New England males to sign their names to legal documents ("signature literacy"), hovered around 61% in 1660; for women, the figure was considerably lower (31%). Theorists of the history of literacy use these figures as benchmarks, determining from them that at very least, this percentage of the population can also read, but some scholars challenge this assumption. See Magnuson, *Education in New France*, 87-8, *n.* 198; Thomas L. Purvis, *Colonial America to 1763* (New York: Facts on File, 1999), 248.

and cipher.[112] Maine communities were frequently penalized for failing to comply with a Massachusetts law which stipulated that towns with fifty or more families engage a teacher for them (part of the strategy to keep the "old deluder Satan" at bay).[113] To a critic of frontier dwellers like Cotton Mather, the inability or lack of interest in forming schools was another indication that these people were haphazard, at best, in their regard for religion and its role in their lives.

In the towns to the Eastward, which were constantly vulnerable to religious antagonists by land and sea, piety and zeal held the potential to be more important tools for fomenting a cohesive Protestant identity than texts that explicated Catholicism's intrinsic deficiencies. These issues were raised not through regular interaction with Protestant literature, but through escalating tensions between two European nations that spilled over into the colonial arena. While Mainers believed their status as Protestants was built upon the conviction that the Pope and his minions were anti-Christian, it took the events of the last decades of the seventeenth century – experienced intimately by many Maine families - to give these sentiments a stronger, more unified form. The arrival of Protestants with well-defined Puritan leanings into Maine during the course of the second half of the seventeenth century exacerbated this movement toward a unified Protestant identity. And even those who fumbled for their religious bearings in the scattered, inchoate frontier communities of early Maine retained at least a vague

---

[112] Hall, *Worlds of Wonder*, 35.

[113] J. T. Champlin, "Educational Institutions in Maine While a District of Massachusetts," *Collections of the Maine Historical Society* Series 1, 9 vols. [hereafter "Coll MeHS"] (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1831-1887), 8:158. Known as the "Old Deluder Satan" act, the movement was intended to create mandatory schools throughout New England and compel children to attend them, since "it being one chief project of the old deluder Satan to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures." Qtd. in Magnuson, *Education*, 111.

ideological conviction that the Catholic Church was inherently corrupt and not a true church of God.

Though they occasionally interacted for good or ill, the French and the English colonies were separated by that most literal of boundaries – geography. But many English settlers encountered a form of Catholicism on a regular basis. For decades, many Wabanakis, Penobscots, Mik m'aqs and Maliseets had considered themselves at least nominal Catholics. But the common bond of Catholicism was not enough to make them consistent allies of the French. Throughout the seventeenth century and beyond, various Native America groups demonstrated their local interests often outweighed their allegiance to the government in Quebec or French Catholic missionaries. Still, they valued their missions, feast days, and devotions, and, in many cases, took European versions of them and adapted them to their specific cultures.

But to later generations of Maine Protestants – those who had lived through the vicious cycles of fighting during King William's and Queen Anne's wars - the indigenous peoples were not simply defective Christians. They were not Christians at all. This view of Native Americans is particularly evident in captivity narratives. It is in them that the Christian Wabanakis of Maine shared equally in the evils of their non-Christian counterparts.

Other Mainers, however, argued that any exposure to Christian spirituality and concepts was a valid starting point. For them, the challenge would be how to mold defective Christian knowledge into the perfection of their own vision. And, reflecting the diversity of early Maine Protestantism itself, others simply did not care, as long as the

Wabanakis left the English to pursue their own interests in peace or procured worldly goods from English warehouses.

By the onset of King William's War, Protestant Mainers were tackling both internal and external religious enemies. A great deal of confusion complicated their ability to discern these enemies. In addition to religious fractiousness, fear also tainted relationships between borderland New Englanders and even their co-religionists – that is, those who were able to wield power. Suspicion that administrators and merchants of the more thickly-settled areas and the colonial metropoles were secretly allied with French and Wabanaki forces created a fear that the "spice of popery" was being dished out liberally at the expense of poor settlers and their meager frontier enterprises. During the early years of King William's War, colonists in both Massachusetts and Maine gradually came to view the witchcraft crisis in Salem as the culmination of a supernatural conspiracy among greedy Boston merchants, the minions of the antichrist in both North America and Europe, practitioners of unorthodox religions on the northern frontier, Catholics from various corners of Europe (including England), and malevolent supernatural forces. [114]

Sylvanus Davis and his companions at Fort Loyal bore the brunt of all these fears as they worked to prepare the region for French and Indian attack in the wake of open hostilities between France and England. The Bay Colony's efforts to foster religious

[114]There are numerous recent scholarly treatments that touch on this subject, including Mary Beth Norton, *In the Devil's Snare* and "George Burroughs and the Girls from Casco: The Maine Roots of Salem Witchcraft," *Maine History* 40:4 (Winter 2001-2002), 259-277, Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*; Emerson W. Baker and James Kences, "Maine, Indian Land Speculation, and the Essex County Witchcraft Outbreak of 1692," *Maine History* 40:3 (Fall 2001), 159-189, and Emerson W. Baker, "Lithobolia: Frontier Prelude to Witchcraft in Salem."

orthodoxy as a bulwark against the Catholic menace to the north and east were not the same as providing real, physical protection to co-religionists on the northern frontier. The settlers of the Casco Bay settlements were suspicious of the province's government and its state of preparation to deal with its enemies. They had good reason to fear. In the face of such threats, Casco's settlers refused to cooperate with the militia, preferring instead to pursue and protect their own interests. Troubled by his inability to convince the Casco settlers to unite against the threat and appalled by their lack of corporate commitment, Sylvanus Davis informed the General Council in Boston of the situation, and complained that the region's

> Inhaebitance Are Gon ought of ou^{r} Towne & Are dayly Going of soe that wee Grow weaker & weker every day as all soe such a speritt of disorder amongst soom of our peopell that there can hardly bee Any order kept all though it been for the presarvation of thaire owne & thaire naibours Lifes…[115]

Davis's complaint underscored the fact that Casco's settlements, like other settlement clusters throughout Maine, lacked the cultural and religious conformity that contributed to discipline in times of stress and provided the cohesion necessary to support the militia and communal life within Fort Loyal itself. The Casco settlements did not have a meeting house or a settled minister until well into the eighteenth century.[116] Given the multiple services that such spaces performed within New England towns, the absence of a meeting house meant missed opportunities to spread news, to reinforce community solidarity, and to consecrate group defensive measures.[117]

---

[115] Sylvanus Davis et al. to General Council, 15 July 1689, *DHSM* 9:14-15.

[116] Falmouth's first meeting house was still unfinished as late as 1728. William Willis, *The History of Portland*, 2 vols. (Portland: Day, Fraser & Co., 1831), II:97.

[117] Stout, *The New England Soul,* 14.

Colonial leaders were also remiss in passing intelligence to the settlers. News of the impending attack on Fort Loyal came not from within New England itself, but through the providential intervention of a Dutch privateer who happened to be privy to an important piece of new. Had it not been for Abraham Fisher's relation that the Wabanakis and French "Resolved to use theire uttermost Indevo[r] to Destroy Casco: pertecularly & all the Engles in Jenerall," the surprise of attack might have been a complete.[118]

Anticipation did not mitigate the destruction that the French and their allies were able to heap upon Casco. When the threatened attack came on May 16, 1690, it was overwhelming: combined forces of as many as five hundred under the leadership of an experienced French frontier fighter, Réne Robinau de Portneuf. The attackers swooped down on Fort Loyal within a day of Captain Simon Willard's departure for Port-Royal.[119] The fort's seventy-five local militiamen were poorly prepared and desperately outnumbered. Still, the inmates of Fort Loyal managed to resist the onslaught for days. Exhausted and depleted, however, they were forced to surrender five days later. Davis extracted a promise of safe passage to the next English town for the fort's noncombatants.[120] But the Fort Loyal fighters soon learned, in the most brutal ways imaginable, that they had been deceived.

---

[118] Sylvanus Davis to General Council, 11 September 1689, *DSHM* 9:48.

[119] Samuel Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 2 vols. (New York: Farrar, Straus and, Giroux, Inc., 1973), I:259.

[120] Davis, who had served as a militia captain during King Philip's War, was an obvious choice to lead the militia at Fort Loyal despite the ill-will he may have incurred over the land patents issue. He played a role in redeeming Cocheco captives several months before the attack on Casco Bay, and it therefore seems unlikely that he would be ignorant of the profits attached to the ransoming of captives. *DCB,* 2:172; *NEC,*I: 142; *DHSM,* 5:145-6.

It was at this point that the attack became a war of not just territorial control, but religion. Davis reported that the French commander reneged on the terms of quarter and do so in good conscience, proclaiming that the fort's inhabitants were in a state of rebellion against their rightful Catholic monarch. [121] As a result "as soon as [the French and Indians] had us in theire Coustady thay Broker theire Articuels surfed out wiming & Children & our men to be mad Captiffs in the Hands of the Heathen to bee Cruelly murdred & Destroyed many of them wonded men, only the French kept my self & 3 or 4 more & Carried us over Land for Canada."[122] As a captive himself, Davis suffered a fate common to survivors of the border wars. Most of the soldiers were not so lucky. They were killed immediately upon leaving Fort Loyal, their lives cheapened in French eyes for forsaking their rightful Catholic monarch.

Fears born over the lack of Protestant cohesion on the early Maine frontier had come to pass. As a unified front, frontier Catholics had successfully exploited their relationships with the Wabanakis and their knowledge of Maine's topography to launch a devastating attack on Protestants. Driven by self-interest and lack of concern for their neighbors, many had fled the English settlements at the mere threat of a Catholic juggernaut. Instead of banding together in common interest, they left their fellow Protestants to fend for themselves. The power of the pulpit, both to encourage a proper response to the French and Indian menace and to disperse information, had failed those who remained. Laxity in enforcing the established church and reasonably peaceful

---

[121] *NEC,*I:198.

[122]"Declaration of Sylvanus Davis," n.d., *DHSM,* 5:145-6. Étienne Taillemite suggests that Robinau de Portneuf may have been powerless to stop his Wabanaki allies from seizing and killing some of the Casco captives – a common though sometimes unsubstantiated claim by French forces in almost every war of empire. *DCB,* 2:441.

coexistence between disparate interfaith intermingling – the very things that made Maine's English settlements attractive to so many who either left or bypassed Massachusetts altogether – ultimately proved to be the downfall of those unlucky enough to live there during King William's War.

For many settlers, religious odysseys began before the wars of empire and the arrival of zealous agents of religious homogeneity in New England and New France. The ethnic and religious diversity of settlement under the Gorges proprietorship, the irregularities of congregational development, the failure to attract and settle orthodox ministers, and the close proximity of substantial numbers of Native Americans (a significant percentage of whom practiced a syncretic Catholicism imported by French Jesuits), combined to hinder Maine's settlements from achieving, or even seeking, appropriate Puritan purity from the late seventeenth into the eighteenth centuries. Despite the best efforts of Massachusetts to bring Maine into the fold of orthodoxy, many of its settlers had already undergone a partial religious transculturation that may have been of their own choosing before captivity forced the issue. For some, Catholic conversion, even if it was temporary, was less a leap than a step. For others, the experience of captivity in a Catholic country reinvigorated religious sensibilities that may have been atrophying. Thus, some returnees, like Sylvanus Davis, brought with them a hardened sense of Protestant conviction that they may have lacked before captivity. Many of these returned captives, especially those who resisted becoming "Satan's prey," contributed to a standardization of religious life and practice in Maine in their post-captivity lives. In other words, religious culture in Maine was very different from that of

Massachusetts at the end of the seventeenth century. The experience of captivity, endured by individuals and by extension their families, and corresponding changes in the religious culture of Massachusetts, played an important role in bringing the regions closer together in terms of religious conformity during the early eighteenth century. But it also contributed a peculiar byproduct – mixed-faith families – whose members could not be completely excised from New England memory. The wars of empire aided in the formation of a solid Protestant identity in Maine, but also left the uncomfortable reality of Catholic *canadien* kin with whom subsequent generations of Mainers were forced to cope.

In the seventeenth century, Catholicism was not a completely alien form of religious life to the inhabitants of Maine's English settlements. Wabanaki neighbors were numerous. Some of the settlers themselves, having come from parts of Catholic Europe that lacked a reformed tradition or were particularly tied into maritime trades, were most likely at one time Catholics themselves. And the unsettled state of the boundary between New England and New France frequently forced these contacts to continue over lengthy periods of time.

Paradoxically, as divisions between Maine and its Catholic neighbors grew more distinct and were increasingly viewed in terms of religious identification, the two regions grew more similar as early modern religious societies. And some Mainers, for better or worse, experienced both types of religious societies, and even both Christian faith traditions that thrived flourished in the upper reaches of early North America, firsthand.

CHAPTER 2

"SATAN'S PREY" OR "*L'ESCLAVAGE DE L'HERESIE CALVINISTE*?": IMPERIAL BATTLES, BORDERLAND SOULS

Maine's unsettled state was the bane of those orthodox New England ministers who feared for the souls of settlers who cast their lot in the region. The most vocal of these ministers was Cotton Mather, whose writings stressed that the religious instability of the province jeopardized New England's holy experiment in its entirety. Mather thus warned the province's inhabitants, known as "outlivers," that their dwelling in the "more Pagan [out-] skirts of New England" would lead to death – or worse. "Satan terribly makes a prey of you, and Leads you Captive to do his Will," Mather warned.[1] To the outlivers who survived them, this prediction became prophesy fulfilled in the wake of the death and "dismemberment" of many Maine families during King William's, Queen Anne's, and Dummer's wars.

Hannah Swarton and her family were typical of the outlivers whose choices Cotton Mather so strenuously condemned. Hannah herself was the daughter of committed Puritans and had spent most of her life in the Essex County town of Beverly.

---

[1]Qtd. in Axtell, *The Indian and the European*, 276.

Little is known of the family into which she had been born. But the family she was raising with her husband, John, was most likely of marginal social status. Certainly they were in terms of wealth, so much so that they were unable to purchase land in Essex County.[2] Maine appealed to people like the Swartons. For one, it was still possible to procure decent parcels for a reasonable price or in exchange for service. Any religious concerns the family might have harbored appear to have been surmounted by economic ones. In the end, the Swartons traveled far beyond the safety of the established Puritan communities of northern Massachusetts to North Yarmouth, a new settlement on the northern edge of Casco Bay. North Yarmouth and its sister communities on Casco Bay - Falmouth (now Portland), Spurwink (Cape Elizabeth), and Falmouth Neck - were poised for prosperity, thanks to their location on the bay and the interest of land speculators from Massachusetts. This promise was ostensibly protected by Fort Loyal, which stood in Falmouth and was intended to protect Casco from enemies who came via land or sea.

If the region was economically promising, however, such promise was realized only through significant personal sacrifice, including the stability the family had known in Beverly and the protection of thick settlement. Most significantly, the North Yarmouth that Hannah Swarton and her family settled into still lacked a meeting house, a minister, and for that matter, any sense of organized religious life.

To Hannah Swarton, the baptized child of parents who were church members, the "remove to Casco Bay where there was no church or minister of the Gospel," was about

[2] By the 1670's, Beverly already had few options for newcomers and those on the lower end of the economic scale. John Swarton's experience clearly falls into the occupational patterns of such newcomers. Vickers, *Farmers and Fishermen,* 55.

to be punished by God.[3] That punishment came swiftly on May 16, 1690, when a combined force of French and Wabanakis killed some of the Swartons and carried the rest into Wabanakia and Canada. Separated from her three surviving children, Hannah bravely negotiated the multiple worlds of her captors. Bereft of her identity as a New England wife and mother, she clung instead to reformed religion – the sole element of her pre-captivity life that defined her existence.

Hannah spent nine months of her captivity in Wabanakia. Isolated by design from other Maine captives, she was taunted for her beliefs by who to Hannah was the cruelest of all imaginable tormenters - an Indian woman who had been raised and catechized among English Puritans but was now "married to a Canada Indian and turned papist."[4] Hannah was ransomed from this situation by French agents in mid-February, 1690/91, and eventually conveyed to Quebec, where she endured more intensive interrogation of her religious beliefs. This time, however, Hannah's Puritanism was dissected by "the nuns, the priests, and the friars" whose own explicit goal was to bring her to the Church of Rome.

She was not one to be cowed by fellow European Christians. Instead of assenting to their demands out of fear or for the sake of convenience, Hannah engaged her French captors in a lively theological debate. The parameters of these debates were preserved for the enlightenment of her contemporaries and their offspring by none other than Cotton Mather, who lent his own ministerial perspective and literary stylings to her story. Mather's interpretation of Hannah's captivity, "A Narrative of Hannah Swarton

---

[3] Hannah Swarton, "A Narrative of Hannah Swarton Containing Wonderful Passages Relating to Her Captivity and Deliverance," in Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Stories of Captivity and Redemption* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1981), 150.

[4] Ibid.

Containing Wonderful Passages Relation to Her Captivity and Deliverance," first appeared in 1697 as part of *Humiliations Followed with Deliverances*, and later appeared, in an expanded version, as part of Mather's monumental work *Magnalia Christi Americana,* in 1702.[5] The story remained in print and in New England long after the French Catholic threat was removed.[6]

The historical Hannah's deliverance was far from complete. A dangerous journey home to New England lay ahead of her. And once she got there, the full scope of her family tragedy would have hit hard. The Swarton family, once consisting of six people, had through war and captivity been reduced to a family of two. Hannah was reunited with the youngest of her four children, Jasper, on board the *Province Galley,* the ship that conveyed them both back to New England. But another son had been killed in the early days of the family's captivity, and a third son's fate was never known.[7] The worst fate of all by the standards of New England befell her daughter Mary, who converted to Catholicism, married, and became a fully acculturated subject of the French king, for whom she and her husband created many future subjects.[8]

After her return, Hannah herself virtually disappears from the historical record. At least one source claims she married Edward Belcher of Beverly by 1708.[9] If so, it is

---

[5] Ibid., 148.

[6] As late as 1837, Hannah's story was being reprinted as "The Narrative of Mrs. Hannah Swanton" for use in New England Sunday schools. Editors probably deliberately changed the family surname from Swarton to the more lyrical and allegorically-suggestive "Swanton."

[7] His return was Jasper Swarton's last entry in the historical record as well. It is possible that the boy died young, probably shortly after his return. *NEC,*I: 204.

[8] Mary's husband, the Ireland-born John Lahey, was born a Catholic but became a Protestant after he migrated to the English North American colonies. He returned to Catholicism while in the service of captive service of Jacques Le Ber, and soon afterward was freed, settling in the Saint Lawrence Valley permanently. He and Mary, now "Marie-Madeleine Lahé, had thirteen children. Foster, 31; *NEC,*I:206

[9] *NEGHR* 5:122.

reasonable to assume that the bride, forty-seven at the time, had no more children. If she married a local Beverly man, her days most likely ended in the community where they began. The town had seen its own strife thanks to the Essex County witchcraft hysteria of 1692, but had since regained its stability.[10] Hannah, now widowed with few or no worldly goods, had extended family there who could help her transition into her post-captivity life.

Witchcraft hysteria had come and gone from Beverly, but the more worldly threat to the Casco settlements from the French and Wabanakis persisted for years to come. These communities would not be reestablished until after 1713. It was two years after the fall of Fort Loyal before anyone returned to bury the bones of the dead.[11] Even if Hannah's family had survived the attack intact, there would have been nothing whatsoever at Casco to return to.

The Hannah of Mather's "Narrative" continued to be a recognizable figure long after Hannah herself was lost to memory. The narrator's descriptions of loved ones lost, cruel Indians, and zealous and threatening priests are not only standard tropes of any narrative for the victims of captivity during King William's War, but for those of Queen Anne's and Dummer's wars as well. Yet Hannah was but one of more than 200 Maine Protestants who can be accounted for that were taken by force from their settlements between the years 1688 and 1727.

---

[10] The name Hibbard and all its variations appears frequently in vital records of Essex County well into the nineteenth century. Several accused witches were from Beverly, and town residents were part of the greater "chain of gossip" that helped spread the hysteria throughout Essex County. *Vital Records of Beverly Massachusetts to the End of the Year 1849* vol. 2 (Topsfield, MA: Topsfield Historical Society, 1906-7), 160-1; Norton, *Devil's,* 113, 146.

[11] William Willis, *History of Portland.* (Portland: Day, Fraser & Co., 1831), 303.

Most Mainers probably knew or had had some sort of relationship with a captive; given the close intermarriage of Maine's largest families, most were also probably related to captives through birth or marriage. Thus the idea of captivity, and what it conceivably entailed in regard to faith, was spread throughout Maine, not through print, but through experience.

Hannah's narrative is also replete with references to the encounter of religious culture that took place between Protestants and Catholics. While literary scholars and other historians have pointed out that Cotton Mather highlighted these elements of this encounter to serve a greater didactic purpose, it should not be concluded that the essence of these interrogations was fabricated by Mather for dramatic effect.[12] Instead, it is critical to acknowledge that the *range* of Hannah's own religious encounter as described in the "Narrative" (Mather's invented dialogue notwithstanding) is consistent with those of other captives. Some withstood conversion efforts; some did not. For example, Hannah's fellow captive, Mary Plaisted of York, left no such record of her captivity experience, yet one can infer from the events of her life that her religious encounter bore many similarities to Hannah's. So did those of other captives. Religious interrogation or, at the very least, molding, were clearly part of life for every English captive in New France. These interrogations had surprisingly mixed results. This chapter focuses on the parameters of this encounter, and the effects of this encounter in personal and popular memory. Such an examination suggests how these captives were perceived by their

[12] For an account of Cotton Mather as a ghostwriter of women's frontier experiences, see "Mather in Drag," Chapter 1, passim, of Lorrayne Carroll, "'Taken from Her Own Mouth:' Women's Captivity Narratives and the Uses of Female Authorship." In *The Land Before Her*, Annette Kolodny gives more credence to the idea of collaboration in devising Swarton's narrative for publication. 24-27.

captors and promotes a critical comparison of points of view on both sides of Maine's "borderland of faith."

Drawing on this analysis, the challenge remains to discern if Mainers reacted to the religious elements of their captivities in ways that deviated significantly from their counterparts in other regions of New England. To that end, the purpose of this chapter is to examine the region's religious diversity and the implications of complete acculturation among some of its settlers, which, as defined here, meant becoming Roman Catholic in the French tradition. In contrast, however, it will also show how captivity had a spiritually-galvanizing effect on some Mainers, propping up flagging frontier spirituality – or creating it where it did not appear to exist before – with its clear challenge to the New England way. This was a particularly critical effect for Mainers, who, despite protests of zeal such as Hannah's, had lived lives outside of the auspices of the New England Way even before captivity pulled them under the cope of the Wabanakis and French.[13] Hannah and others like her gave the impression of being solid New England Protestants.

Unlike Mary Rowlandson, who moved to the Massachusetts frontier with her minister husband to bring the gospel to ungospelized parts, these Mainers had because of more worldly interests put themselves voluntarily on the "pagan skirts" of New England, away from the spiritual protection of more established communities. For these actions, Mather or other Puritans might conclude that Mainers received all due divine punishment.[14]

---

[13] Gildrie, *The Profane, the Civil and the Godly*, 135.

[14] See Mary Rowlandson, "The Soveraignty and Goodness of God" in Vaughan and Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676 – 1724* (Harvard: Belknap Press, 1981), 29-75.

The question of how and why captive New Englanders adopted Catholicism, even temporarily, has long fascinated contemporaries of the border wars as well as those who came, and continue to come, long after. By focusing exclusively on Mainers, however, one can determine how the circumstances of a diverse and vulnerable borderland region affected responses to a captivity that sought to detain bodies and, wherever possible, remake souls. These people, therefore, were much more than prisoners of war or hostages.

Maine is a particularly fruitful focal point for study for several reasons. As stated before, Maine was not uniformly Puritan or even close, and those who identified as Puritans were not particularly notable for piety or orthodoxy. In addition, Maine's fragile communities were easily decimated, as with Hannah Swarton's North Yarmouth, which all but ceased to exist in the wake of the 1690 raid. With the province itself functioning as one enormous frontier, these demonstrations of its inherent fragility must have led some to conclude that life there was futile – particularly if their families, in addition to their property, had been destroyed. As Emerson Baker notes, many of Maine's settlers were "people on the edge," with few personal options to exercise in the wake of tragedy.[15] The complete acculturation process from New England Protestant to *habitant* of New France is rendered perhaps more understandable against such a backdrop, especially if the French went to great lengths to demonstrate that these new immigrants, involuntary as they were, would be welcome. That metaphorical welcome mat was extended through the Roman Catholic Church, an institution invested with so much power and cultural meaning in New France that no *canadien* was permitted by law to

[15] I am indebted to Emerson Baker for this insight. Personal correspondence, 07/22/04.

profess any other faith. In the stability and uniformity of its liturgy, it offered a potent counterpoint to the uncertainty of life in the borderlands as a captive.[16]

The religious encounters in captivity of Hannah Storer and another York captive, Mary Plaisted, fell in different places along a continuum of encounter that ranged from simple introduction and proselytization to coercion and threat. The spiritual contest took many forms. It had equally diverse results. Some continued to resist Catholicism as a matter of faith and principle. Others assented to a baptism which ultimately proved to be temporary. Still others converted and remained in Canada or Wabanakia.

Though these were the three possible outcomes, the journeys to them were far from prescribed. Taking into account geographical, political, and religious factors, captive Mainers were pulled in to complex networks of relationships that transcended imperial boundaries, as well as familial and religious categories. Those who managed to return to New England only did so after they had navigated several sets of challenges to their religious identities. Furthermore, they frequently left pieces of themselves behind – children, siblings, and in at least one case, a parent – which meant that returning Maine captives often continued to have ties to their French and Wabanaki captors.

Maine was not the "pagan skirt" of Cotton Mather's nightmares. Nor was it a showcase of Puritan orthodoxy, or indeed, any kind of predictable, cohesive Protestantism. The province had yet to find illumination through the good civic, theological and moral order that religious conformity could produce. Uniformity of this kind was ironically much more apparent in the Euroamerican settlements of New France than it was in the Maine of Mather's day.

---

[16] Richard Gildrie contends that the structure of Catholic liturgy "exercised a strong pull on those captive English who experienced the demoralization of a collapsing frontier from 1675 to 1725." *The Profane, the Civil, and the Godly*, 139.

* * *

On the surface of Mather's "Narrative," Hannah Swarton appeared to have a fairly simple life story. She was a poor Puritan woman who moved with her family to Maine. Her husband and son were killed in King William's War. She and three surviving children were taken captive and lived for a time among the Wabanakis. She was subjected to harsh proselytizing by her Indian, and later her French, captors. She resisted bravely because, as a good Puritan woman, she knew her Scripture and was able to refute all of her enemies' theological points. Her faith was rewarded with a providential redemption. She found one of her children. She returned to New England to live among "good" Puritans and shared with them her story to deepen their faith and to illustrate God's illustrious providences.

But Hannah's own life story – before, during, and after captivity – was more complex than Mather knew, or as the case may be, chose to reveal. Like many Mainers, Hannah came to the province because of a complex set of circumstances. And the byproduct of her captivity led to additional complications. Hannah, the seemingly archetypal Pilgrim wandering in the wilderness, came to Maine with wider ties to the Atlantic World. Her captivity experience, which according to Mather galvanized her faith, had the ironic outcome of enhancing those ties.

She was born Hannah (or possibly Joanna) Hibbard in Beverly, Massachusetts in 1651. She was the sixth of nine children of Robert Hibbard and Joanna (Luff), both members of the church. In 1670, she married John Swarton, tailor and native of the Island of Jersey, with whom she had at least four children over the next fifteen years, all

of whom were baptized in the church at Beverly. In need of improving their material prospects, the Swartons left Massachusetts for North Yarmouth, Maine some time between the summer of 1686 and 1689.[17]

Hannah's religious preferences before the family decamped to Maine are known: more orthodox in her practices than most in Maine had the luxury or ability to be, she had been baptized as an infant herself and had had all four of her own children baptized as well.[18] The Hannah of Mather's "Narrative" had learned her Scripture well: she could also recognize a Christian when she met one and was critical of those who abused the term.[19]

Had all migrants to Maine retained their affection for their birth religion as Hannah Swarton did, and had the Maine frontier been secure in terms of religion, Cotton Mather and the Massachusetts authorities would no doubt have been pleased. Hannah was precisely the kind of settler one would want to have in a place like Maine: zealous, knowledgeable, anxious to please God and contribute to the Protestant vanguard that slowly made its way up the rocky coast.

But as a woman, Hannah was at the decision-making mercy of an outsider to Massachusetts religion and order. As a French-speaking Jersey native, her husband, John Swarton, may have been less than delighted with life within the Puritan colony. The then-far reaches of Maine offered not only economic promise, but relief for the Bay Colony's spiritual hegemony as well.

---

[17] *NEC,*I: 204-6; Swarton, "Narrative," 147–157.

[18] Hannah's baptism predates that development of the "Halfway Covenant," which allowed the sacrament to be administered to the children of non-converted parents. See Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England* (New York: Harper & Rowe, 1966), 174 and Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety*, 127.

[19] Swarton, "Narrative," 158.

As a Channel Islander, Hannah's husband John had ample reasons to avoid full engagement with New England's religious mission. In the seventeenth century, the Channel Islands were culturally and linguistically French, despite centuries of political ties to England. This did not mean that Channel Islanders were unwelcome in New England. On the contrary, the unique cultural mix of the Islands made their educated and connected New World settlers particularly valuable to the New English. They were able to bridge the linguistic and culture gap between the English and French trading partners, a simple extension of the skills that Channel Islanders had perfected in Europe. They also claimed important contacts to the markets of continental Europe, another central adjunct to New England trade. As a group, Channel Islanders tended to make their homes in Boston or the seafaring communities of Essex County.

Some Channel Islanders, like Philip English, were able to exploit their connections remarkably well. Born Philippe L'Anglois in Jersey, English developed sophisticated and lucrative intercolonial trading networks among Boston, Acadia, the Caribbean and western Europe. As such, he was an important mediator between Boston merchants and Acadian fishermen, conducting his business with the twenty-one ships he owned. Church membership, marriage to an Englishwoman, and anglicized name all suggest that English transformed himself to conform to the standards of New England Puritan society.[20]

[20] However, it is important to note that the fragments of English's French identity, so valuable to his success in business, cast suspicion on him and his wife during the Salem witch trials of 1692. English later became an Anglican and built Saint Peter's Church in Danvers, MA. Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 137, 140, 176; Bernard Bailyn, *The New England Merchants of the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Harper & Rowe, 1955), 144.

But not all Channel Islanders were equally valuable. John Swarton was not in the same league as Philip English or his other merchant class associates.[21] When Swarton took an oath of fidelity at Beverly on December 3, 1677, he identified himself as a tailor, a respectable yet modest profession.[22] He also lacked the cross-cultural skills so prized among other Channel Islanders, as demonstrated by Benjamin Church's observation that Swarton's old Norman French *patois* was nearly impossible to understand.[23] Deficient on two counts, it is probable that Swarton was something of an outsider in regard to the church as well. His wife's Puritanism was a religion of words, and in Essex County and throughout the rest of Massachusetts, those words tended to be English. A linguistic inadequacy need not impede piety, but it may have imposed a barrier to full participation in a Puritan congregation.

Swarton clearly recognized that his marginal status was an impediment to his family's economic stability. Seeking his fortune outside of the scope of Essex County, in 1686 he appealed to the General Council for a grant of land in "North Yarmouth in Cascoe." In his petition, he stated with pride that he had "formerly served his Late Majestie King Charles ye second of Blessed Memorie in ye wars in flanders under ye Comand of Colonell Marloe and elsewhere."[24] For someone like Swarton, who had defended the Stuart cause in Europe, the new royalist government with its high church tendencies may have given the impression that men like him, who were not beholden to

---

[21] Secondary sources that discuss Channel Islanders are surprisingly scant. Notable exceptions are Bailyn's and Norton's works, cited above.

[22] *Records and Files of the Quarterly Court of Essex County* (Salem, MA: Essex Institute, 1911 – 21), 4:400.

[23] *NEC,*I: 204.

[24] John Swarton to General Council, 6 June 1687, *DHSM,* VI: 264-5. Coleman states the grant was for fifty acres of land, though the petitioner requested only ten. *NEC,*I: 204.

the Puritan elite, would find favor. His identification with the restoration of the Stuarts and the timing of his petition – 1687, exactly a year after the new royalist government assumed authority over Massachusetts – are suggestive. The petitioner might have seen this as an opportunity to press a case to a government that would look on his military service with a friendly eye, especially since that most faithful of Stuart supporters, Edmund Andros, a defiantly-Anglican Channel Islander himself, had now become the royal governor.[25]

Whether Swarton found favor because of his service to the Stuarts, or because he provided warm bodies to populate North Yarmouth, the petition was successful and resulted in a fifty-acre plot with which the Swarton family hoped to make a new start. That new start, however, would be in a settlement without churches, ministers, or predictable religious identities. This would not have been unusual to John Swarton. In the seventeenth century, the Channel Islands contained a diverse mix of Catholics, French-speaking Anglicans and, later in the century, an increasingly large Huguenot population, especially after France revoked the Edict of Nantes in 1684.[26] The Channel Islands of Swarton's younger days, however, were the site of denominational tension. First, the Calvinist island gave refuge to Prince Charles, Anglican son of a French Catholic mother, after the execution of his father Charles I. After Charles was taken from the island, ministers like Increase Mather flocked to Jersey to "purify" the churches and effect the complete Protestant reformation. Their expectations were quashed when they were "persecuted out" of the islands during and after attempts to restore the Stuart

---

[25] W. H. Whitmore, ed., *The Andros Tracts* vol. I (Boston: The Prince Society, 1868-1874), xxxiv, 53.

[26] The revocation of the Edict of Nantes coincided with James II's attempts to reassert Catholic control over the Channel Islands. A.C. Saunders, *Jersey in the Seventeenth Century* (Jersey: J.T. Bigwood, 1931), 169.

monarchy.[27] After a fairly brief flirtation with Calvinism in the previous century, the Channel Islands of John Swarton's day had returned to a high church interpretation of Protestantism.[28] Swarton, who had probably been exposed to these brief Puritan ventures during this active period of confessional flip-flopping, came to New England before the subsequent wave of Huguenot migration to the islands. This suggests he had been raised or professed Anglicanism, or possibly even Catholicism.[29] While living in Massachusetts, the fact that his children were baptized indicates that he assented to his wife's affiliations and outwardly conformed to Essex County Puritanism. But his decision to move himself and his family to the unchurched regions of Casco Bay - a repudiation of Puritanism in the eyes of some thinkers - placed him in one of the few regions of New England where public worship could not be forced upon him. Maine's unsettled state might have caused discomfort to Hannah's soul: John's sentiments on the issue were probably more complicated.

The Swartons were still relative newcomers to Casco when French and Wabanaki forces attacked the bay's settlements on May 16th, 1690.[30] The enemy was quick to take advantage of the evacuation of sixty men under the command of Captain Simon Willard. These troops left Fort Loyal just the day before under orders from the government of Massachusetts to join Sir William Phips's expedition against Port Royal, the largest settlement of the nearby French colony of Acadia. The local militia that remained behind

---

[27] Kenneth Silverman, *The Life and Times of Cotton* Mather (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 5.

[28] Ralph Mollet, *A Chronology of Jersey* (Saint Helier: Société Jersiaise, 1954), 25–29; Saunders, *Jersey in the Seventeenth Century*, 18.

[29] Andros's own "high Anglicanism" is confirmed by the language of his will, which notes special days in terms of the pre-Reformation religious calendar. Bequests to family members were to be made based on an annual cycle of saints' and feast days. *Andros Tracts* vol. 2: xlii.

[30] The Casco Bay settlements include present-day Portland (Falmouth), North Yarmouth, Spurwink and Black Point (both part of Scarborough) and Purpooduck (South Portland). Coleman, *NEC,*II: 420.

to defend Fort Loyal was desperately outnumbered and ill-prepared. Though it managed to withstand the force of the enemy's assault for five days, Fort Loyal was taken by the French and Wabanakis after a five-day siege. The enemies of New England were not satisfied with simple capitulation: they also sowed destruction throughout the settlements of Casco Bay, leaving no hope of a quick return to the anguished survivors of the raid.[31] Sylvanus Davis had complained to the government of Massachusetts about deserting settlers and soldiers and their disregard for their neighbors, but John Swarton was a "good neighbor" by Davis's standards. This may, however, been less a moral decision than a practical one. The Swartons may not have had a place to go – at least on such short notice.[32]

Swarton was not rewarded for his loyalty. Instead, he paid for it dearly. He might have lived as a Frenchman, but he died an Englishman, killed defending Fort Loyal, as were most of the rest of the small militia force left behind by Willard. Hannah and the four children, who ranged in age from five to sixteen, were taken along with at least sixty others from Fort Loyal. Mother and children were separated, most likely by the captors' design, in the melee that ensued.[33]

Nine months of Indian captivity, all but unbearable for Hannah, were to follow. It was during this time that Hannah was taunted by the "papist" Indian and treated as a drudge. Its end, however, marked a great point of contrast. Hannah was ransomed to the

---

[31] During the attack, Fort Loyal housed seventy-five militia and about 200 non-combatants. Alden Vaughan and Edward T. Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1981), 147.

[32] I am indebted to Emerson Baker for this insight. Personal correspondence, 07/23/2004.

[33] Separating captive families was a common first step in the acculturation process. For other examples see John Williams, *The Redeemed Captive Returned to Zion* (Northampton: Hopkins, Bridgeman and Company, 1853), Mary Rowlandson, "Sovereignty and Goodness of God," and John Gyles, "Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, etc.," both in Vaughan and Clark, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1981).

Intendant of New France himself, Jean Bouchart de Champigny, and thereafter lived in the greatest physical comfort she had yet known.

This comfort came with a high cost. Now a servant-member of the pious Champigny house and a Protestant at that, Hannah was expected by the master and mistress of the household to be a literal captive audience for focused interrogation by her French captors, clergy and lay alike. At least one occasion, they forced her to attend a Catholic mass, an event that she found repugnant.

If Mather's "Narrative" can be trusted, Hannah held her interrogators at bay by skillfully applying her knowledge of Scripture to Protestantism's defense. She was eventually relieved from attending mass, suggesting that her captors had given up on her as a convert. Instead, they became content to settle for holding her in bondage and benefiting from her labor, appropriate treatment for an unrepentant believer in Calvinist heresies.

But laboring for captors actually came with benefits for the English men, women and children who refused the French version of the light of salvation. While in the Champigny household, she was finally able to communicate with other captives, including Margaret Gould Stilson of Pemaquid, who also served there, and Edward Tyng and John Alden, fellow Maine captives detained nearby. According to Hannah, speaking to these fellow captives strengthened her resolve to resist the coercive tactics of the Champignys and their friends and remain true to her faith. Why would Hannah be permitted so much latitude for heretical discourse? The most likely explanation is that her Protestant zeal encouraged the proselytizers to focus their efforts on more promising converts. Her value now lay more in her ability to do housework on demand than in her

potential as a soul for the Church of Rome. It paid, therefore, to keep her in a reasonably content state of domestic servitude. Given Canada's own growing pains as a colony, everyone – belligerent Protestants included – needed to be productive.[34]

Theological interrogations notwithstanding, Hannah's physical environment was comfortable, and she was grateful to her French hosts, especially after the hard winter she spent as a captive of the Wabanakis. And on at least one occasion, she was also allowed to see her daughter Mary, a captive held in domestic service in Trois-Rivières.[35]

After four years of captivity, Hannah was redeemed as part of a prisoner exchange that included twenty-one other captives. Among these was her youngest son, Jasper, the only one of the Swarton children to come back to New England.

Given the resistance she described to Mather, it is understandable that Hannah's French captors came to view her more in terms of value that transcended her soul. She made it clear she was not converting. But Hannah's daughter proved to be a much safer bet: though baptized a Puritan, Mary Swarton had become an acculturated before the *Province Galley,* which brought her mother home, weighed anchor in Canada. But both the 1697 and 1702 editions of the "Narrative" describe Mary as "captive at Montreal." This is strange, especially since Mary was already baptized, married to fellow ex-captive named John Lahey, and had already given birth to at least two of her eventual thirteen

---

[34] Peter Moogk describes the world of French Protestant merchants in New France. Though by the middle of the eighteenth century, Protestants were eventually allowed to ply their trades in New France, they were still regarded as outsiders. However, they maintained important contacts among the New England merchant elite – contacts that were lucrative and welcome to the French colonial government. Moogk, *La Nouvelle France*, 193-4.

[35] Mary Swarton spent six days at the Hôtel-Dieu in Quebec in 1693. It is likely that her mother visited her there since Hannah, redeemed in 1695, 'had not seen [Mary] in two years before [she] came away." Marcel Fournier, *De la Nouvelle-Angleterre à la Nouvelle-France : L'histoire des captifs anglo-américains au Canada entre 1675 et 1760* (Montréal : Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française, 1992), 212-213; Swarton, "Narrative," 157.

children by 1702.[36] Captive no longer, she was a particularly fecund subject of the King of France. In recognition of naturalization, the King awarded Mary and John Lahey the healthy sum of seventy *livres* apiece in 1710.[37] Was the description of Mary in the narrative born of Hannah's ignorance of her daughter's real situation? Or was she in denial about the choices Mary had made while in captivity that eased her lot? After all, Mary Swarton was her father's as well as her mother's daughter. Perhaps the French colony struck a chord.[38]

Back in New England, Hannah described the events of her captivity to Cotton Mather some time between 1695 and 1697. The first edition of this account was published in Boston as part of *Humiliations Follow'd with Deliverances* in 1697; an expanded version appeared in *Magnalia Christi Americana* in 1702.[39]

Little is known of her post-captivity life or Hannah's involvement, if any, in the narrative's publication. As a widow from a decimated community, she had nothing to return to in Maine. The Casco settlements would remain in disarray for years, and no one would attempt to resettle there for a decade. Returning to Beverly would have made the

---

[36] *NEC,* I: 206-7; Fournier, *De la Nouvelle Angleterre en Nouvelle France,* 212-213. The family eventually expanded to include fifteen members. Coleman and Baker found baptismal records for only eleven: Fournier, working fifty years later, identified two more Swarton/Lahey children. Other captive New Englanders served as godparents. Mary's husband was a native of Ireland and a baptized Catholic when he emigrated to Corlear (Schenectady) in 1690. During his eventful first year he first abjured Catholicism and then was taken captive by the Iroquois when they attacked Corlear in 1690. He resisted conversion back to Catholicism for six years. His story is told in detail in Foster, *The Captor's Narrative,* 25-6.

[37] Lettre de Vaudreuil au ministre, 14 avril 1714. Colonial Archives C11A Correspondance générale 34:333-5, NAC, Ottawa, Canada.

[38] This had happened before, both with Mary's own half-Protestant, half-Catholic husband, John Lahey, and with Grizel Otis, a Dover, New Hampshire captive who mother had been Catholic. Though introduced to the colony through violent means, both soon embraced the relatively familiar culture of their captors. *NEC,* I: 206-8; see also Nash, "Two Stories of New England Captives," passim, and Foster, *The Captor's Narrative*, 25-6.

[39] Swarton, "Narrative," 148. *Magnalia Christi Americana* was published in London in 1702. "A Narrative of Hannah Swarton" appears in Book VI, 10–14.

most practical sense for Hannah, for numerous Hibbard relatives continued to live there. It also would have brought the possibility of remarriage, which would have saved the impoverished outliver from becoming a dependent of the community. Other widowed captives did the same: Mary Reed, a native of Braintree, Massachusetts who was taken from Salmon Falls, returned to Braintree with her surviving children after her redemption, and the family remained settled there.[40]

But last, and perhaps most compellingly, returning to Massachusetts permanently would have been a literal fulfillment of 2 Chronicles 6: 36–39, a piece of Scripture that Hannah claimed in the "Narrative" to have read and meditated on many times in the company of her fellow captive in the Champigny household, Margaret Stilson:

> If they sin against thee … and thou art angry with them, and dost give them to an enemy, so they are carried away captive to a land far or near; yet if they lay it to heart in the land to which they have been carried captive, and repent, and make supplication to thee in the land of their captivity, saying 'We have sinned, and have acted perversely and wickedly'; if they repent with all their mind and with all their heart in the land of their captivity … and pray toward their land, which thou gavest to their fathers, the city which thou hast chosen, and the house which I have built for thy name, then hear thou from heaven the dwelling place of their prayer and their supplications, and maintain their cause and forgive thy people who have sinned against thee….

Hannah's sins and acts of perversion were those impulses that brought her and her family to Maine in the first place. A redeemed captive at last, she atoned for her sins in the land which God gave to her fathers, not far from the city that He chose as a home for all true Christians. She left the pagan skirts behind, never to return.

---

[40] *NEC,*I: 191; *GDMNH* 580.

In addition to Margaret Stilson, Hannah's companions on the *Province Galley* included a Berwick woman, Elizabeth Tozier, and Mary Plaisted of York. Both Elizabeth and Mary endured multiple captivities. Also unlike Hannah and Margaret, both had been unable to resist, or perhaps accepted, Catholic baptism. Though these conversions ultimately proved temporary, the religious odyssey of Elizabeth and, to an even greater degree, Mary, highlight another perspective on the vagaries of frontier experience and its effects on the religious encounter in the wars of empire. In particular, Mary Plaisted's story demonstrates the multiple pitfalls of frontier life – and the possible inclination to stem the tide of harm they caused in favor of a more closely-circumscribed existence.

Mary Plaisted's adult life in Maine was a series of deprivations and losses – of loved ones, of homes, and of personal freedoms. By the time of the Candlemas raid on York, she had already endured the deaths of three husbands and two children, and one Indian captivity. At thirty-two, she had lived through more hardships than most settlers, even those on the pagan skirts of New England, would have expected.

In stark contrast to the realities of her adulthood, Mary's life had begun with great promise. She was born into the Wheelwright family, which made her a member (at least by blood), of the most powerful clan in the entire province. Her male kinsmen were provincial representatives to the General Court and had closer connections to the Massachusetts leadership than almost anyone else in the province. They were also instrumental in attempting to bring Puritan orthodoxy to Wells, one of the province's largest settlements.[41]

---

[41] For Wheelwright family civic leadership in early Maine, see *GDMNH,* 743-5. Mary's cousin John Wheelwright was one of the founding congregants of the First Church of Wells at 1701. One of the first events of the church was the baptism of his young children, including the future captive and nun Esther Wheelwright. *Records of the Church from October 29, 1701, to October 21, 1810* (New York: n.p., 1918).

But success had not made them complacent. The Wheelwrights were used to challenges. The family had ended up in Maine in the first place because one of their ancestors, a radical antinomian, had outstayed his welcome in Massachusetts. The Reverend John Wheelwright, Mary's grandfather, was a Puritan preacher and supporter of his kinswoman through marriage, Anne Hutchinson. He was so committed to her religious vision that he willingly shared her fate of banishment from Massachusetts. When he left the Bay Colony in the company of some of his followers, he counted among them Edward Rishworth, Mary's father.[42] The small group of exiles settled first in Exeter, New Hampshire, where they attracted other antinomian partisans from both old and New England.[43] But when Exeter came under control of Massachusetts Bay in 1643 (it was the last holdout among the New Hampshire settlements), the minister, still under sentence of banishment, fled even farther north to Maine.[44] It was around this time that Rishworth married Wheelwright's daughter Susannah, Mary Plaisted's mother.[45]

Whether the strain of two removals into the wilderness took their toll, or a genuine change of heart was responsible, Wheelwright at this point had had enough of life as a theological exile. Not long after his arrival in Wells, he penned an apology to the Governor John Winthrop and the General Court, asking for forgiveness, which was

---

[42] He was the son of Anne Marbury Hutchinson's sister, Esther. *GDMNH*, 367.

[43] Clark, *The Eastern Frontier,* 38.

[44] Exeter was the last settlement of the "Piscataqua Plantations" to come under Massachusetts jurisdiction. Though Wheelwright's followers were granted continued exercise of their civil rights, "whether or not they were, 'at present,' church members," Wheelwright was still under sentence of banishment and forced to leave Exeter altogether. Wheelwright's town was a victim of its own success. Charles Clark observes, "Because of its relative prosperity and ordered community life, the town attracted new settlers; as it grew in population, Wheelwright's immediate followers lost their majority." Clark, 46–7.

[45] Bourne, *History of Wells and Kennebunk,* 10.

granted.[46] His banishment revoked, he moved back toward the heart of settled New England, with ministries first in New Hampshire and then Massachusetts.

He left his older children in Maine to make their way themselves. In a gesture antithetical to Wheelwright's original religious designs, his sons worked hard to make Maine "a frontier outpost of a Puritan society."[47] For their cooperation with Massachusetts, Mary's Wheelwright uncles were thus rewarded with judicial appointments, salaried administrative posts, and military protection for Wells. Sharing in their good fortune was their brother-in-law Rishworth, whose protean political attitudes managed to annoy many less-powerful associates but ultimately protected his personal interests and position.

As his only child, Mary Plaisted served as executor of Edward Rishworth's will and was his sole heir. But Edward had outlived good fortune. Like so many other Mainers who tied their fortunes to Massachusetts speculators and investors, Rishworth suffered financial reversals toward the end of his life. Bad investments, debts, and failed land speculation reduced his personal fortune to a mere £39 at the time of his death.[48]

Still, despite various economic downturns and spiritual crises, Mary's maternal relatives were the closest things Maine had to ruling elites. And, thanks to her multiple marriages, she was also related to ambitious frontier entrepreneurs who hoped to build the colony's strength through trade and association with Massachusetts. She could now count among her in-laws Henry Sayward, father of her second husband, John. Henry

---

[46] Clark, 47.

[47] Ibid., 51.

[48] Apparently Rishworth's ability to survive adversity was envied by many of his fellow settlers. He died an immensely unpopular man. Charles Edwin Banks, *A History of York, Maine,* vol. I (Boston: n.p., 1931), 216.

Sayward was one of the earliest settlers in York and Kennebunk and builder of one of the region's first lumber mills. Sayward also helped raise funds for the construction of York's first church, for which his mills supplied the building materials. When he lost his York mill to fire in 1669, he was invited to resettle at Wells, where he built a larger gristmill and sawmill complex near the Mousam River, the first set of permanent structures in what is now Kennebunk. The fact that the mills were built with the help of Wabanaki labor indicates that relationships between Native Americans and Europeans had not yet reached a point of alienation, and that Sayward himself, whose granddaughters and daughter-in-law would one day be Indian captives, had good relationships with them.

Like the Rishworths, however, the Sayward family's fortunes fell victim to the all-too-common tangle of loans from Boston merchants, mortgages and failed business partnerships.[49] When Henry died, his widow attempted to eke out a living selling unlicensed liquor, and her sons, including Mary's husband John, were forced to sell their inherited interest in the mills in order to reduce an inherited debt.[50] Then John himself died, leaving Mary again a widow and with four small daughters and possibly an infant son, though the actual existence of this child is in some doubt.

The reversals of fortune of the Rishworth and Sayward family were passed from one generation to another, thus illustrating another aspect of the difficulties New English settlers faced on the Maine frontier. Henry Sayward had built a church and several mills,

---

[49] Banks, *York*, I: 110–114.

[50] William H. Foster, "The Captor's Narrative: Catholic Women and Their Puritan Men on the Early North American Frontier, 1653–1760," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 2000, 123. Foster concludes that the Plaisteds were economical marginal because of the small size of the estate left by one of Mary's deceased husbands. Bourne, *History of Wells and Kennebunk,* 109–114.

two types of structures critical to the definition and function of a permanent settlement, but his efforts to ensure the permanency of York and Kennebunk ultimately held no guarantees for his own family. Effort did not guarantee upward mobility in Maine – there were too many other variables linked to the vagaries of frontier life that were part of the Maine experience. These were present in times of peace as well as war. Ironically, it was captivity, and not perseverance in Maine, that propelled John and Mary's daughters, Mary and Esther, into the economic and religious stability that had eluded previous generations of the Rishworth and Sayward family.

Mary Plaisted's captivity ordeals began in August, 1690, when she and her third husband, Phineas Hull were seized by Indians as they walked with another couple on a sandy road between Kittery to York. One of their party was killed, and both Mary and Phineas were taken hostage.[51] Phineas reportedly escaped soon after, and Mary was released after the truce at Sagadahoc.[52] Phineas Hull must have died sometime shortly thereafter, for Mary was married to James Plaisted, her fourth husband, by the following year. By January 25, 1691/2, Mary was living in an outlying area of York called Cider Hill with James, a farmer, and five children.[53] On that day, a band of French-supported Eastern Wabanakis attacked the town, leaving forty-eight settlers dead and eighty in hostile hands.

---

[51] Banks, *History of York* I: 284.

[52] Mary might have remained in captivity for as long as six months. She was redeemed in May, 1691. *GDMNH*, 358; Samuel Adams Drake, *The Border Wars of New England* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), 70.

[53] William Foster notes that this area of York was reserved for farmers of more modest means. He refers to James Plaisted as a "hardscrabble farmer," though he, like Mary, was tied to more prestigious family members like his brother, Portsmouth merchant Ichabod Plaisted. *The Captor's Narrative*, 66; *GDMNH,* 559.

The fallout from the horrors of the York massacre (also known as the Candlemas massacre) was so severe that some scholars believe that it was the watershed event that precipitated Salem's witchcraft hysteria.[54] York, one of the oldest and most established settlements in Maine, was almost completely wiped off the map. Garrisons were besieged, houses and outlying buildings were reduced to ash, and dozens of animals were slaughtered. From his home in Wells, almost fifteen miles away, the Reverend George Burroughs wrote a vivid description of the terrible plume of smoke spewing forth from the burning town.[55] Little did Burroughs suspect that he would soon suffer terribly from the consequences of the attack he chronicled. Arrested under suspicion of playing a supernatural role that contributed to York's terrible misfortune, he was hanged at Salem as a witch, yet another casualty of the increasing suspicion cast on the perceived unorthodox of religious life in the borderlands.

In the sense that they suffered no casualties, the Plaisteds were luckier than most other families, some of which were completely obliterated. But Mary was again a hostage, this time with two of her daughters, eleven-year-old Mary and seven-year-old Esther.[56] With other York captives, the family was forced to march quickly to the wooded areas near Cape Neddick Pond where their captors camped for the night. Before dawn, the captives were hustled toward Wells, where the Wabanakis stopped at Joseph Storer's garrison, "under a flag of truce," and gave the English an opportunity to redeem some of their captives for cash. Ten days later, Captain James Converse and John Alden

---

[54] Baker and Kences, "Maine, Indian Land Speculation, and the Essex County Witchcraft Outbreak of 1692," 167; Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 15, 21.

[55] Qtd. in Banks, *York,* I: 291.

[56] Ibid., I: 294-5. This number is subject to some debate: Banks says forty-eight were killed but Coleman puts the number closer to one hundred. Banks seems to have based his account on Mather's in *Magnalia Christi Americana (*Book VII), 77.

arrived at Sagadahoc, almost one hundred miles up the coast from York, with enough donated money from settlements throughout New England to redeem thirty-six, or almost half, of the captives.[57]

Mary and her daughters were not among the redeemed. Instead, they were hastened into the wilderness regions that separated New England from New France. James Plaisted's failure to redeem his family remains a mystery. The family may have been economically humble, but both Mary and James had connections who might have helped.[58] The Plaisteds, after all, were among the largest landowners in Salmon Falls and were civil and militia leaders, and Mary's own personal kinship networks, courtesy of birth and marriage, extended to almost every community in Maine. The reason the family remained captive is subject to two possible scenarios. Either the funds raised in Boston for the relief of the York captives were earmarked for specific persons, or the process was subject to the judgment of the captors, who kept those who best suited their needs and released the others. The first scenario seems particularly plausible in light of the fact that four wealthy Portsmouth residents who were well-connected in Boston and had the misfortune of being in York when the raid took place were among the first to be ransomed at Sagadahoc.[59]

Mary, however, was forced to remain among her Wabanaki captors for perhaps as long as two years. But by the end of 1693, she had been ransomed to the French and was

---

[57] Banks, *York,* I: 296–8. Donations were received from other communities in Maine and as far away as Dorchester and Plymouth.

[58] Foster, *The Captor's Narrative*, 66.

[59] These were Theodore Atkinson and his wife, Francis Tucker, and Elizabeth Alcock, a wealthy widow. Coleman, *NEC* I: 226, 227, 229.

a servant in the house of Catherine Gauchet, the recent widow of royal judge and seigneur Jean-Baptiste Migeon de Branssat.[60]

With her daughters at the nearby school of the Congrégation Notre-Dame, Mary remained in Gauchet's home and allowed herself to be baptized. Once a Catholic, Mary was fully vested in Canadian society, presumably with access to her daughters and comfortable living arrangements. Then, surprisingly, she left both her children and her new religion and returned to New England with Matthew Cary in 1695.[61] Upon her return to York, Mary resumed her married life with James and bore two more daughters and a son. A year after her redemption, she was fined 4 shillings "for not attending y^{e} public worship of God on y^{e} Lords Day."[62] Her husband told the court that she had been ill on the day in question and paid the fine. It has been suggested that this was an act of defiance against the established church, of homage to vestigial Catholicism, or disgust with religion in general.[63] Or perhaps the problem was Samuel Moody, York's "spiritual dictator," whose sermons about Hell and the "howling, roaring, yelling [and] shrieking" of the damned was a source of painful memories for any redeemed captive.[64]

By all accounts, the reunited Mary and James led fairly uneventful lives. The year after Mary's return, James requested a license from the Court of Quarter Sessions

---

[60] After Mary left her household, Catherine Gauchet became a nun of the Hôtel-Dieu of Montreal, where one of her daughters had preceded her. *DCB,* I.508; *NEC,*I: 236.

[61] *NEC,*I: 79.

[62] Ibid.,: 238-9.

[63] It is also possible that she was indeed ill, especially since she was prosecuted for no further infractions of this nature. I: 238-9; Foster, *Captor's*, 68;

[64] Samuel Moody, "Doleful State of the Damned" (sermon; n.d.), qtd. in Banks, *York*, 32-3; Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, 85.

"to retayle bear syder and victuals at his now dwelling house."[65] After James's death, Mary applied for, and was continually granted, renewals for a license to retail liquor.[66]

It is not known if Mary ever saw her *canadienne* daughters again. She was alive as late as 1723, a year before her daughter Esther visited the Eastward in the company of several other acculturated French captives. But Mary and Esther continued to live seemingly contently in the captor colony, carving out lives of their own. Mary became Soeur-des-Anges of the Congrégation of Notre-Dame, and Esther became Madame Lestage, the wife of a wealthy Montreal merchant. Despite Mary's vow of poverty and Esther's brilliant marriage, however, Mary Plaisted continued to imagine there was hope that both would return. As late as 1715, she pressed a suit against her own son to prevent him from claiming his sisters' modest inheritances of less than £20 apiece.[67]

Like her comrade Hannah Swarton's, Mary Plaisted's story was disseminated throughout New England by none other than Cotton Mather. In 1702, Mather included an anecdote about Mary Plaisted's captivity in *Magnalia Christi Americana.* According to the minister, Mary was taken captive not only with Mary and Esther but with a newborn son as well. The baby restricted the movement of his mother and he cried, leaving the retreating party of Indians and captives vulnerable to their pursuers. Frustrated by these complications, a Wabanaki seized the infant and killed him. Though the actual existence of this baby is doubtful (no family, church or civil records mention him), the point of Mather's inclusion of his story was to add to the already grievous losses of the mother and demonstrate the barbarity of the captors. But with or without the

---

[65] *York Deeds* IV:77.

[66] Mary neglected to renew the license in 1711 and was prosecuted. *YD,* X:187.

[67] *NEC,*I: 238-40.

putative baby, the real Mary had lived a life of diverse losses which had begun long before she was seized by Wabanaki and French forces and carried against her will to Canada.

A comparison of the life circumstances and reactions to captivity of Hannah Swarton and Mary Plaisted reveals similar patterns. The promise of fresh starts and material prosperity that Maine had seemed to offer both of their families had not come to fruition. Both experienced periods of their lives as adult women bereft of their critical sources of identity: husbands, fathers, extended family, and offspring. Both were subjected to the same challenges to religious identity once they were imprisoned in New France. Both were ransomed back to New England, but had children who were not.

Though their stories diverge in significant ways, they both suggest a possible range of experience, action, and response for Maine captives who crossed frontiers of space and faith. Mainers are the focus of this examination because many, like Mary and Hannah, had already to a certain degree crossed these boundaries. By virtue of their own placement on New England's pagan skirts, Maine's outlivers were more likely than most other New England settlers to share intimate contacts, voluntary or otherwise, with the religiously and ethnically diverse populations of the northern frontier.[68] To an observer like Mather, an established theologian and social critic writing from the secure perch of

[68] The growth of the number of outlivers was a natural byproduct of New England's geographic expansion in the latter half of the seventeenth century and caused concern throughout orthodox circles. Hambrick-Stowe, *The Practice of Piety,* 244.

Boston, the tragedy for both women, and other captives, began long before they ever faced foreign foes.[69]

How does the experience of Mainers compare with those of New England captives overall? Emma Lewis Coleman and Charlotte Alice Baker identified at least 201 Maine captivities between 1688 and 1727. One hundred and nine were known to have returned and fifty-one were known to have remained. Of the remaining forty-nine, some were killed or died before they ever encountered religious difference, and a few lucky ones experienced such fleeting captivities that they barely left the Maine settlements at all. Maine captives were diverse in terms of age, occupation, and place in life. Among them one finds soldiers, small children and infants, and the elderly. Several of the women taken from Maine between 1688 and 1727 were pregnant; when the infants they bore did not impede the progress of the raiding party, they were valued as a source of increased ransom.[70]

Regardless of gender, the Mainers who took the first critical step toward acculturation into the captor culture – Catholic baptism – tended to do so while among the French, not in the Indian missions. Despite the proselytizing and haranguing of Wabanaki neophytes and the nearly constant presence of aggressive Jesuits proselytizers, remarkably few captives were baptized in the missions. This is puzzling, especially since missions functioned as sacramental stations, places where, for the most part, a

---

[69] The "evils" of geographical dispersion are evident in two Mather publications, *Decennium Luctuosum* (Boston: printed by B. Green and J. Allen,1699) and *Good Fetch'd out of Evil* (Boston: Bartholomew Green?, 1706).

[70] When Susannah Johnson, a captive from New Hampshire, gave birth to her child while in Wabanakia, her Indian master joyfully exclaimed "Two moneys for me! Two moneys for me!" Colin Calloway, ed., *North Country Captives: Selected Narratives of Indian Captivity from Vermont and New Hampshire* (Hanover: University of New Hampshire Press, 1992), 54.

sacramental technician of some sort was always present.[71] Catholic priests were more predictably present at the missions than they were in the smaller parishes of New France, and as the most learned and zealous of proselytizers, would have set to work on captives quickly.[72] With the religious potency of the missions in mind, how can one account for the failure of captives to convert while detained in the missions of Wabanakia and Canada? Many factors suggest themselves, but all coalesce around the same theme: the clash of cultures was far too great to encourage and support substantial numbers of conversions.

In truth, there were few pressing reasons for adult captives to yield to the coercive techniques of Native American captors. On the practical end, it is likely that captives, especially those in later wars (Queen Anne's and Dummer's), resigned themselves to long or permanent stays among their captors. They had seen enough of their friends and neighbors return to have some idea of how captivity and redemption unfolded. Though captivity could last for years, it mostly went through phases that ended with the captive living somewhere among the French, not the Wabanakis.[73] In addition, many captives rejected most if not all elements of Native American culture out of hand.[74] This is understandable in light of the fact that the Wabanaki culture was so relentlessly alien. Almost always suspect to English settlers to begin with, they were in addition associated

---

[71] When a priest could not be present, missionaries left lay neophytes, called *dogiques*, to administer the sacraments, including baptisms. Thwaites, ed., *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* 27: 65.

[72] Daniel Scalberg notes that, as late as 1683, there were only twenty-five priests in New France covering a 620-mile area. Scalberg, "Religious Life in New France under the Laval and Saint-Vallier Bishoprics," (Ph.D. diss., University of Oregon, 1990), 39-40.

[73] Throughout their article "Crossing the Cultural Divide," Vaughan and Richter show that it was much more common for captives to remain in French than Indian hands.

[74] Using Emma Lewis Coleman's research, Vaughan and Richter determined that New England captives who became acculturated French Catholics outnumbered those who became transculturated Native Americans by a factor of more than four to one. Vaughan and Richter, "Crossing the Cultural Divide," 60-62.

not only with the terror of the raids but with a form of Catholicism imparted by French missionaries that made this alternative Christian vision seem doubly strange and perverse. The Wabanakis, even ones who professed Christianity, were regarded as "heathens" and "barbarians," "diabolical" in all their religious practices, regardless of their origins.[75] This is observed in particular in New Englanders' reactions to the killing of York minister Shubael Dummer in the Candlemas Massacre. On witnessing the death in front of his terrified congregation, Francis Tooke, equated the killing to divine judgment on York, fearing that it did "bespeak Gods dreadfull displeasure agaynst us, the first minister kild in all our warrs."[76] Ironically, the possibility that God had chosen the Wabanakis as emissaries to punish the New Englanders did not render them less sinister or anti-Christian in their own right. The latter sentiment was confirmed to all captives when their captors, some of whom paraded in the dead minister's clothes, led their prisoners into the wilderness giving mock sermons, singing *Te Deums*, matins and vespers, and raising a common component of Catholic liturgy to a cry of victory in war.[77] Though clothes of the dead were a common form of booty, the sight of the Wabanakis in Dummer's ministerial attire was not only abominable, it was downright satanic. Mather described the Wabanaki who donned the clothes as "a Devil as an Angel of Light."[78]

Far worse, these mission Indians were, according to Protestant writers, capable of far-greater anti-Christian acts: the killing of babies and young children during the forced

---

[75] See examples in Mather, *Decennium Luctuosum,* 63, 64, 71; Joseph Dudley to the Board of Trade, 2 December 1712, *DHSM,* 9:335; John March to Joseph Dudley, 10 November 1703, *DHSM,* 9:164.

[76] *NEC,*I: 232.

[77]Drake, *Border Wars of New England*, 76. If mission priests encouraged these offenses, they did so in absentia: there is no record of active Jesuit participation in any of the raids on the southern Maine settlements during King William's and Queen Ann's wars. See Thwaites, ed., *JR* 67, passim.

[78] Mather*, Decennium Luctuosum*, 77.

marches into Wabanakia. According to Cotton Mather, one of Mary Plaisted's own children was a victim of the deliberate design to conquer English settlers by attacking the symbol of English conquest: their children. Consider Mather's relation of Mary Plaisted's loss. According to the clergyman, her captors "forced her to Travel in this Weakness … without any Respect of Pity."[79] Her own infant was snatched from his mother by her "Diabolical master," who "took her Child from her, and carried it unto a River, where stripping it of the few filthy Rags it had, he took it by the heels, and against a Tree dash'd out its Brains, and then flung it into the River." The killing of this unfortunate child offered proof positive that the "heathen," even those that professed to be Christians, were inherent savages beyond the reach of redemption. To Mather and his readers, a chilling demonstration of this savagery came from killing Christian babies who may not have had access to baptism because of their outliver parents' choices, and were therefore now excluded from the Puritan covenant forever.[80] Due to the unpredictably organized ministry (or possibly resistance by parents), many Maine babies were not, or could not, be baptized in their infancy. This sacrament, one of the few that Puritanism retained from the pre-Reformation Church, brought children into covenant with God and their families. Death before baptism foreclosed that possibility.

The murdered Plaisted baby might have been a case of mistaken identity or may not have existed at all. The anecdote reflects the fact that death was an all-too-common fate for infants and the very young in captivity, for their Native captors sought to relieve

---

[79] Ibid., 71.

[80] Charles Hambrick-Stowe describes Samuel Sewall's profound concern for the soul of his own sickly child, whom he feared might die before baptism. The sacrament was quickly performed by his colleague, Samuel Willard, because "It seemed important to bring the child officially into the covenant as quickly as possible." So-called "outlivers" rarely had the opportunity to sacramentally enclose the family as quickly as their contemporaries in more established communities did. *Practice of Piety*, 9,11.

adult captives of their physical burdens on the wilderness trails. This practice was not applied in any consistent manner. It depended largely on the time of year, the condition of the mother and the child, and the perceived level of jeopardy that these human impediments caused to the greater effort of keeping captive and captor out of the hands of the pursuing English.[81] It was also not restricted to the very young, nor was it universally meted out to them. Older children who became problems for their captors and were too large to be dashed against a tree were killed in other ways if they became troublesome. To English observers, even Indian mercy appeared cruel: Mather wrote that one small child, on the verge of being roasted for food, was saved only by the timely appearance of dog, which took the baby's place as the evening meal.[82] The implication of this anecdote was clear: to Native Americans, English children were little different from beasts, ripe for any form of abuse.

These horrifying images would not have been completely new to Mather's New England readers. Accounts in his writings of burned churches and homes, slaughtered ministers and brutalized children all demonstrated that French and Indian enemies were aggressively, and mercilessly, targeting the symbols of permanent settlement in particularly vicious ways. Such accounts would have been familiar to a Massachusetts population who had endured the horrors of King Philip's War and were urgent reminders that these enemies strove for nothing less than complete annihilation.[83] As residents of a

---

[81] For a thorough description, see Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive*, 29.

[82] The child was Hannah Parsons of Wells. Hannah, the niece of Esther Wheelwright, survived, matured in Canada, and married Claude-Antoine Berman, a military officer from an aristocratic family. Hannah, who by 1759 was a widow, moved to France in the wake of the fall of Quebec and sold her home, ironically, to James Murray, the first British governor of Canada. Mather, *Good Fetch'd Out of Evil*, 35; *NEC,*I: 410.

[83] Jill Lepore discusses atrocities perpetrated by both Native Americans and New Englanders in *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Vintage, 1998), passim.

frontier region with few spiritual protections, many potential Puritans were similarly lost, including the youngest, most vulnerable, and most promising. It is little wonder that conversions were unlikely to happen among these Native American captors and their equally-vicious priests, who were hateful and fearful tropes of a maturing New England literary genre.[84]

Death was only one form of permanent separation suffered by individual members of captive families. During Mary Plaisted's captivity among the Wabanakis and in New France, she and her daughters were subjected to a "sorting process" that took into account each captive's age, sex, and potential receptivity to Catholicism. The same most likely happened with Hannah's family, but the process was compounded by the fact that she lost a son. In many cases, the sorting mechanism, which was meant to determine which captives would be good candidates for acculturation in New France or transculturation in the Wabanaki communities, meant that captives and their kin would be parted for the remainder of their lives – a situation which, at least in the case of this family, was just as finite and permanent as death.

Last, rejecting Indian transculturation was also the result of more worldly considerations. When Hannah Swarton cataloged the deprivations she endured while living among the Wabanakis, she included on her list "friends, neighbors, house estate, bread, clothes, or lodging suitable."[85] Such an environment was unlikely to produce a

---

Increase Mather, Cotton's father, was the author of one of the major accounts of King Philip's War, *A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New-England* (1676).

[84] For a fuller exploration of these tropes, see Linda Colley, *Captives: The Story of Britain's Pursuit of Empire and How its Soldiers and Civilians Were Held Captive by the Dream of Global Supremacy, 1600-1850* (New York: Pantheon, 2002), 151-2.

[85] Swarton, "Narrative," 144.

convert, especially since Hannah laid blame for these more earthy troubles exclusively at the feet of Native American raiders.[86]

Heathenism was bad enough, but for particularly zealous Protestants, the concept of a "Papist" Indian was at once both a confirmation of Catholicism's intrinsic flaws and a perversion of Christian belief. While among the Wabanaki, Hannah Swarton was forced into servitude by an Indian woman who had lived among the English at Black Point but had married a "Canada Indian and turned papist." The Wabanaki convert delighted in chiding her captive for her religious beliefs. She tauntingly told the captive that "had the English been as careful to instruct her in our religion as the French were to instruct her in theirs, she might have been of our religion."[87] In this world turned upside down, Hannah Swarton and her Protestant companions paid the price for their ministers' lack of interest in converting the Wabanakis.

Like those of many other captives, Mary's experience consisted of several distinct journeys and stops along the way that moved her through the geography of the borderlands. The terminus of her odyssey was any one of the developed settlements of New France. For many captives, this transition marked the end of their ordeal in the wilderness among the "salvages" who shared universal responsibility for attacking their settlements. For those who returned to New England, however, it was another step in the process of their encounter with a borderland that must have seemed infinite.

Arriving in Quebec, Montreal or Trois-Rivières – all settlements that Mainers would have recognized as the built environments of fellow European Christians - brought with it physical comforts that were familiar and, at least in contrast to Wabanakia,

---

[86] Ibid.

[87] Ibid., 150.

welcome. And even the most pugnacious of captives commented on the ease of life in New France and the quantitative improvement in their material circumstances once they were placed in French hands.[88]

Young captive Mainers were far more likely to enter these Euroamerican communities already baptized as Catholics. The process was fostered by the French missionaries of Wabanakia, who used more advanced neophytes to encourage newcomers. Demonstrating his imperfect knowledge of the fundamentals of Puritan piety, Jesuit Jacques Bigot asserted that prayer was an alien concept to captive Protestant children. With reversed perspective to Indian Christians, Bigot credited the Wabanakis themselves for providing a positive example of Catholic devotional practices. The Jesuit reported to his superior: "At first I find [captive children] greatly prejudiced against us, but they gradually allow themselves to be persuaded by the devotion of our Abnaquis and their zeal for prayer — which they do not find, they say, in their colony."[89]

Bigot's assumption that Protestants did not engage in communal prayers is puzzling, especially in light of the fact that the French authorities knew of the existence of Protestant captive prayer groups and tried to forbid such meetings. The captors feared such activities would support captives in their quest to preserve Protestant identity and

---

[88] Ibid., 153. Like other captives, Hannah was ransomed into the household in a high-level New French administrator. By en large, her material environment was "a great and comfortable change as to my outward man in my freedom from my former hardships and hardhearted oppressors." Hannah, however, never loses her sense of being in enemy hands, and proceeds to contrast this comfort with the "danger to my inward man" presented by her close proximity to evangelistic priests. John Williams of Deerfield was received in the home of Governor Vaudreuil himself, whom he described as "in all respects relating to my outward man, courteous and charitable to admiration." Williams, *Redeemed,* 34. Even Mather admits "the French … Treated [the captives] with a Civility ever to be acknowledged, until care was taken to fetch 'em home" and even conceded that mission priests could be "very civil" to their New England human booty. Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana,* 69 and *Good Fetch'd Out of Evil*, 32.

[89] Bigot to unidentified Jesuit, 10/26/1699. *JR* LXV:91

keep them from succumbing to pressure to convert.[90] The Reverend John Williams, a captive from Deerfield, wrote in the narrative of his own captivity that "when we arrived at New France, we were forbidden praying one with another, or joining together in the service of God."[91] The problem surfaced again during his 1713 mission to New France to ransom captives, when the intendant of New France warned Williams and his companion, John Stoddard not to preach to or meet on Sundays with any English prisoners, under penalty of house arrest for themselves.[92]

Other captors were not so intimidated, and saw the free exercise of the religious impulse as a door through which they could proselytize. Joseph Bartlett, a young captive from Haverhill, was subjected to a constant string of inquiry about his knowledge of Scripture by Père Meriel, the Sulpician priest who dedicated his ministry to converting English captives. To prove his points, the priest turned to Scripture and assented to gentle debate with the boy. He eventually won Bartlett's affection, and although he was never formally converted, Joseph entertained a respectful interest in Catholicism thereafter.[93]

Still others, like Hannah Swarton's captors, proved less interested in her case when they failed to punch through the walls of her convictions. They provided her with a

---

[90] The importance of public and group worship is discussed in Hambrick-Stowe, *Practice of Piety*, Chapter Four, passim.

[91] Williams, *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion*, 18. His experience had an impact on Cotton Mather, who wrote that the captives found the means to meet despite the moratorium – with, of course, the assistance of divine grace. Mather, *Good Fetch'd Out of Evil,* 13.

[92] [John Stoddard], "Stoddard's Journal," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* [hereafter "*NEHGR*"], 5 (January 1851),33.

[93] *NEC,*I:359-60.

scrap of Scripture in English and took no measures to prevent her from engaging in pious discourse with her housemate in captivity, Margaret Gould Stilson.[94]

Why did so many other Maine captive assent to be baptized? Reasons identified by scholars range from apathy to gratitude. For Mainers, however, the possibility that it was less of a transition when in the company of other European Christians should be considered. Put simply, acculturation was an integral and irresistible part of the early American experience.[95] The greater the distance from the religious establishment of New England grew, the greater the tendency toward acculturation. It was hard to go farther than Maine.

There were pragmatic considerations as well. Coupled with steadily mounting pressure from their captors to join the Church of Rome, many captives must have found the chances for finding some semblance of stability and peace an increasingly tempting reason to convert. For Mary Plaisted, Elizabeth Tozier and Mehitable Goodwin, three years of this mounting pressure were needed before the women accepted baptism at the hands of their captors.[96] The Catholic Church provided for these married women, who were now separated from living husbands, with an element of protection and prestige that they had not enjoyed since before their captivities. Others might have made conscious decisions to stay in New France, but prisoner exchanges, paid ransoms and other incentives eventually brought them back to Maine. These probably included Hannah Parsons, Martha Grant, and Anne Batson, all widows with children in captivity with

---

[94] Swarton, 150.

[95] Vaughan and Richter assert this belief in their article "Crossing the Cultural Divide." The authors also were among the first to suggest that the lines ideological lines that separated Protestant and Catholic, New Englander from *canadien*, were perhaps less rigidly defined, especially when other factors such as distance, religious commitment and exposure, age, to name a few, came into play. "Crossing," 87.

[96] *NEC* I: 185, 194, 237.

them, assented to baptism, as did their children. Charles Trafton was a youth when he was taken in the Candlemas raid, was rebaptized as Louis-Marie, and had learned a trade before he too returned to Maine decades later and well into his adulthood.[97] Children with or without parents in captivity also converted and returned, though their captors often went to extraordinary lengths to coerce them into staying. Despite strategies that included denying their presence to both French and New England authorities and hiding captive children's clothing so they were unable to travel, these captives were lost.[98]

More than any other part of New England, Maine produced male captives who chose to remain in New France. Although these males still represented a far smaller percentage of Maine's unredeemed captives, the fact that most of the males who remained did come from Maine reinforces the idea of permeability brought on by the marginal status of many of the province's settlers. Like captives from other parts of New England, most of these Maine men were taken in childhood or adolescence. At least two adult males, John Edmunds and William Lucas, however, determined to remain within the captor culture.[99] Others remained and were naturalized, only to return to New England for what appear to be material reasons, such as opportunities to inherit land and goods.[100] Several other males who remained, like Joseph Fry, Aaron Littlefield, Richard Nason, and George Gray, were well into adolescence at the time of their captivity, and nearing adulthood when they were finally redeemed to into Canada, where they

---

[97] *NEC,* I: 184-7, 245, 410-12 ; II: 3-8 , Fournier, 180, 209, 216.

[98] Aaron Littlefield, whose story is covered in Chapter Five, had has clothes hidden by the curé whom he served. New England negotiators got wind of this underhanded strategy and complained bitterly of the tactic to French officials. Williams and Stoddard to Vaudreuil, Feb. 2 1713. *NEGHR* 5: 28-9.

[99] *NEC,*II:19; 404; Fournier, 166.

[100] These were William Hutchins (Salmon Falls), and Joseph Stover and Charles Trafton (both of York), all of whom are discussed in detail in Chapter Five. *NEC,*I: 244-7, 391-3,

converted to Catholicism and became fully acculturated to the French colony. Fry and Nason were already familiar with borderland religious experimentation: both were from Quaker families who had run afoul of local authorities.[101] The common theme that bound these male captives were their modest origins, suggesting that a *concession* and the opportunity to build a more productive life than they might otherwise be able to obtain in Maine were worth the price paid in terms of new religious alliance. But for at least two of them, Gray and Littlefield, the associations went deeper. Gray, for one, reported himself that he refused to return home "for love of his new religion."[102] Aaron Littlefield was initially tricked into remaining in New France, but after marrying, parenting numerous children, and creating a productive adult life, he resisted lures to Maine, even for choice pieces of property.

The relative stability of property in New France was coupled with an obliging populace, who, even if they had little or nothing invested in the public relations components of captive conversion, still welcomed the newcomers and treated them well. Even among returned captives, few could deny that *some* French settlers were sympathetic captors. Even Hannah Swarton remarked that she "found the French very kind to me."[103] Deposing against the Norridgewock sachem, Bomazeen, Grace Higiman of Pemaquid conceded that the French at Quebec had treated her well, in contrast to the Indians, whom she claimed had beaten her.[104] Abraham Johnson, a mariner who was

---

[101] *GDMNH*, 248, 504-5.

[102] *GDMNH*, 284.

[103] Swarton, "Narrative," 152.

[104] Grace Higiman was taken from Pemaquid along with her husband and children. The entire family might have returned in tact, though the two Higiman children disappear from the historical record. The fact that Grace does not mention them in her testimony suggests that they were not killed in the raid or in captivity. "Statement of Grace Higiman," *NEGHR* 18:161.

taken captive at sea during Dummer's War, preferred French captivity to the offers of transculturated freedom procured through marriage to an Indian woman.[105]

Impractical as it might have seemed, resistance frequently ended with the captives' desired result with their exchange or ransom back to New England with their Protestant integrity intact. But other adolescent or adult captives concluded that Catholic baptism opened more than just the gates of heaven: it could add significant ease to their troubled lives. Captives who took this step were admitted into the wider world of public participation in Canadian society, which in many ways revolved around the feast days and sacraments of the Catholic Church. Baptism also allowed not only for entry into the well-established colonial world of New France, but for the reintegration of English captives into the company of one another.

But before any of these could happen, the captive's soul had to be procured for Rome. Preparation for entry into the Catholic Church varied. In some cases the sacrament was administered immediately, usually to very young or frail captives. When time was less of an issue (rare at a time when the two nations were entered into negotiations), Maine's acculturating captives were carefully prepared. For the mature women in question, this was in the households of Canadian elites. For younger women and girls, the venue of choice was Canada's convents and their schools.

Captive networks in Canada were by and large created through sacramental association, a form of fictive kinship within some forms of Christianity that ideally created a special spiritual and worldly bond between the recipient of the sacrament and his or her sponsor. The actual conversion of the captive, epitomized in the sacrament of

---

[105] *NEC,*II:144.

baptism, took on an overarching meaning for the whole captor community. For this reason, captives were frequently baptized on major feast days. These were holy days of obligation when the churches of New France were busy, active spaces, teeming with faithful who created an instant audience for one of French Catholicism's triumphal moments.[106]

December 8th, the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, was a particularly popular choice for the celebration of baptism for female captives. The feast to honor the conception of the Virgin Mary, predicated on the dogma she had been conceived without original sin, was loaded with obvious ritual symbolism for bringing captives into the church. Bringing female captives forth in a spiritual "rebirth" after the corruption of heresy was a fitting way to celebrate the feast in New France. This explanation also solves an enduring mystery of the Plaisted/Sayward captives by explaining why mother and daughters were baptized on the same day but in different churches. The act of family baptism was less relevant than the act of celebrating it on the feast day.[107] The same was true for the Deborah and Mary Cole, two young girls from Saco, who were baptized together on December 8th, 1703.[108]

In baptism, all five captives now bore the name "Marie," presumably in honor and gratitude to the Virgin Mary. Mary and her daughter already possessed the English version of the name, but the fact that they both retained a form of "Mary" as their first name, and that the name was also selected for Esther, offers further proof that these baptisms were deliberately planned to correspond with this important day on the Catholic

---

[106] For church celebrations and conduct, see Moogk, *La Nouvelle France*, 255-60.

[107] For a contemporary account of the importance and celebration of the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary in New France, see *JR*, 66:83.

[108] *NEC,*I: 13-5.

calendar. There is no doubt that "Marie" was an extremely popular name in New France and that first daughters frequently bore it in honor of the Virgin Mary and her power to protect young lives.[109] So did their subsequent sisters, for the French had no aversion to giving two or more daughters the same first name, provided it accompanied a distinctive middle name which probably served to identify the progeny. But names like Charlotte, Louise, Madeleine, Thérèse, Marguerite, Jeanne, and Françoise were popular as well – with or without a Marian antecedent. The preponderance of the name Marie not only indicates a special connection between captive converts and saved souls, but also connotes the ability of captors to shape new converts' religious lives by steering them toward key figures of special veneration and worship.

The purpose of renaming a captive in baptism was to wipe their slate clean, even of the taint of distinctly Protestant names. That these women were given a form of their birth names, instead of completely new ones, suggests that there was also an element of veneration involved in naming. For those overseeing this sacrament under these circumstances, the use of the name "Marie" created a palpable bond with the Virgin Mary herself. It was, after all, she who was credited with bringing these captives out of the "*esclavage de l'heresie calviniste.*" The name "Marie" was conspicuous in its use in Catholic baptismal names for males as well. In accepting the name "Louis-Marie," Charles Trafton of York took in baptism the names of two great Franco-Catholic warrior-protectors, one male, one female. For those who were born English, had spent their early years speaking English, and had, in many cases, strong memories of their birth culture, it

[109] Moogk, *La Nouvelle France,* 238.

could also serve as a near-constant reminder *to them* that they had gotten to New France not by choice but through forces well beyond their control – supernatural or otherwise.

Though captives throughout New France, and in particular those from Maine, were not a homogeneous group, they were prone to seek the company of other New Englanders when they had the opportunity. Recognizing this tendency, *canadien* captors created an alternative system of alliance among captives who had passed through the process of religious acculturation. By encouraging baptized captives to act as godparents and as witnesses to marriages, and to other events that involved administration of Catholic sacraments, captors mimicked the idealized form, minus the theology, of New England community religious life. Furthermore, the privileged spot afforded captives who converted allowed them to sustain a fragment of New England life: relationships with the family, friends and neighbors who happened to have shared their fate.

Focusing on captive women from all areas of New England, Barbara Austen has demonstrated the range of female kinship networks that female captives relied upon during their captivities.[110] Mainers, however, formed links across gender lines. Networks linking Maine captives to each other were extensive and durable and transcended gender. Evident among both men and women, these connections preserved some remnant of the families and neighbors left behind. They also, however, created new families, and, through the use of Catholic sacramental life, new forms of fictive kinship that had excluded them from many forms of New England Protestant spiritual life by reformed religious traditions.

---

[110] Barbara Austen, "Captured … Never Came Back: Social Networks Among New England Female Captives, 1689 – 1763," in *New England/New France 1600 –1850* edited by Peter Benes (Boston: Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife, Vol. 14 1992), 28–38.

The networks that linked Mainers are most evident in the extensive and thorough sacramental records of the French church. It is in these records that one finds that captives who converted became active in each other's spiritual lives, as well as in the spiritual lives of those who were about to convert. These interactions were clearly mediated by factors other than proximity and kinship. Catholic baptism was the most important line of distinction. Maine captives who embraced the Church of Rome earned the privilege that any other Catholic had: the privilege to participate fully in the sacramental life of the church, and with it, fully embrace the fictive kinships that the sacraments offered. Those who resisted baptism, however, were restricted from full participation in these intimate ceremonies. Baptism therefore simultaneously served as a unifying force for captives who had assented to it and as a wedge between captives who converted and those who did not. It created fictive kinships, based on sacrament, with other New Englanders while simultaneously blurring the lines between blood kin and spiritual kin.

The sacramental connections of Mary Storer Saint Germaine, originally of Wells, emerge clearly from the sacramental records. When Mary wrote to family in Wells and Boston, she sent with her missives the regards of Aaron Littlefield, also originally of Wells, who now lived a short distance away in Chambly.[111] Their association predated the journey the two took to Maine in 1725 but continued, and became more intimate, when the two converted. Several members of Mary's French kin, the Gaulthiers, served as godparents to several of Aaron's children.[112] The husband of Mary's cousin, Priscilla,

[111] Mary Storer Saint Germaine to Ebenezer Storer, 17 July 1727. Mary Storer Papers. MHS, Boston, MA.

[112] *NEC,*I: 414.

witnessed to two of the three French marriages of New Hampshire captive Paul Otis, indicating intimacy with another captive family. Otis's first wife was Elizabeth Weber, a captive from Purpooduck.[113]

The Storers and Littlefield knew each other before captivity, but other captives who supported each other throughout their spiritual journeys had most likely been strangers in Maine. From baptism to unction, no cross-cultural travelers who resisted conversion are to be found among the ranks of the witnesses to Catholic sacraments. Converted Mainers were channels through which the alien nature of Catholicism, hitherto the religion of enemies, was rendered more palatable and familiar to others. Consider the case of Anne Odiorne Batson. She and her distant cousin, Abigail Cass Turbet, were members of one of Cape Porpoise's original families when they were taken in 1703. When Abigail lay dying two years later, Anne, who had converted shortly after her captivity, kept vigil over her deathbed and served as witness for the three sacraments that Abigail received - baptism, penance, and unction - before expiring. Stephen Williams, a young Deerfield captive and the son of minister John, witnessed Anne and Abigail's prolonged bedside conversation about the step the dying woman was about to take. According to Williams, Père Meriel, who served as a de facto "chaplain to captives," recorded what he overheard of the conversation, presumably as reference for future proselytizing efforts.[114] Anne did the same for Esther Jones, a captive of Northampton, Massachusetts. The deathbed retinue included several French nuns and Charles Trafton, the acculturated York captive.[115] The clergy and religious who encouraged converted

---

[113] *NEC,*I: 161-2.

[114] *NEC,*II: 8.

[115] *NEC,*I: 321.

captives to witness sacrament undoubtedly hoped that witnessing these sacred acts would keep these neophytes tied to their faith as well.

Anne Batson not only actively engaged in the spiritual life of others, she actively delved into it herself. In 1705, when she married another Maine captive, James Stilson of Pemaquid, the marriage was performed in accordance with the rites of the Catholic Church. The Stilsons had their first child together baptized with the name of Anne (ironically, was the name the mother left behind in her own Catholic baptism). In naming their first child after her mother, the Stilsons were following a Protestant pattern of naming that was common New England Protestants – yet conferring the same in Catholic sacrament.[116]

Catholic baptism not withstanding, little Anne Stilson eventually returned with her parents to New England. Her older half-brother, born a few months into his mother's captivity, was less fortunate. Through naming, this child bore the marks of captor culture more strongly than his sister. The little boy was given the name of Clement, as were at least two other infant captives (two Clement Adamses). William Foster has argued that this name was deliberately used to honor the papacy, which had several popes named Clement during the early modern period. As such, the name was most likely chosen by the captors who were aggressively guiding the parents into the Catholic Church.[117] Other Mainers who came back frequently left their French names behind, but the

[116] Hall, *Worlds of Wonder*, 10, 26.

[117] "Clement" had been the name of choice for no fewer than four popes between 1592 and 1700. Foster, *Captor's*, 138.

identification as captives followed. Ebenezer Hill of Saco, for example, continued to be known as "the Frenchman" for years after his return.[118]

As Chapter Three of this study will show, marriage was the most important of the Catholic sacraments that bound Mainers permanently to the captor colony and served as the most forceful confirmation that at least some captives had voluntarily bound themselves to the . In addition to other considerations, marriages created the same tangle of family trees among Maine captives that one found in contemporary Maine towns. Though Mainers did not necessarily marry Mainers or even other New Englanders, the families into which they married, and even helped create in marriage, frequently came to be linked through subsequent marriages. One of the most tangled of these centered around Mary Austin, a captive from York; the Edmunds family from Pemaquid; and the Gibau family of Montreal. Mary, an older cousin of the aforementioned Aaron Littlefield, was eight years old when she was taken from York in the Candlemas raid of 1691/2.[119] Her cousin, Josiah Littlefield, discovered her whereabouts during his own brief captivity in 1708. His letters to Maine indicate that Mary was in contact with fellow Maine captives Mary, Rachel and Priscilla Storer, also cousins who were victims of the attack on Wells in 1703. Josiah reported that these four young kinswomen, three of whom were unmarried, sent with him regards to family in Maine, stating "Mary Storer is well and Rachel Storer and Priscilla Storer is well and Mary Austin of York is well and dasaires to remember their duty to thear father and mother and their kind love to all thear

[118] *NEC,*II: 17.

[119] *NEC,*I: 231; *GDMNH*, 441-2.

friends and relations, hoping in god you are all well." [120] In the next sentence Littlefield relayed how he had "riten to the governor at boston" concerning his own redemption, yet he seemed curiously impassive in his tone toward the three women. Though filled with concern for his own status, he makes no inquiries about theirs. Furthermore, the women's messages to their parents manifest no real curiosity about reunion with their families. Could it have been that Mary Austin's resignation fostered the same reaction in her young cousins?

It is not difficult to believe that it would. By the time the Storer women came to Canada, Mary Austin had already been resident in the French colony for more than a decade. Like the Storers, her parents survived the attack and continued to live in the Eastward towns. Likewise, all of their fathers had strong ties to the interests of the province. Mary's father, Matthew Austen, was a militia captain and prominent in county affairs, as was her grandfather, John Littlefield. Though her fate might have been a mystery for the first three years of her captivity, it eventually became known, for Mathew Cary reported to the General Council that she was among "thos Remaining Still in hands of the French at Canada" in 1695.[121] Knowing she was alive, the family probably had sufficient resources and connections to procure ransom. As a captive who had not been naturalized, Mary's status within Canadian society did not create any impediments to return. By the time she met with her cousin Josiah, she was twenty-six, not a French subject, and still unmarried. Nothing, except possibly religion and personal preference, bonded Mary Austin to Canada.

---

[120] Josiah Littlefield to an unidentified male Wheelwright relation (probably Captain John), in Maine, 1708. Qtd. in Bourne, *Wells*, 268.

[121] Mathew Cary to Massachusetts General Council, November 1695. *Massachusetts Archives,* 38a:1-3, MSA, Boston, MA.

Why, then, did she persist in her captivity? In Mary Austin's case, the most obvious answer is that she wanted to. Mary was only eight when taken, just one year older than Eunice Williams, the daughter of Deerfield, Massachusetts minister John Williams and another permanently "unredeemed captive." Like Eunice, the young Mary Austin had witnessed the failure of her father, a powerful man within the community, to protect her.[122] And also like Eunice, she remained with her captors during her formative years. She spent three years among the Wabanakis before being ransomed by François Hazeur, "marchand-bougeouis" of Quebec.[123] By the late 1690s, Hazeur was one of the wealthiest and most well-connected merchants in the colony. The contrast between the fragile settlement of York, so completely destroyed in such a short period of time, with Hazeur's house in the well-developed and fortified upper town of Quebec was striking. For Mary, as for other captives from the towns to the Eastward, the points of contrast must have been profound, especially in the minds of children and adolescents who had witnessed untold horrors that befell their fragile communities on the Maine frontier.[124]

As Mary grew, so did her awareness that there were other captives around her. It was her 1710 marriage to Etienne Gibau, a joiner by trade, that brought her into an even closer circle of French families interlaced with Maine captives. The sacramental life of the Gibau family provided opportunities for additional interactions with the English Canadians. Madame Lestage, the former Esther Sayward and another York captive, was godmother to Mary's first child, Marie-Elisabeth. The marriage of another daughter, Marie-Thérèse, was witnessed by Joseph-Daniel Maddox, who like Gibau was

---

[122] Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive*, 109; *NEC,*I: 230-1.

[123] Fournier, *Nouvelle*, 144.

[124] *DCB,* 2 :275-6.

a joiner and immigrant from England. Maddox, who appears to have emigrated to New France and may have already have been Catholic, witnessed the marriages of Wells-born Aaron Littlefield and Matt Farnsworth, a captive from Groton, Massachusetts.[125] Mary's nephew in marriage, another Etienne Gibau, married Marguerite Edmunds, the daughter of acculturated Pemaquid captives John and Mary Edmunds. The two families lived next to each other in Montreal.[126]

These networks began and were fostered in the homes of the elite of New France: wealthy merchants, administrators, and officers of rank. To elite *marrains* and *parrains*, the importance of a captive as an individual diminished soon after the soul and allegiance were procured. For New France's elites, the ties to military, church and the fur trade engulfed much of their time. Captive sponsorship increased their prestige in the eyes of their peers, but money and other economic favors were most likely reserved for the promotion of their own numerous children. These godparents tended to belong to a deeply-ambitious, unstable class in New France, where working to promote family honor and prestige was a full-time occupation.[127] Captives who came to live with them, and complied to the spirit of the household, were treated to comfortable circumstances. But virtually none were subsequently set up in households of their own or in businesses by their *marrains* and *parrains*. Their real holdings were allocated elsewhere.

The ubiquity of these *marrains* and *parrains* underscores the fact that captives for the most part, were taken into the homes of French elites, who had resources at their

---

[125] *NEC,*I:231, 408; Moogk, *Nouvelle*, 142; Fournier, *Nouvelle,* 128, 162.

[126] Fournier, 127, 144; René Jetté, *Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles du Québec des Origines à 1730* (Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1983), 398.

[127] For a thorough description of the inheritance patterns and priorities of the nobility in New France, see Sweeney and Haefeli, 232-7.

disposal to either aggressively court captives to new religion, put them to productive labor, or both. And these were the very people to have the best personal connections to the church and political leadership of the relatively-sparse colony. Consider the cases of both Hannah Swarton and Mary Plaisted. Hannah's captors, Jean Bouchart de Champigny, the Jesuit-educated intendant of New France, and his wife, Marie-Madeleine de Chaspoux, were known to be deeply devout. Hannah Swarton disclosed that priests were near-constant visitors in their home. Champigny also turned his piety outward, worked closely with the clergy to establish the *Bureaux des Pauvres*, an institution for relief of the poor. The Champignys channeled this impulse in other ways, taking what they would have considered "spiritual *pauvres*" into their own home, and, in an attempt to cure them of their heresy, subjecting them to vigorous religious instruction.[128]

For other captors, religion mattered less than labor. Agathe Saint-Père, who kept not only the Adams family of Wells, but Hannah and John Sheldon, Judah Wright and Warham Williams (all of Deerfield), and another Mainer, Pendleton Fletcher of Saco, used her captives for her own business enterprises, and contented herself with baptizing their infant children rather than engaging in heavy, possibly distracting proselytizing to adults who had valuable skills to contribute to Saint-Père's business enterprises.[129]

---

[128] These captives were Hannah Swarton, Margaret Gould Stilson, Mary Stilson, and a little girl from Dover, New Hampshire named Sarah Gerrish. The Champignys failed in their goals with the two older women, but made willing converts among the two others. Mary Stilson remained in Canada, accepted baptism, and became in that sacrament and in marriage Marie-Madeleine Cardinet. The Champignys gave Sarah Gerrish over to the care of the nuns of the Hôtel-Dieu, with whom the child bonded. When she was told of her redemption and return to her New England family, she wept and refused to go. She was later found to have hidden a crucifix in her armpit when she left Canada. *NEC,*I: 145, 175-8.

[129] William H. Foster demonstrates how one particular settler used captive labor to improve her family's situation within Canadian society. William H. Foster III, "Agathe Saint Père and Her Captive New England Weavers," *French Colonial History* 1 (2002), 129–41.

When the possibility of return came, captives who were not subject to aggressive proselytizing had little invested in the colony and were swift to leave. Others, like Mary Plaisted, might have been more hesitant. Unlike Hannah Swarton, Mary Plaisted left no account of her perceptions of her experiences. But circumstances suggest that she might have had a stronger attraction, or ultimately stronger ties, to Catholicism than many of her fellow adult Mainers. For one, she assented to baptism much more quickly than most adult captive from Maine. Second, she reportedly had easy access to her children, thanks to the intervention of the family with whom she lived, the Gauchets. Third, though she was baptized by another priest, she had managed to make the acquaintance and make an impression on Père Meriel, the indefatigable proselytizer to so many New England captives. Meriel still remembered her a full sixteen years after she returned to Maine, and sent his "commendations" to her in a letter to another ex-captive, Johnson Harmon.[130] Why would Meriel remember this captive after so brief an acquaintance? If Mary was attentive to her newly-acquired religious duties, she would not have been unusual among Maine captives. Others, like Grizel Otis Robitaille of Dover, New Hampshire, played an active role in layperson affairs almost from the time of conversion. And as disclosed before, so did Anne Batson and Charles Trafton.

Like Hannah, Mary cohabitated with a forceful model for Catholic female piety: her mistress, Catherine Gauchet. It was likely that Gauchet, the widow of a French official, ransomed the Sayward/Plaisted trio together and arranged for the girls to attend school at the Congrégation of Notre-Dame.[131] Her devotion to the Congrégation was so strong that she later took up residence in the convent. But the forces to participate

---

[130] Henri-Antoine de Meriel to Johnson Harmon, n.d. *Massachusetts Archives,* MSA 51: 212-3.

[131] *DCB,* 1: 508; Foster, *The Captor's Narrative,* 67.

actively in New France's spiritual life also came from within captives themselves. As William Foster notes, playing an active role in the church may also have been Mary's means of maintaining family ties with her older daughter, who was brought into the Catholic fold almost immediately.[132] Perhaps this commitment impressed Canadian onlookers, including Meriel.

Despite similar circumstances, Hannah Swarton and Mary Plaisted responded in different ways to the reality of Catholicism's overarching presence in the captor culture. The circumstances that brought them there, and their varied responses to the beckoning of the new religion, reflect the diverse backgrounds, motives and experiences of the Maine frontier's settlers.

Ultimately, neither Mary Plaisted nor Hannah Swarton was among the forty-three Maine captives taken between 1688 and 1727 who remained in New France as baptized Catholics. Hannah fell into a more populous group of seventy-nine which comprised the resistors. Mary, as part of a group of twenty converted and redeemed captives, was a representative of a less common impulse.

Baptized in captivity or not, redeemed captives were quickly reintegrated into New England religious and family life. Understood on both sides of the Christian coin to be *sous condition,* Catholic baptism that proved temporary was no more a permanent stain on a Protestant soul than it was for a committed Catholic convert to have been born in New England to heretical parents.

---

[132] Foster, *The Captor's Narrative*, 68.

Upon her return, Mary Plaisted soon reestablished her matrimonial bonds, bearing a child to her husband James within a year of her release.[133] At first puzzling, her decision to return to New England and leave her daughters behind is perhaps less so when viewed in the light of her status as a married woman whose husband continued to live on the Maine frontier. While James might have pursued a divorce from Mary on the grounds of abandonment, Mary had no such option in New France.[134] Obviously, she could not marry either, unless she had definitive proof that James had either successfully divorced her – or died himself. And despite her ingratiation into the household of the elite Catherine Gauchet and the proximity to her daughters, she had once known greater freedoms, and enjoyed higher status as the wife of a freeman, back home in Maine. The challenges of the early Maine frontier bred pragmatism in the face of adversity: for many captives, conversion was yet a form of this pragmatism which rendered a terrifying ordeal more manageable, underscoring yet again that these settlers often came to this region for reasons that transcended religious considerations.

With the onset of King William's War, Mather's gloomy predictions about the doomed "pagan skirts" appeared to many New Englanders to have become part and parcel of the harsh realities of intercolonial warfare. Satan and his minions were no

---

[133] *GDMNH,* 560.

[134] In no instance did the spouse of a captive petition the General Court of Massachusetts to declare a captive husband or wife dead – even in the absence of compelling proof that the partner in question survived the ordeal. Furthermore, no spouse attempted to obtain a divorce from a missing spouse on the grounds of desertion, though on at least on one occasion a New Hampshire captive appears to have used her captivity as a convenient means to affect a "self divorce," another practice elicit in New England. The reasons for this are obvious: captive wives and husbands had not voluntarily left their families, and their inability to return was more often a product of failure to negotiate effectively or meet demands of ransom than ambivalence on any captive's part to return to his or her family. The topic of self-marriage is explored in much more detail in the next chapter of this study. Morgan, *The Puritan Family,* 35; Nancy F. Cott, "Divorce and the Changing Status of Women in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series 33(4) (1976): 588.

longer disembodied spiritual threats. Instead, they were real, physical manifestations in the Eastern Wabanakis of Maine, their Catholic missionary priests, and their French allies. Though Hannah Swarton's "Narrative" ascribed the return of captives to the wonder-working and mercy of God, the number of captives who stayed among the French, or let down the guard of true religion while in captivity, was comparatively large. This is not a phenomenon that a Cotton Mather or his associates would have publicized, for they spoke of disturbing weaknesses to Protestant fortitude when surrounded by a foe that had numbers, distance, and clever conversion strategies on their side.

Maine's underdeveloped communities were vulnerable to physical attack, but spiritual conquest also loomed large. Their proximity to New France and the hostility of the Wabanakis, and their weakly-organized defenses made them ideal frontier targets. The sporadic presence of French trading partners, decades of interaction with local Wabanakis during times of peace, and the presence of Jesuits and other missionaries on Maine's northwestern and eastern frontiers provided the enemies of New England with ample opportunity to note the spiritual poverty of many Downeast settlers. And, as Mather predicted, a surprising number of Mainers who were taken captive in the frontier violence that ensued did become "Satan's prey" when they adopted the alternative Christian vision that labeled all Protestants heretics of their captors, a vision so clearly reviled by orthodox New English that it opposition to it provided some key definitions to the very meaning of Puritanism itself. A Puritan was, in all things, the antithesis of a Catholic – at least in the world of religious rhetoric. But the porous nature of early American borderlands gave Maine's settlers ample opportunities to experience the testing of the thesis.

CHAPTER THREE

"PITS OF HELL" OR "*MÉNAGES DES ANGES*?": UNREDEEMED CAPTIVES, SELF-MARRIAGE AND MIXED-FAITH FAMILIES

The Treaty of Utrecht effectively ended Queen Anne's War, and its third article provided for the return of all prisoners of war – frontier captives included. Mainers aware of the stipulation no doubt looked forward to the imminent – and permanent – return of captive loved ones whom they knew had survived the Canadian ordeal.

But the Treaty's policy on captives did not result in immediate return to New England. The processes that brought the lucky and willing home were often long and convoluted, or required handling on a case-by-case basis. Even when efforts to redeem captives unfolded smoothly, however, the results were difficult to predict. Some Maine captives came home thanks to diplomatic missions. Others returned of their own accord even after they had established productive lives – and new identities - in Canada and Acadia. Still others resurfaced thanks to the unpredictable circumstances of the constantly-shifting borderlands.

But many did not come at all – even after a treaty as significant as Utrecht appeared to guarantee their liberty. Or, if they did, it was not to stay, but only to make

brief contacts with friends and family and see to more worldly matters. When these errant – or unredeemed - captives resurfaced under these circumstances, it was with different names, different religions, different family circumstances, and different cultural affinities.[1] And it was to these new identities, and their attendant new connections of family and God that these one-time Mainers returned once their business in New England was concluded.

To the Maine families that they again left behind, this time seemingly of their own free will, these painful events must have appeared baffling. Such events drove home the fact that unredeemed captives were different people than those who had left them. Their post-captivity lives had been shaped by circumstances that frequently transcended their blood kin's own experiences. Because they had matured away from their parents, and been led through these processes by their captors, these captives were often barely recognizable. They came, and returned to New France and the lives they had made there, with their alien guises intact.

Two elements in particular formed an ideological barrier between visiting captives and the New England families with whom they sought rapprochement. For one, all of these captives had converted to Catholicism, and thus added unwelcome interfaith branches to Protestant family trees. In philosophical fundamentals, Maine was by and large no different from other areas of New England during the wars of empire, when emotional and practical issues supported anti-Catholicism. Even when anti-Catholic sentiments were a high watermark of their usefulness as an identity-forming rhetoric in

[1] John Demos used the term "unredeemed captive" in his book of the same title. The term plays with the title of a famous captivity narrative, Rev. John Williams's *The Redeemed Captive Returned to Zion.* The study itself tells the story of Williams's daughter, Eunice, who refused redemption to New England, preferring instead to become a fully-transculturated Native American. Nevertheless, Eunice and her Indian family maintained ties with her New England siblings. John Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive,* passim.

early America, many Mainers grappled with the almost inconceivable idea of these defective Christians, with all their strange alliances, among their closest blood kin. Returning, unredeemed captives were flesh-and-blood reminders of this uncomfortable reality.

Second, and more importantly to the purposes of this chapter, many of the unredeemed captives had apparently taken the most critical step of cementing their lives to New France, sacramental marriage, of their own accord. The new kin connections that resulted from these marriages could not easily be dismissed or dissolved, even when the captive party had enacted the marriage under duress. Furthermore, the very existence of these marriages, and the expectations for procreation that went along with them, meant that many New England families had Catholic branches that would persist long after the death of the original convert captive.

By New England standards, these unfortunate unions qualified as "self-marriages." This title was given to all marriages transacted without the permission or in express opposition to the will of one's parents.[2] Under Massachusetts law, such an infraction was prosecutable in the courts and punishable by fine. Even when they were effected between two New England Protestants, self-marriages carried the risk of familial ostracism. But to their kin at home, captives cum *canadiens* who married in the French colony went several steps further along the continuum of disobedience. Self-marriages stripped Protestant parents of some of their most valued, God-ordained prerogatives, including guiding children to a calling, encouraging and approving spouses for them, and

[2] For early American marriage practices and expectations, see David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four English Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford, 1989), 78; Helena M. Wall, *Fierce Communion: Family and Community in Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1990), 49-53.

transferring material wealth to them when they reached adulthood.[3] Instead it was the captives themselves, or worse still, strangers - and French Catholic strangers at that – who filled these roles. Self-marriage, therefore, was as much a religious act as one of social self-determination. With its emphasis on *vita activa* – the active religious life, as promoted in post-Reformation piety by the Jesuits and others – self-marriage involved abjuring Protestantism and accepting as many as four Catholic sacraments before a fifth sacrament, marriage, could be conferred.[4] These sacramental marriages brought the acculturation process full circle, creating Catholic subjects of a French king who were now united in marriage to fellow French subjects. What was more, they seemed to involve will on the part of the captive, who either pursued or allowed themselves to be shepherded through the process. Ultimately, they fractured the familial and civil relationship between Maine-born captives and their birth parents by robbing the latter of a vital prerogative in the lives of their children. Instead, that honor was transferred to complete strangers who were also, on several levels, ideological enemies of the parents.

Before the Treaty of Utrecht and the other initiatives to bring these captives home, self-marriages could be explained as acts of coercion and an abomination to the institution of marriage. But as years and decades rolled on, and peace was established between the two colonies, the strength and constancy of these unions (or the creation of new ones *after* Utrecht) pointed to other realities that suggested will on the captive's part. Family members who remained in Canada crossed the line that separated the unfortunate

---

[3] On the dangers to social order and punishments for self-marriage, see Demos, *Little Commonwealth*, 118-120; Kulikoff, *From British Peasants to Colonial American Farmers* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2000), 239, Barry Levy, *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware* (New York: Oxford, 1988), 91–93.

[4] Captives would have received the sacraments of baptism, penance, Eucharist and confirmation prior to marriage. In all likelihood, the conferral of some of these sacraments was rolled into one pre-marriage ceremony.

and debauched from the intrinsically corrupt and disobedient. Redeemed captives confirmed that this could happen, and the writings of Cotton Mather and John Williams spread these stories to wider audiences throughout New Englanders. But as years and decades rolled by, and captives who were assured their freedom failed to materialize, the unredeemed must have appeared incorrigible.

In a world where, according to one historian," No individual was utterly alone and private; instead, each was always obligated by a series of relationships and connections that bound him to an ever-widening circle of people, from the most intimate and domestic ties to the ties of public life and religious duty," it is difficult to imagine, at least in theory, less desirable connections for any New England family than "frenchified" Catholic ones.[5] Conversion to a despised and feared Christian form, and the subsequent disobedience to Protestant parents wrought by it, could have by rights and principle led to clean break of bonds. But they did not. Instead, borderland families attempted to cope with the presence of captive Catholic kin without adopting a stance of religious relativism. In classic expressions of "hate the sin, love the sinner," Maine families who established contact with family members who deviated from New England marriage and settlement patterns offered enticements for a return to rectitude and threatened punishments for continued defiance. These included a combination of material enticements (a subject of Chapter Five), and religious and kinship-based arguments.

In spite of the implicit disobedience of making critical life decisions based on the new religion's terms, and the alien guises of their visiting kin, Protestant Mainers

[5] Philip Greven, *The Protestant Temperament: Patterns of Child-Rearing, Religious Experience, and the Self in Early America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 186.

struggled to engage the complex and enigmatic figures who briefly entered their lives with requests for familial recognition and affection. These interactions between unredeemed captives and their New England kin demonstrate that the process of religious encounter initiated in the borderlands lasted long after the religious enemies themselves were subdued or vanquished. The eighteenth century saw a welcomed hardening of the ideological and geographical borders of faith. But for Maine families with unredeemed captives, a sustained encounter that continued for decades kept these lines, at least emotionally, persistently vague and undefined.

Ira Berlin has observed that history is the study of changing relationships.[6] In the case of Maine's unredeemed captives, said changing relationships unfolded in fits and starts, brought on by the rare opportunities for contact that borderland politics permitted. The relationships of one Maine family – the Storers of Wells - to three of their captives provide ample points of departure for examining the changing relations wrought by conversion, self-marriage, unredeemed captivity, and the vagaries of imperial politics in a borderland of early New England.

The Storers came from Wells, a town that had been the target of French and Indian raids several times before the turn of the eighteenth century. But as occupiers of one of the most significant English settlements to the Eastward, and one of the few left intact by the end of King William's War, this family and the town's other residents had learned to defend themselves effectively.[7] The Storers – as well as two other large and

[6] Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1998), 1.

[7] Attacks on Wells and its environs by Wabanaki or Wabanaki-French forces occurred on four separate occasions between 1691 and 1712 (June, 1691, January 1691/2, August 1703, April 1712, and September

important local families, the Wheelwrights and the Littlefields – had called Wells home for decades and were reluctant to evacuate without explicit threat or provocation. The garrisons owned by Wheelwright and Littlefield family members alone housed more than sixty percent of Wells's population during times of crisis.[8] Those of the Storer brothers, Joseph and Jeremiah, housed most of the others.[9] Like many early Maine families, the Wheelwrights, Littlefields and Storers were connected to their communities via an intricate network of marriages. The garrison owners were therefore protecting more than just their neighbors: in many if not most cases, their neighbors were also their kin.

In the early years of Queen Anne's War, Wells's good fortune in holding its enemies at bay abruptly ran out. On August 10, 1703, the town fell prey to a particularly vicious attack by combined French and Native American forces that left the community stunned and shattered.[10] Thirty-nine of its residents were either killed or seized by hostile hands. All of Wells's prominent families lost members to captivity in this raid. Among them were three members of the Storer family: Mary, the eighteen-year-old daughter of Joseph and Hannah Hill Storer, and Rachel and Priscilla, seventeen and nine respectively, the daughters of Joseph's brother Jeremiah and Ruth Masters Storer.

1712). Drake, *The Border Wars of New England*, 71, 76, 155, 286, 288. Following the destruction of Casco in 1690, Charles Frost reported that "nothing now remains Eastward of Wells," and warned that the town "will desert if not forthwith reinforced." Charles Frost et all to General Council of Massachusetts, 22 May 1690, *Massachusetts Archives* 36:77, MSA, Boston, MA.

[8] In her article on the role of gender in the life experiences of Esther Wheelwright, Ann Little provides a detailed description of the family dynamics of community in early Wells. "The Life of Mother Marie-Joseph de l'Enfant Jesus," *Maine History* 40(4), 282.

[9] Malcolm Storer, *Annals of the Storer Family* (New York: n. p., 1924), 30. Storer, a descendant of the Storers of Maine, eventually turned the family papers used to compile this narrative genealogy of his family over to the Massachusetts Historical Society.

[10] Samuel Penhallow, *The History of the Wars of New-England With the Eastern Indians* (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), 18. Penhallow's work is one of the few contemporary treatments of Queen Ann's War and a major source of details on the depredations that conflict wrought throughout northern New England.

It would be over a decade before any of these young women would see New England again. Priscilla never returned. Rachel Storer did, even though a probably-contrived French religion and marriage conspired to have her do otherwise.

It was cousin Mary, the oldest of the girls at the time of capture, who fell somewhere in between and whose reappearance twenty-two years later caused her family (and herself) great emotional upheaval. In May, 1725, she and another Wells native, Aaron Littlefield, received a permit from the French government to visit New England and *"voir ses parents et régler ses affaires domestiques"* ("see their parents and put their personal affairs in order").[11] They traveled with Madame Lestage (the former Esther Sayward of York; Mary Plaisted's younger daughter), and Jean-Baptiste Dagueil, sergeant in François Dauphin de La Forest's company and an experienced emissary for New France to neighboring English colonies. Dagueil was also the husband of Priscilla Storer, who was now herself a naturalized French subject and the mother of numerous children. [12]

Mary, who in Catholic baptism and marriage in New France had become Marie St. Germaine, used her time in New England to visit her parents and siblings, including her younger brothers, Ebenezer and Seth. Her reminiscence of the visit indicates that she regarded these two men with particular affection. The eldest daughter still living with her parents at the time of her capture, she undoubtedly had cared for these brothers when they

---

[11] 05/05/1725, Registre des congés, 1721-1726, MG8–C8, 2:526-531, NAC.

[12] The year before he accompanied his kinswomen, Dagueil had been entrusted to carry letters between Governor Vaudreuil and New York governor John Schuyler related to intervening in Dummer's War. Schuyler to Vaudreuil, 21 November 1724, *DHSM,* 10: 233-4; *DCB,* 2: 213.

were little boys.[13] Mary could speak of her feelings with ease: unlike many New England captives, she retained a complete command of the English language.[14]

But memory worked both ways for Mary Storer. Her early years in New England had ended in a burst of frontier violence. Such bursts, however, had in actuality overshadowed her entire early life. The Wells of Mary Storer's childhood and adolescence was a challenging, often frightening, place for a child to live. When Mary was six, she undoubtedly witnessed the still-living victims of the Candlemas massacre stumble wounded, stunned and shattered into Wells to beg for help and shelter. Many took refuge in her family's garrison, where the general lack of privacy in most frontier homes meant that, in all likelihood, the little girl heard the survivors tell of their terrifying ordeals. Mary got a taste of this first hand when Wells itself was attacked four days later.[15] And she, along with everyone else, must have been severely disquieted when George Burroughs, the minister of Wells who was accused of witchcraft and horrible related crimes including the supernatural murder of two of his wives, was taken into custody at her family's garrison.[16]

Men with families to protect, like Joseph and Jeremiah Storer, both of whom were experienced Indian fighters, tried always to be prepared. [17] People like them were of

---

[13]Mary was the third of Joseph and Hannah Storer's daughters. *GDMNH*, 304, 665. Children of both sexes, sometimes as young as four, were charged with the responsibility of minding younger siblings. See Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650-1750* (New York: Knopf, 1982), 29, and *A Midwife's Tale: The life of Martha Ballard Based on Her Diary,* 1785-1812 (New York: Knopf, 1990), 243.

[14] Mary's command of English made an impression on a New Englander visitor to Montreal, the Reverend John Norton. In 1746, Mary and her brother-in-law Dagueil paid a call on the minister to inquire whether he knew Seth Storer (he did not). *NEC,* I: 419.

[15] Drake, *Border Wars of New England*, 71-2, 76–80.

[16] For the structure, proportions, and flexible uses of Maine's frontier garrison houses, see Edward Bourne, "Garrison Houses of York County," *Coll MeHS* ser. 1, 7: 114.

[17] *GDMNH,* 664-5.

critical importance, for with everything to the Eastward destroyed by 1696, Wells became New England's eastern frontier. As such, it was frequently a military zone, its population top heavy with soldiers but otherwise isolated from regular contact with other communities.[18] But these precautions somehow failed in the summer of 1703, when Wells was overwhelmed by French and Indian enemies. Samuel Penhallow noted that, though Wells had "valiantly stood its group both in the former and latter war," it had now "suffered great spoil, nor could it escape the loss of 39 that were killed or taken," including the Storers and some of their cousins.[19]

To Mary, the infiltration of the family compound and her own captivity must have impressed upon her that preparation, fighting skill, and zeal guaranteed nothing in the face of certain enemies. Security and stability were elusive in her Maine, but they were not in the centers of the northern French empire. The French community to which she was quickly ransomed appeared stable, safe and prosperous.

Mary landed in this contrasting environment in less than six months. As with most Mainers, the Storers' captor-surrogates were French rather than Native American. Nothing is known of the cousins' time among the Wabanakis, except that it was relatively brief.[20] Their formative years were therefore spent among the French, and it was among the French that the acculturation process clearly took its shape.

---

[18] Clark, *The Eastern Frontier*, 67-8.

[19] Penhallow, *The History of the Wars of New England with the Eastern Indians*, 18.

[20] *NEC,* I: 414. None of the Storer women spent more than two-and-a-half years among the Wabanakis, and possibly much less. Mary was redeemed some time before her baptism on February 25th, 1704 (New Style). For example, Mary Storer's Native American captivity lasted for at most six months, which meant that her marriageable years were spent almost exclusively in New France. This is not surprising, given the fact, as Evan Haefeli has demonstrated, that conditions between the French and their Native American allies were shifting during Queen Anne's War to favor French captivity over Native adoption. Consistent with this new policy, which included payments of money or gifts to Native American captors to relinquish their prizes quickly, Haefeli, "Ransoming," 118. This was the ideal, though not always the case. Esther

Mary in particular had the good fortune to be ransomed by Pierre Boucher, master of one of the most prosperous *seigneuries* in all of Canada.[21] Like other elite *canadiens,* Boucher took a particular interest in New England captives, as did his family. It was Boucher's son, Jean-Baptiste Boucher de Niverville, who became her godfather when she was baptized by the ubiquitous Père Meriel in February, 1704.[22] Members of the Boucher family, including the seigneur Pierre, attended Mary's wedding four years later. Her spouse, Jean Gaulthier *dit* St. Germaine, was a prosperous young Boucherville farmer with connections to the seigneurial family.[23]

Clearly, this particular captive was guided through the decisions of adulthood, at least in part, by an elite, established *canadien* family whose affluence and prestige afforded her connections to colonial elites, and perhaps most importantly, that all-elusive physical security. Children quickly followed her marriage to Gaulthier, and the couple continued to prosper in the material sense as well. By 1725, a Storer family acquaintance

---

Wheelwright of Wells spent six years among the Wabanakis of Norridgewock; many captives of Deerfield, Massachusetts spent years, and in a few cases, the remainder of their lives, among the various Native American groups who had established villages in the Saint Lawrence Valley. See also Haefeli and Sweeney, *Captors and Captives*, Chapter 8, passim.

[21] Pierre Boucher ransomed at least three Maine captives: Mary Storer, Martha Grant of Salmon Falls, and Sarah Randall Cole of Saco. Sarah and Martha were both older when taken and were used as house servants until they were redeemed. Martha was baptized and actively engaged in the Catholic Church until she was returned; Sarah's religious activities in New France are unknown, though her two daughters did convert, and one married in New France. *NEC,* I:184-7; II:13-15.

[22] *NEC,* I: 414.

[23] There were also several powerful merchants in nearby Montreal who had the Gaulthier name. Ironically, several of them had been Huguenots before abjuring their faith as the price for settling in New France. Though Jean Gauthier *dit* Saint-Germaine has not been linked to these families through any of the standard family sources, it is possible that Mary was not the first birth Protestant of his intimate acquaintance. Jetté, *Dictionnaire généalogique,* 475, *NEC* I: 415-16.

and ex-captive himself, Theodore Atkinson, had visited Montreal and seen Mary, whom, he noted, was "very well marryed … & Lives very Grandly."[24]

Shortly thereafter, this unredeemed captive returned home to Maine. Her month in New England included visits to her parents and siblings, including her two younger brothers, Ebenezer and Seth. Her subsequent letters to them suggest that the Maine Storers embraced her, but they also worked on her, encouraging her to return to New England and the bosom of her birth family, demonstrating that, at least for this family, a fully-acculturated *canadienne* was deeply-flawed person who had to be retooled before she could reenter the family fold.

This is ironic, considering Mary's life course bore striking similarities both to those of her brothers and those expected of daughter of a family such as her own. She was therefore far from unrecognizable. Mary, Ebenezer and Seth all enjoyed more worldly success and security away from Wells than they probably would have enjoyed if they had stayed there. Ebenezer had become a Boston merchant. Seth entered the ministry. Mary, of course, had her aforementioned brilliant marriage into an affluent and well-connected family.

And though Mary's transition to a more prosperous situation was involuntary, it did, like those of Ebenezer and Seth, follow an established pattern of migration that took their generation out of the Province of Maine in the direction of more established seats of

---

[24] Qtd. in *NEC,* I: 415. This observation was made by Theodore Atkinson, a Portsmouth merchant who was taken captive in the Candlemas raid on York and redeemed several days later at Sagadahoc. Though lacking in specific details about Mary's life, Atkinson's observation is nonetheless valuable: as one of the wealthiest merchants in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, he was a capable judge of what "living very grandly" entailed. Clark, *The Eastern Frontier*, 260.

colonial power.[25] Like many of his peers, Ebenezer pursued his fortune not from the Eastward province but from Massachusetts proper. He left Maine to attend Harvard and saw better opportunities in building Boston-based connections for exporting his home province's indigenous goods into the wider Atlantic World.[26] And there he stayed and, like his sister, lived very grandly himself by turning a handsome profit on his home province's bountiful resources. Ebenezer married Mary Edwards in 1723, and with her had eight children. He built a large home in the center of Boston, complete with extensive gardens. Family portraits by John Singleton Copley proclaim the refinement that this generation of Storers had been able to purchase with gains from the raw materials that Maine produced for wider markets.[27] All this was a far cry from his birth origins – in the crude confines of Saco Fort – where the family had fled under threat of violence in the last year of King William's War.[28] In addition to acquiring worldly wealth, Ebenezer eagerly sought civic and spiritual riches. He served as a justice of the peace, overseer of the poor and church warden. When he died in 1761, Ebenezer was publicly remembered for his "kindness, charity, and devotion to good works."[29]

---

[25] Ebenezer Storer followed the path of other promising young men out of Maine and neighboring New Hampshire. His contemporaries in these ventures included Wheelwright cousins, as well as members of the Plaisted and Shapleigh families. *GDMNH,* 560, 624, 744.

[26] Clifford K. Shipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1933-), 4: 412-13; *GDMNH*, 665.

[27] The Copley portraits of Ebenezer Storer, his wife Mary Edwards, and their children Ebenezer II and Mary Green Edwards hang in the American Wing of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Ebenezer Sr.'s religious preferences are alluded to in the style of his clothes which, though clearly well-made of costly fabrics, were relatively plain in contrast to those of many of his peers, who were also painted by Copley. He and his son were also wigless, an indication, at least in Sr.'s case, that he sided with religious conservatives who saw in periwigs and other finery the demise of religious devotion and appropriate comportment during the first half of the seventeenth century. Carrie Rebora et all, *John Singleton Copley in America* (New York: Harry Abrams, 1996), 154, 243.

[28] *GDMNH*, 665.

[29] Shipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, 12:208.

Taking his cue from his brother, Seth too left Maine and enrolled at Harvard, and remained in Massachusetts for the rest of his life. At twenty-five he was ordained to the comfortable pulpit of Watertown, where he served as minister for fifty years.[30] In 1734, he married Mary Coney, with whom he led a comfortable life. His parishioners valued his skills as a mediator, which were amply tested in local disputes. The sole controversial moment of his career was when he publicly refused to invite George Whitefield to speak in his church, preferring instead the stern stability of Old Light religion to New Light's emotionalism.[31]

Mary's trajectory into the responsibilities of adulthood was, in many ways, conventional and consistent with the best hopes for her counterparts back home. She became a wife and mother and an engaged church member with a thriving household to manage.[32] As her husband would later attest, Mary was a perfect helpmeet and made their home a "*ménage des anges*" ("angelic household").[33] God had smiled on the fortunes of these Storers, and provided them with the stability that had eluded them during their early lives. They had all fulfilled best expectations for their futures. But Mary's success came at the expense of a Protestant, New England soul. As post-visit correspondence between the unredeemed captive and her family demonstrates, the differences wrought by this fact were unsettling to all involved, and bordered on insurmountable. And though they did not result in outright rejection, they did leave

---

[30] Ibid.; *GDMNH,* 665.

[31] Shipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, 6: 412-3; *GDMNH,* 665.

[32] Mary gave birth to nine children, five of whom lived to adulthood. She served as godmother for a number of her cousin Priscilla's children. *NEC* I: 414-5, 423.

[33] Jean Gaulthier ["JG"] to Ebenezer Storer ["ES"], 20 mars 1748. Mary Storer Papers, MHS.

Mary's family with the task of assigning a role to her, suitable both to the gravity of her own perilous spiritual state and appropriate for their own comfort.

Subsequent correspondence among the siblings hints at these complexities. After six weeks in home, Mary returned to Canada via the Champlain-Hudson Corridor.[34] While in Newport awaiting the next leg of her journey, Mary composed a series of letters to her newly-reconnected family members. The content of these missives suggests that religion was a common topic of discussion between the Storers and their unredeemed captive. Apparently Seth Storer, the family minister, was either deputized by the family or willingly assumed the task of winning his errant sister back to Protestantism. His arguments provided food for thought and succeeded in leaving the captive with a good deal of spiritual discomfort. From Rhode Island, Mary wrote of these effects to her mind and soul:

> I had but litel time with you who I thought woulde show and teach me more then eney bodey sir but what you have saide to me I will not for gett it and I hope god will in able me in all my afflictions and that it may be for the best and good of my soule deare brother doe not for get me in youre prayers which I hope will be a counfort to me and what eure paines and trouble I have and shall have in all my jorney … I hope god will have merce on me and help me.[35]

Clearly, Mary was moved – but not enough to come back to stay. One historian reduced her decision to a simple hedged bet, arguing "[Seth] was at a hopeless disadvantage in this matter, for, as a Puritan, he had to admit that sect alone was no bar to

---

[34]This route was most certainly familiar to Priscilla's Storer's husband, Jean-Baptiste Dagueil, who had traveled it numerous times as an emissary and negotiator between New France and its English neighbors, a role he continued to play through Dummer's War. Ironically, it was Dagueil who carried peace overtures to New York from the French government during the latter conflict. John Schuyler reported to William Dummer that he had had "some descours with the said Daguiell Concerning ye warrs between between New England and ye Indians." Schuyer to Dummer, 21 November 1724, *DHSM,* 10:234.

[35] Mary Storer Saint Germaine ["MS"] to Seth Storer ["SS"], 28 June 1725. Mary Storer Papers, MHS, Boston, MA.

salvation, but Mary had learned in Canada that heresy was automatic damnation. Naturally she played it safe."[36]

But in reality, Mary had little choice but to remain a Catholic, or at least to continue to conform to the religion of the colony she now called home. To reconvert to Protestantism would have meant leaving home, spouse, and children, as well as the security of a comfortable existence in New France and to live among people who were beloved, yet still strangers. Given Mary's comfortable situation in life, as well as her status as an eighteenth-century woman, it was better to be a wife and mother than sister and daughter. Her life in Canada and its required ties to Catholicism were perhaps more binding than any of her New England relations could admit.

Seth was not the only Storer to use theological arguments to convince Mary to return to New England while she had the opportunity. A month after her Newport letter to Seth, Mary wrote to Ebenezer "deare brother I remember what you have saide to me I thanke you and all that has spoek for my goode," indicating that the Storers collectively viewed Mary's good as, first and foremost, coming home.[37]

Seth did not give up so easily. He gave his sister a memento of their conversations – an unidentified pious Protestant book – and urged her to continue to contemplate its lessons on her own. The minister-brother probably hoped that this permanent artifact would provide a more consistent form of religious instruction than an episodic French Mass. Thanking him, Mary reassured Seth that the book "will be for my good."[38]

---

[36] Shipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates*, 6:413.

[37] MS to ES, 13 July 1725. Mary Storer Papers, MHS.

[38] MS to ES, 26 June 1725. Ibid.

"For my good." The phrase appears consistently in Mary's letters to her brothers. She wanted to reassure them that their arguments for her well-being were valid and strong. Yet she also defied them in persisting with her own life course. Placed her squarely between her Catholic present and Protestant past, the best Mary could do was reiterate her gratitude for their caring and welcome their prayers for the good of her soul – even if these prayers came from those who professed , by Catholic standards, Calvinist heresies.[39]

Ebenezer tried an additional method to reintegrate his sister into the Storer family. Theological arguments might win one soul, but Mary had children who were also potential converts. During the visit, the siblings had discussed Mary sending at least one of her sons to live with her brother and engage in his business. A New England connection of this caliber would have been a good one for the Gaulthiers. But such an arrangement would have put the Protestant brother in charge of the nephew's soul as well as his body, guaranteeing that the boy had at least some exposure to the Protestantism that his mother had sadly lost. One generation might be lost due to circumstances beyond Storer family control, but the next could be worked on.

The next generation was used in another way to knit Mary closely to her family. Ebenezer's third child, a daughter, was born during Mary's visit, and the newborn was named in the unredeemed captive's honor. Mary was clearly flattered: subsequent letters refer lovingly to "little cosine mary who is my name sake." Her hope for the parents, to

---

[39] MS to SS, 28 June 1725; MS to ES, 29 June 1725. Ibid.

"have the comfort to see her a woman grone" is poignantly reminiscent of her own lost years.[40]

Theological and intergenerational ties aside, Mary went against family assertions that were "for her good." She returned to Canada – to her marriage to a stranger to her family, to Catholicism, to her persona as Marie St. Germaine. In short, she once again became a stranger. And though Mary had proven to be a good French subject by obeying the terms of her *pérmis*, she never applied for additional visiting privileges. Storer family hopes for redeeming part of Mary's line suffered a setback in 1727, when Mary wrote to Ebenezer that the promised son was "not willing to goe from us."[41]

But the true challenge to recognizing and embracing this sister – equal in all worldly ways - came with the death of Joseph Storer, the family patriarch, in the winter of 1729/30. When Joseph made a will in 1721, he virtually disinherited Mary, leaving her a mere ten shillings, or 1/100th of the patrimony that was promised to her other sisters, if she refused to come home.[42] Return, however, would bring full recognition – the same £50 promised to her New England sisters. In the intervening years between the creation of his will and his death, Joseph had seen his daughter again, spoken to her, and undoubtedly learned about the life that kept her bound to Canada. Whether unmoved or simply forgetful, Joseph Storer did not change his will as a result of becoming reacquainted with his daughter.

---

[40] MS to ES, 29 June 1725. Ibid.

[41] MS to ES, 17 July 1727. Ibid. Placing children out to work in the households of other families, particularly in those of extended kin, was a common practice in early New England. In *The Puritan Family,* Edmund Morgan posits that Puritan parents "did not trust themselves with their own children, that they were afraid of spoiling them by too great affection." Laurel Thatcher Ulrich concurs in *A Midwife's Tale: The Life of Martha Ballard Based on Her Diary, 1785-1812* (New York: Knopf, 1990), and discusses the gendered aspects of this system. Morgan, *The Puritan Family,* 75-8; Ulrich, *A Midwife's Tale*, 81.

[42] William A. Sargent, *Maine Wills 1640-1760* (Portland, ME: Thurston Brown & Co., 1887), 306.

After he died, however, Mary made it clear that she felt entitled to the patrimony of £50.[43] And it was over this issue that the hope of return inspired by the 1725 visit was officially foreclosed. Mary Storer St. Germaine and her French family were worthy of recognition through correspondence, but not the more tangible form New England Protestants provided for their good children - patrimony.

The gatekeeper to this higher form of recognition was none other than Ebenezer. Sticking to a strict interpretation of Joseph's will, he refused to give her the £50. This surprised and angered Mary. She countered her claim in a letter to her brother, asserting "We are al the same blode you can not denie it."[44] She then took her case to their mother Hannah: "my brother Ebenezer wright to me that my deare father maide his will that I may be equall to my sisters you may belive my deare mother why I am far frome you and my deare familie I belive that is for me who is youre one childe."[45] Perhaps Hannah tried to intervene, but Ebenezer remained unmoved. Months later he reiterated to his sister, "I … will do any thing yt is proper if it be not against ye will of our Father."[46]

Certainly Ebenezer respected the wishes and judgment of his father. Furthermore, the terms of wills were not easily – or legally - ignored. But Mary's physical separation from her family meant that she never had to know the terms of the will. Ebenezer had the means to supply the money – provided he wanted to make his sister feel invested as an equal with the rest of her sisters. But he clearly did not. Instead, he used the will controversy as an opportunity to demonstrate to the unredeemed captive that he

---

[43] Malcolm Storer described his ancestor as "the wealthiest man in Wells." His estate was valued at £1,481. Storer, *Annals of the Storer Family*, 36; *GDMNH,* 665.

[44] MS to ES, 19 April 1733. Mary Storer Papers, MHS

[45] MS to Hannah Hill Storer, April 1733. Ibid.

[46] ES to MS, 24 May 1733. Ibid.

concurred with the judgment of the rejected father. Mary's value as a Storer was materially diminished by her unredeemed status. Her persistent disobedience throughout her adulthood, her refusal to take her brothers' advice "for her good," rendered her a less valued family member, despite her status as a respectable and well-regarded member of her adopted culture that technically put her on par with her New England brothers.

In contrast, Mary's push to receive her portion of Joseph's will seems less about the money than about the complete and equal recognition - of her marriage, of her status within the Storer clan, of her entire adult experience, of love and charity implicit in the gift – that such a bequest would have implied. Gone too would have been any stain of self-marriage and disobedience. But given the persistence of the person of "Marie St. Germaine," even in the face of personal contact, arguments, and letters, it was perhaps asking for more understanding than the Maine Storers were capable of giving. She was forced to settle for polite discourse and loosely-construed filial love and friendship.[47]

When Mary herself died in 1747, her *canadien* husband, Jean Gauthier, relayed the sad news to her New England kin. Gaulthier told Ebenezer that his sister had died "*en parfaite chretienne*" ("in a perfect Christian manner").[48] This observation must have been galling to Ebenezer, whose own idea of Christian perfection included rejecting false religions and obeying one's parents. Subsequent communications from Jean Gaulthier indicate that Ebenezer was a less than enthusiastic correspondent. The brother had little

---

[47] After the inheritance controversy, the correspondence between siblings apparently decreased in both volume and frequency. One letter in particular, in which Mary tells that she lost one of her sons "about a year ago," speaks of lengthy gaps between missives.

[48] JG to ES, 20 mars 1748. Mary Storer Papers, MHS.

interest in hearing the Frenchman assert that it was God himself who had handed Mary, his "*une des meilleur femme du Monde,*" over to the French.[49]

In life, Mary Storer St. Germaine failed to conform to Protestant expectations of embracing true religion and obedience to one's parents. The transgressions of religion and self-marriage placed her in a category of family relations that constituted neither acceptance nor rejection, but something in between. Catholics and Protestants continued to encounter each other throughout Maine's colonial period thanks to captive conversion and self-marriages, but their modes and byproducts of contact demonstrate that contact did not lead to comprehensive accommodation or understanding.

Self-marriage was a deeply serious sin. The unions it created split families to be sure, but there were other factors, more deeply rooted in the prerogatives of Protestant parenthood, that made them not only undesirable in terms of family connections, but offensive in the sight of God. In New England, the family was a primary vessel of religious culture and the paramount social unit of the community. Puritans in particular regarded this status as ordained by God. [50] Family was therefore the single most important bridge between religion and society, and the structure of its relationships was considered analogous to God's omnipotence over all living things. Parents claimed from their children the same pair of emotional responses that all Puritans in turn were expected to give to God, love and fear.[51] Even though many Mainers were not orthodox Puritans, elements of the classically-Puritan conflation of family as a dispenser of religious

---

[49] Ibid.

[50] Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, 18.

[51] Greven, *The Protestant Temperament,* 21; David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), 241.

experience – in both private devotions and public worship – appear also in other Protestant denominations, including Quakerism and Anglicanism.[52]

But when Protestant family bonds transcended borders and cultures, the immediacy of fear was lost. Parents' efforts to compel or control their children to live good lives in accordance with Protestant principles were thwarted by distance, inaccessibility, and new kinships (voluntary and involuntary) that captives formed within captor society. Thus for Mainers, it was not just "turning papist" but "staying papist" that was synonymous with abdicating every right that every Protestants enjoyed.

Yet few New England families appear to have been fully aware of the extremely complex world in which Canadian captives found themselves, and how this led to the acceptance of new religion and creation of new kinship ties. Little is known of the processes, decisions or interactions that created Marie St. Germaine out of the former Mary Storer. Much more is known about the process that led her cousin Rachel to the altar and beyond. The details of her experience illustrate the potential range of choices, hazards, and in some cases evident manipulations that each captive faced as he or she approached marriageable age. Thus, what was perceived as self-marriage in the English colonies was in actuality a phenomenon that had far-reaching consequences, and touched more institutions than family and church. In short, marriage in New France was as much about a comprehensive cultural encounter as it was about beginning life with a new partner. Captives did not always choose marriage. But even when they did, it was still a process within a process, one which included conversion, acculturation, and the painful

---

[52] Greven, 257.

realization that waiting for redemption meant that they might foreclose forever the possibility of becoming spouses and parents themselves.

For very young captives in New France, these cumulative processes started almost immediately. Because many Maine captives were young children when taken, they were the easiest targets for cultural and religious conversion. Unlike older captives, they knew little or nothing of New England and their birth families. And, though in the eyes of the law and the church, *canadien* families were technically structured no differently than their New England counterparts, French custom and tradition and the added layer of New World encounter resulted in different forms of parenting in New France.[53] Diverse European observers from the Jesuit Charlevoix to the Protestant Peter Kalm observed the New World French raising their children "in the manner of the savages," giving them wide latitude and personal freedom.[54] Ironically, captive children had a wider range of personal freedoms than they would have enjoyed New England freedom, and they apparently took advantage of them. Captor-surrogates did their duty to the colony by supplanting the captive's love for his or her biological parents with an attachment to their new surroundings.[55]

---

[53] As in New England, religious and civil authorities in New France were clear in their beliefs, as well as in their laws, that fathers were undisputed heads of family units, and children were bound by God, law and tradition to acquiesce to the authority of both parents. See Chapter Six of John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (New York: Oxford, 1970), passim, and Chapter Three of Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, passim.

[54] Church authorities and observers of French Canada noted with chagrin the absence of strong parental authority in New France. Speaking of *Canadien* children, Charlevoix noted "There is one thing with respect to which [family relations] they are not easily to be excused, and that is the little natural affection most of them shew to their parents, who for their part display a tenderness for them, which is not extremely well-managed. The Indians fall into the same defect." Pierre F-X de Charlevoix, *Journal of a Voyage to North-America* (London: J. Doddsley, 1761), I: 267.

[55] Sweeney and Haefeli, *Captors and Captives*, 157-8.

Catholic clergy resorted to these means as well. This practice appalled Deerfield's Reverend John Williams. According to Williams, these celibates had lost the God-given authority to claim parental love and fear, yet they persisted in claiming for themselves the same rights as birth parents to shape lives and determine "callings" for children of all ages and backgrounds.[56] Williams was even more scandalized at the thought that "calling" could pull Protestant-born children into Catholic holy orders. It was known to happen: Wells captive Esther Wheelwright and her cousin Mary Sayward pursued "callings" that led them to a celibate religious life. So did at least six other young women from various corners of New England.

With every day lost in New France, the critical elements of the life courses of captive children and youths were developing far beyond the reach of their parents. This was often happening at the very time of life when those parents would be molding their child into a "calling" and providing the central role model for him or her.[57] But despite the usurpations of the French, captive children who were returned to their birth parents could undergo complete redemption. The situation changed, however, if the young captive married in captivity. This created the most serious impediment to redemption.

Unlike baptism, marriage was more than a spiritual "gift" conferred upon an individual: it was an arrangement between people who had reached a certain level of maturity. It involved sex, children, property, legal identity and status. It had the power

---

[56] In his drive to counteract the effects that the priestly authority of Père Meriel was having over his son Samuel, John Williams wrote to the boy, "Was Mr. Meriel a God, a Christ? Could he bear to hear such words and not reject them, replying 'Don't commit your soul into my hands, but see that you commit your soul into the hands of God through Jesus Christ, and do whatever God commands you in his holy word. As for me, I am a creature, and cannot save your soul…" *The Redeemed Captive*, 67.

[57] Morgan, *The Puritan Family*, 67.

to create new families. It was recognized throughout New England as valid, even if it had been conferred in a Catholic church.[58]

Though Protestants could scoff at these sacraments as mere idolatrous rituals, the consequences they wrought could not easily be undone. While historical records are silent on their inner deliberations, evidence suggests that some Maine captives might have eventually concluded that home had given up on *them*, and thus felt liberated to seek opportunities for fulfilling adult relationships elsewhere. Older captives like Mary and Rachel Storer, who would have witnessed the return, or lack thereof, of captive neighbors from King William's War, would have known from that experience that not all captives were fortunate enough to come home again. Even so, evidence suggests that captives (at least those who had choices) deliberately postponed marriage to keep hope for redemption alive and resist a higher level of commitment to the captor colony. When they did relent to love or pressure, they tended to be older than their *canadien* counterparts. Allan Greer has demonstrated that the average age for first marriages among *canadiens* in the first half of the eighteenth century was well below twenty-two. In contrast, Mary Storer was twenty-four and had lived in Boucherville for five years before she married Jean Gaulthier *dit* Saint Germaine. Mary Austin had lived in New France for more than a decade, and Hester Sayward almost two, before they committed to sacramental marriage. The women were twenty-six and twenty-seven, respectively, at the time of these marriages.[59] Mary Scammon, a Dummer's War captive, married for the

---

[58] David Hall asserts that, though Protestantism dismantled much of the old Catholic world of ritual, it reemerged within Protestant communities, in particular in the celebration of sacraments that predated the Reformation. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment,* 19; Charles Hambrick-Stowe discusses the pan-Christian applications of sacrament in *The Practice of Piety,* 123.

[59] *NEC,* I: 243; II: 148.

first time, and brilliantly as well, shortly before her thirtieth birthday, and after more than a decade of life in the Ursuline convent at Trois-Rivières.[60]

To some, these marriages brought rewards. Most captives (in marriage, ex-captives) seemed to have been content with their self-marriages. They lived in comfort; their children were numerous. The prospect of "living grandly" in the Maine that Mary had left behind as a teenager had simply not existed. Nor did it exist in adulthood for her four sisters, all but one of whom continued to live in the settlements to the Eastward.[61] Mary Storer was not the only lucky one: Mary Scammon of Saco and Hester Sayward of York became Madame de Tonnecouer and Madame Lestage, respectively and were propelled into the highest social strata of Canadian society.

Even captives from less respectable backgrounds could flourish with fresh connections in New France. Consider the case of York captive Barsheba Webber, who clearly came from a troubled family. Barsheba's mother was punished for public drunkenness, her brother for profaning the Sabbath, and her sister for fornication, bastardy, and falsely accusing a man of fathering her child – all in the course of one year.[62] But Barsheba's captivity wiped clean the taint of association with this disreputable clan. She married Joseph Saleur, a *bourgeois*, in 1714 and bore four sons. Materially and socially, this was a good marriage for young woman from an unsavory clan, who might have been shunned by more respectable suitors had she never been taken captive.

---

[60] *NEC*, II: 147.

[61] Her sisters were Hannah (m. Joseph Hammond, Kittery), Sarah (m. Ebenezer Coburn, York), Abigail (m. Joseph Littlefield, Wells), and Keziah (m. Benjamin Plummer, Essex County, MA). *GDMNH,* 665.

[62] *MCPR,* IV: 197, 208-9.

These marriages seemed to have worked particularly well, for both captive and colony, when one partner had standing in the society. As James Axtell notes, their successes were powerful instruments of pro-French propaganda.[63] But Canadian society's own complexities worked against absolute control. In truth, it was Mary Storer's cousin Rachel, not Mary herself, who engaged in a more clear-cut form of self-marriage. Mary had powerful protectors in New France; Rachel at first did not, and it took a potentially embarrassing crisis to procure them for her. The lack of oversight governing Rachel (she was seventeen when abducted) left her to her own devices. And the young girl made seemingly poor choices: she cast her romantic lot with a French-born soldier name Jean Berger, who like his paramour was an immigrant and, like other low-level military men, was bereft of family ties, making him something of an outsider in Canadian society. Jean at very least dallied with Rachel, but he did not immediately commit to marrying her. This created a potentially embarrassing situation for the French, for it stood to expose the colony's assertions that New Englanders had adopted "true religion" over heresy of their own accord. To combat the accusation that captives were neither recipients of particular spiritual care, nor allowed to choose their futures freely, someone who had an investment in the colony's honor took action, disregarding Rachel's happiness for the greater good and glory of New France – and, by extension, his own reputation and career. In the end, Rachel Storer married Jean Berger, who may or may not have been willing. She endured several crises within this marriage. But ultimately, the troubled marriage became the means of her salvation. In the tangled history of

---

[63] Taking captives served an additional purpose: it added more warm bodies to the underpopulated French colonies. Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 287.

borderland relations and politics, happy endings could be affected by turns of events that no one could anticipate.

At first glance, Rachel's partner appeared respectable. Jean Berger was born in Lyons in 1681. As a teen, he enlisted as a soldier and was sent to New France around 1700.[64] This was a common trajectory for males emigrating to New France: soldiers composed 30.5 percent of the entire immigrant pool to come to Canada during the French period, and represented the largest single category by occupation.[65] He was in Quebec in 1706 when he married Rachel (now known as Marie-Françoise), and was living with her in Montreal, trying to find work as a painter, by 1707. This was an unusual choice for a choice for an ex-soldier. Most of his comrades either returned to France or turned to farming when their enlistments were up.[66] Jean's talents were sufficient, however, to net him several commissions. His work decorates the altar frontal of the church of La Sainte-Famille in on Île d'Orléans to this day. And in contrast to Mary's husband, Jean Gaulthier, who tried to engage his New England family, Jean Berger helped celebrate Canadian victories over the English when he painted portraits of the Hertel brothers, two members of the famed military family whose participation in the Salmon Falls and Deerfield, Massachusetts raids made them notorious figures to the English. [67]

---

[64] In *Frenchman into Peasants,* Leslie Choquette notes that many young men ended up in New France thanks to the efforts of military recruiters. Called *racoleurs*, these recruiters joined in the efforts to built the ranks of the French colonial military with civilian counterparts. Many were working against French Canada's unattractive reputation and, as stated above, provided enlisted men who rarely committed to life in the colony after their military service was through. Choquette, *Frenchmen into Peasants: Modernity and Tradition in the Peopling of French Canada* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1997), 123.

[65] Ibid., 113.

[66] Ibid., 19, 21.

[67] Jean-Baptiste Hertel was the architect on raids on Salmon Falls and Deerfield during Queen Anne's War. His older brother, Zacharie-François, led the French contingent of the Salmon Falls attack of 1690. Both portraits are in the collections of the McCord Museum of Art of McGill University in Montreal. *DCB,* II:54; "Fonds des Ordonnances des Intendants," 1:27-28, NAC.

By 1707, these two immigrants to New France appeared on the surface to have found their bearings: Rachel in her marriage, Jean in his marriage and profession. But they were not conventional settlers. The events that led to their union were the stuff of nightmares for proper Puritans and Catholics alike. In an attempt to preserve her (and their) honor, the Catholics who had access to Rachel Storer finally took a firmer hand in steering her choices. The end result, however, was an example of the manipulations that all New Englanders feared governed the life choices of their captive children. And if all children were subject to these manipulations, why would they resist coming home when they had the opportunity?

If they had both remained in New England, it would have been Rachel Storer who had made more errors in judgment than her cousin Mary. She had, after all, most likely engaged in some activity that both put her virtue at risk and brought attention to her actions. But coming back home could rectify many of these errors in judgment. Technically, New England parents were not without recourse to break the bond of any sacrament, even marriage. Under Massachusetts law, they had the power to sue for divorce for daughters who found themselves in undesirable matches.[68] Baptism was even easier to undo. The captives who returned to New England with Mathew Cary in 1695 alone were compelling evidence: at least four out of fourteen who made the journey with Cary had been taken into the Church of Rome but realigned themselves with family and Protestantism upon their return.[69] As has been frequently noted, sacraments of any kind conferred on captives could be dismissed as pragmatic acts or transient phases that

---

[68] Edmund Morgan notes that marriages could be dissolved by a wife's parents if a groom failed to meet the conditions they had set on the marriage. Morgan, *The Puritan Family,* 83.

[69] The baptized but redeemed Mainers were Mehitable Goodwin, Elizabeth Tozier, Mary Cooper, and Mary Plaisted. *NEC,* I:186, 194, 232, 237,

smacked of duress.[70] Narratives like John Williams's *Redeemed Captive Returned to Zion*, which described beatings and other abusive treatment toward captives who did not comply with religious demands, reinforced this belief, and therefore added grist that could be used to deny the validity of these unions.[71]

As reported by John Williams, it was Rachel Storer herself who was the architect of her own unhappy circumstances. During his 1706 mission to redeem captives, Williams was tracked down by the captive and told, from her perspective, how she had been "debauched, and then in twenty-four hours of time published, taken into their communion, and married; but the poor soul has had time since to lament her sin and folly, with a bitter cry; and asks your prayers, that God of his sovereign grace would yet bring her out of the horrible pit into which she has thrown herself. Her name was Rachel Storer, of Wells."[72]

Already bemoaning the seduction of popery and its affects on young captives (including his own son and daughter), Williams was primed to hear the message. He reported grimly that "such were sent away who were ungainable, the most of the younger sort still kept. Some still flattered with promises of reward, and essays were made to get

---

[70] Vaughan and Richter assert that "well-intentioned Canadian priests and nuns exerted effective if not always admirable pressures, especially on impressionable younger captives, to convert to Catholicism" – one of the primary reasons, along with gratitude and comfort, that drove New Englanders to accept Catholic sacraments. Vaughan and Richter, "Crossing the Cultural Divide," 85.

[71] John Williams complained that the "adversaries did what they could to seduce our young ones to Popery. Such were sent away who were ungainable, but most of the younger sort still kept. Some still flattered with promises of reward, and essays were made to get others married among them." Williams, *The Redeemed Captive*, 83.

[72] Ibid.

others married to them."[73] Rachel's story was consistent with everything he already suspected about captive conversion.

What had made Rachel's life a "pit of hell?" Undoubtedly to Williams, her conversion to Catholicism was the source of this damnation. But he might have had her worldly, married state in mind as well. Evidence argues that Rachel's "debauch" had been literal as well as figurative.

Throughout *The Redeemed Captive,* Williams couched Catholic conversion techniques in sexual terms and linked the loss of true religion to the loss of innocence in general. At least one scholar has also interpreted the use of "debauch" in this light.[74] Others, however, apply a literal understanding, interpreting from Williams's passage that the event referred to sexual contact of some sort, perhaps against Rachel's will, and that she was quickly married off to avoid scandal and hide the potential byproduct of such a violation.[75]

Several additional factors indicate Rachel's debauching was not just away from Protestantism, but from virtue as well – an event that might not have happened under the watchful eye of New England parents. For one, Rachel was nineteen when married: below average for French brides and as discussed before, considerably younger than most Maine captives.[76] In addition, and more importantly, the wedding was clearly expedited.

---

[73] Ibid.

[74] *NEC,* I: 423.

[75] Haefeli and Sweeney also argue for a literal interpretation of the term "debauch," arguing that "some English women in French and Native communities do appear to have been tempted or pressured to marry or enter into sexual liaisons." *Captors and Captives*, 160.

[76] French Canada's underdeveloped population also contributed to the drive to create unions "with a minimum of impediments and delay." The average marital age for young women by 1740 was twenty-two. Allan Greer, *Peasant*, *Lord and Merchant: Rural Society in Three Quebec Parishes, 1740-1840* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 50-1.

Under normal circumstances, preparation for the Catholic sacrament of marriage required the public reading of marriage banns, a measure that was taken to ensure that both parties were indeed free to marry each other. In a place like New France, where bigamy was difficult to detect and could lead to a host of unwelcome social problems if not clearly checked, it fell to the Catholic Church to insist that preventive protocols were followed in all but the most extreme cases.[77] Normally, banns were read at High Mass on three successive Sundays with at least two or three days between publications. In Rachel and Jean's case, however, the prospective bride's baptism and the marital rite took place within the span of two days – and the marriage was conducted with a complete dispensation of banns.[78] Furthermore, the marriage sacrament itself was conferred on April 17th, 1706, right before Williams and Stoddard arrived in Quebec. These rites, which completed Rachel's transformation from New England Protestant captive into a French Catholic *femme*, were performed at the very moment that Rachel's liberation was at hand. Williams was in Canada in the first place to "Treat about ye English Captives" and bring as many home as possible.[79] Few things could have inhibited a willing captive's return, but marriage was one of them, and thus was Williams robbed of his prize.

Perhaps the most important evidence for a literal debauch and the lengths to which the French would go to hide such an embarrassment concerns the laypeople who

---

[77] Scalberg, "Religious Life in New France Under the Laval and Saint Vallier Bishoprics," 236.

[78] Coleman, *NEC,* I:423-4. Though the publication of banns in New France was used primarily as protection against consanguinity, it is important to note that the period of time it took to publish all three of the banns was also meant to discourage polygamy, other impediments, and to create time for pastoral instruction on the responsibilities of the sacrament. Scalberg, "Religious Life in New France Under the Laval and Saint Vallier Bishoprics," 237-8.

[79] Williams and Sheldon were in Canada for almost six months, during which time they secured the redemption of twenty-six captives. Haefeli and Sweeney, *Captors and Captives*, 214.

presided over Rachel's sacramental transformation. Rachel's godfather at her Catholic baptism, signatory to her marriage contract, and witness at her wedding was Jacques Levasseur de Néré, captain, military engineer, and knight of the order of Saint-Louis.[80] Levasseur knew the groom, though he was unlikely to have been a friend: he had been Jean Berger's commanding officer before the latter left military service (in disgrace, as will soon be described).[81]

Why would Levasseur, a man of importance in a highly-stratified colonial society, play an active role in securing the marriage of a disgraced soldier to a prisoner of war? Evidence suggests that the captain's role was tied to the French colony's drive to reinforce its claims to the souls, and bodies, of converted captives. Levasseur's soldiers, for whom he had particular responsibility, were among the chief dangers that the virtue of any young woman, captive or not, faced in Canadian society. The presence of soldiers in New France's cities presented a special challenge to the colony's ideal moral order. Though they faced many challenges, officers, administrators, and even bishops struggled to keep these potentially unruly settlers in order. This included adopting a hard line on fornication and illegitimacy, two problems that plagued a colony full of soldiers. Saint-Vallier, Laval's successor as bishop of New France, issued frequent denunciations against military men who seduced young women using promises of marriage in exchange for sex. Believing the promises of marriage were sincere, the bishop claimed, young women were inclined to engage in premature acts of intimacy. The results were frequently impregnation and abandonment. Families were then charged with arranging for hasty marriages – to the often-unwilling seducer or to someone else - to preserve

---

[80] *DCB* II: 432, Coleman, *NEC,* I: 423-4.

[81] "Fonds des Ordonnances," 1:27-28, 40-41, NAC.

honor.[82] And Jean Berger had already proven himself to be part of this problem: a year before his marriage to Rachel, he had fathered an "*enfant naturel*" with Louise Boucher, the daughter of a local *habitant*.[83] Louise Boucher did not come from a background that required special consideration, but Rachel Storer certainly did. Levasseur's presence at the Catholic rites suggests the case was a matter of honor. A pregnant captive would have seriously challenged the colony's claims to the moral authority that protected these marriages.[84] To Jacques Levasseur de Néré, who was a freshly-minted knight of the order of Saint-Louis and deeply ambitious, such a *faux pas* would have brought shame to his regiment, and through it, himself.[85]

Thus far, Rachel's sacramental marriage to Jean Berger appears unique only in the sense that it was expedited. A young captive woman in a strange land met a soldier and fell for him. Knowing or suspecting a dalliance, people in power worked to marry the couple quickly and hide the captive's potential disgrace.

The hastily-contrived marriage also seemed to have done little damage to the poor captive. The union blessed and official, Rachel and Jean were free to move on with their lives together. If a sexual debauch was feared, it most likely failed to result in a full-

---

[82] Scalberg, "Religious Life in New France Under the Laval and Saint Vallier Bishoprics," 240-1.

[83] Jetté, *Dictionnaire généalogique*, 86. The problem of premarital pregnancies persisted in towns with transient populations, including those that had a significant military presence. For example, in his study of Sorel, a village on the outskirts of Montreal, Allan Greer demonstrates that premarital pregnancies peaked with Sorel's growing importance as a river community with ties to the interior fur trade. Its transient male population and garrisoned soldiers likely caused the spike. Greer, *Peasants, Lords and Merchants*, 60-2. For *habitant* immorality as one of the greatest social problems to plague New France, see Cornelius Jaenen, *The Role of the Church in New France* (Toronto: McGraw-Ryerson Ltd., 1976), 154-5.

[84] Axtell, *The Invasion Within,* 278.

[85] The Cross of Saint Louis was the highest recognition conferred for service to the French Crown; its recipients were officers whose "core values … were defined by honor and service to the king." Haefeli and Sweeney, *Captors and Captives,* 232, 237.

blown pregnancy: Rachel and Jean did not present a baby for baptism until more than a year after their marriage.[86] By this time, the couple had also moved to Montreal, where Rachel was reunited with her sister Priscilla and cousin Mary. Priscilla Storer even served as godmother to the aforementioned baby, Marie-Françoise.[87] Mary and Priscilla were connected to other New England captives as well, a common phenomenon that would have introduced their kinswoman to a broader network of displaced New Englanders.[88] In growing Montreal, Jean could also continue to pursue more work as a painter. The chances for finding such work had recently improved thanks to the recent death of Pierre Le Ber, Montreal's most prominent painter of religious themes.[89]

Thus the newlyweds stepped into a conventional world of family and work. Little seemed to preclude the possibility of a second Storer finding her own happiness and building her own *"ménage des anges*." But actually, there was. Jean Berger was, at very best, temperamental. At worst, he was violent, and possibly unstable. In addition, he had a talent for mischief and attracting the attention of New France's civil authorities that probably exceeded his talent for art. In short, he was a bad candidate as a son-in-law to parents on either side of the New England/Canada border. Yet it was into his power that Rachel Storer was cast, and, just as New England parents feared, sacrificed to fulfill agendas that were not her own. This daughter affected a bad self-marriage, and geography, law, and religion all conspired to keep her bound to it.

---

[86] This baby, Marie-Françoise, did not live long, nor did her little brother, who was born two years later. Rachel perhaps had had other pregnancies, but if she did, the children did not live long enough to be presented for baptism, which in New France usually happened within a month of birth. Jetté, *Dictionnaire généalogique,* 86.

[87] *NEC,* 1:424; *GDMNH,* 664.

[88] For a comprehensive discussion of networks of female captives, see Barbara Austen, "Captured … Never Came Back," passim.

[89] *DCB,* II. 377-8; Foster, *The Captor's Narrative*, 24-5.

Jean Berger's troubles had begun the year before he married Rachel Storer. In 1705, while still a soldier in the company of Levasseur de Néré in Quebec, he was apprehended for lending his artistic talents to Pendleton Fletcher and James Adams, Maine captives and one-time neighbors of the Storers who stood accused of counterfeiting card money.[90] Though Jean was later cleared of the charges, he spent time in prison and was also discharged from the army, which was at that time his sole means of support in the colony. The fortunate Fletcher and Adams were returned to New England while Jean was left to stew in jail.[91] By 1710, he had again tangled with the law, this time charged with severely beating a local apothecary, Claude Saint-Olive, in a street brawl. Though cleared of criminal activity (the events suggests self-defense), continued suspicion of his character suggests Jean had earned a reputation for unsavory behavior. He might have disappeared from the eyes of the law had he not chosen to publicly ridicule those who prosecuted him. But instead of going quietly away, Jean Berger composed a bitterly satirical song that slandered both the apothecary and the powerful "Gentleman of the law" who had prosecuted him.[92] He even further managed to distribute multiple copies of his song - quite a feat of determination considering New

---

[90] "Fonds des Ordonnances," 1:27-28. Card money was a rather informal form of currency devised by the military in Canada to meet its payroll before the arrival of a printing press in the colony. Playing cards were simply stamped with some official symbol and marked with the word "bon." A full card was worth four *livres*; half and quarter cards were worth forty and fifteen *sous,* respectively. *NEC,* I:408-9; Charlevoix, *Journal of a Voyage to North-America*, I:147.

[91] Though the Adamses had to leave their presumably sickly infant son behind in Quebec, the couple themselves had benefited enormously by James's willingness to do almost anything to escape New France, regardless of the potential penalty. Foster, *Captor's Narrative*, 137. For Catherine Adams, James's wife, marriage bound her to his fate, and his crimes in New France had the unlikely outcome of benefiting both of them. Vaudreuil could have sentenced them to death for such a crime, but instead he used the situation to his advantage, offering to return them and their families in exchange for French prisoners in Boston. Vaudreuil à Dudley, 6 février 1706. Qtd. in *NEC* I:400.

[92] *DCB* II: 377.

France had no printing press until some time after 1749.[93] Again he was arrested, again he appeared in court. But this time, Berger's luck ran out: he was ordered to pay fines to the king and the offended apothecary, and was banished, *with his wife*, from Montreal, where the couple had been living. Even in the face of this fearsome punishment, Berger was unable to hold his tongue or restrain his actions. He appealed, and did so – again - with doggerel and insult.[94] The authorities had had enough. Not only did they refuse the appeal, they upped the penalty. As a result, Berger was banishment from all Canada – a particularly cruel fate for the struggling artist and his foreign-born wife.[95]

If Rachel Storer told John Williams that she "bitterly regretted her folly" after a mere few weeks of marriage, her distress over this development must have been profound. These events took place in 1710, almost half a decade before the Treaty of Utrecht supposedly assured that captives could return to New England. Therefore, Rachel remained bound to the fate of her husband. But had these events happened in 1716, would the story have been any different? Could she have simply left him to his vices and returned to the bosom of her New England family of her own accord? Possibly not. Self-marriage had created French citizens out of former captives, and this had the ironic consequence of subjecting the ex-captives to a new series of regulations, which meant that their movements throughout the borderlands were still closely regulated and subject to someone else's scrutiny.

---

[93] Roger Magnuson asserts that the lack of a printing press was not due to a disregard for literacy in the colony, but because French booksellers jealously guarded their transatlantic trades. Jesuits and Sulpicians petitioned France for a press for the better part of a century, but the request was never granted. Magnuson, *Education in New France*, 107-8.

[94] *DCB* II: 377.

[95] Colonial Archives MG1-SérieG3, F-644, NAC ; *DCB*, II : 378.

John Williams and John Stoddard learned of these restrictions when they went to Canada in 1714 to redeem captives. As word of the Utrecht's stipulations circulated through New England, Mainers naturally hoped, and quite likely assumed, that all their loved ones would return to them, regardless of their status in New France. Given their government connections, the province's most powerful families with captive members, including the Wheelwrights, Littlefields, and Storers, were likely aware of the stipulations of the treaty and had good reason to anticipate a homecoming.[96] None seem to have thought that French marriages would prove to be an important sticking point. As representatives of New England, Stoddard and Williams expected that such decisions would be left to the discretion of the ex-captives and their spouses. They were mistaken. Like any other French colonists, these now required *lettres de naturalité* from the French king to move from colony to colony. It was as French subjects, therefore – and not as one-time New Englanders – that the movements of English-born naturalized colonists were to be restricted. Arguing that their status as subjects was overruled by the treaty's stipulations, Williams and Stoddard insisted that native-born New Englanders fell into a different category. After days of debate, Governor Vaudreuil eventually conceded that "French women might be at liberty to go with their English husbands, and that English

[96] Article III reads "All the prisoners made, on all sides, as well by land as by sea, and the hostages carried away or given during the war, and to this day, shall be restored, without ransom, six weeks, at least, to be computed from the day of the exchange of the ratification of the present treaty, each crown respectively paying the advances which shall have been made for the subsistence and maintenance of their prisoners by the Sovereign of the country where they shall have been detained, according to the attested receipts and estimates and other authentic vouchers which shall be furnished on one side and the other. And securities shall be reciprocally given for the payment of the debts which the prisoners shall have contracted in the countries where they have been detained until their entire liberty." James W. Gerard, *The Peace of Utrecht. A Historical Review of the Great Treaty of 1713-14, and of the Principal Events of the War of the Spanish Succession* (London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1885), 182-3.

women should not be compelled to stay with their French husbands."[97] French husbands and children, however, would not be permitted to leave the colony.

In the simple calculus of redeeming Protestant souls, the concession seemed like a good one. Native-born New Englanders could come home. But to captives who had moved ahead with their lives and created families of their own, the concession was all but meaningless. New England women were at a particular disadvantage. In addition to leaving their French children behind, they carried the taint of a previous marriage, and that spouse still lived. Without benefit of annulments or divorces, such women could never hope to marry New England men until after their French spouses died. The choice was clear: remain in Canada with spouses and children who gave their lives definition, or return to New England to a life devoid of marital and social fulfillment. Understandably, they chose the former.

And the French had put teeth into the law: when formally challenged, it was rigidly enforced. Mary Storer and her cousin Priscilla were no doubt familiar with the struggles of their fellow captive and neighbor, Christine Otis Le Beau Baker. During King William's War, the infant Christine was taken from Dover, New Hampshire, with her mother and siblings. The whole family was ransomed to French Canada, where Christine's mother, Grizel, was quick to adopt the religion of her own Irish Catholic mother and became an active Catholic laywoman and proselytizer to other captives. Her children followed her into the church. Christine matured in New France and took the sacrament of marriage with Louis Le Beau in 1710. Louis died three years later, leaving her with two small children. She later fell in love and determined to marry Captain

---

[97] Stoddard, "Stoddard's Journal," 30.

Thomas Baker, a member of the Stoddard/Williams mission. Eager to return to New England with Baker but forbidden by the Canadian government to take her Le Beau offspring with her, she was forced to leave the children in the care of her zealous mother.[98] Christine's experience demonstrated that the decision to return would entail sacrificing one form of flesh and blood for another. This must have been seemed unconscionable, especially since so many Maine captives had been violently separated from their own parents.

To the ones they left behind, the Maine captives who remained in French marriages after they were guaranteed the right to return to New England were lost souls. The few who came back were not. As has been seen, however, the acculturated Mainers themselves rarely moved in a cut and dry world. Instead, their new connections, and the wills and needs of others, often played a role in limiting choices, or even foreclosing them altogether. But these choices were even further limited by the larger realm of imperial politics. Larger events shaping the Atlantic World eclipsed personal relationships and choices, even at the lowest of levels. And these larger events sometimes had ironic consequences. In Rachel Storer's case in particular, her bad luck in self-marriage ultimately became the means of redeeming her Protestant soul, proving that even those who cast themselves into the pits of hell could pull themselves out again – and right into Zion.

[98] The story of Christine's relationship with her mother and other captives is the subject of Alice Nash's article "Two Stories of New England Captives: Grizel and Christine Otis of Dover, New Hampshire," in *New England/New France, 1600-1850*, ed. Peter Benes, Annual Proceedings of the Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife, vol. 14 (Boston: Boston University, 1992), passim.

For Rachel, the redemption came thanks to a combination of factors ranging from Jean Berger's chronic bad behavior in Canada to the cessation of Queen Ann's War. Banished from Canada 1710 for the fallout from the Saint-Olive affair, the Bergers still had choices for settlement, including France itself. For whatever reason, however, they ended up in Plaisance, a cold, crude settlement on the edge of the French colonial world that owed its existence solely to the North Atlantic fisheries.[99] Their reasons for selecting this particular settlement, which contrasted sharply to the relatively-urbane Saint Lawrence towns, are unknown, but could have ranged from poverty to new business opportunities to the possibility that they were forced to leave Montreal immediately, and went where the first boat took them. Once settled in Terre Neuve, Jean Berger pursued business as well as painting, though he probably did very little of the latter: among the poorest of French settlements, Plaisance did not even have a parish church, let alone a local aristocracy who hungered to reinforce family glory by commissioning portraits.[100] The adjustment must have been difficult for Rachel, who was once again ripped away from her family. Plaisance itself was cold, underdeveloped and in all likelihood, miserable.[101]

The discomforts of French Newfoundland were only temporary. Within three years, the overarching circumstances that often capriciously shifted boundaries throughout the Atlantic World brought Rachel Storer back to an English colony - without ever having to leave Plaisance. Under the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht, all the French

---

[99] Jean Berger transacted a series of leases for properties in Plaisance between 8/06/1710 and 5/18/1713 – in essence until the Treaty of Utrecht ceded the French fishing territories to Great Britain. "Dépôt des papiers publics des colonies; notariat," NAC, 8:176.

[100] Ibid.

[101] For a description of housing and environment in French Plaisance, see Peter Moogk, *Building a House in New France: An Account of the Perplexities of Client and Craftsmen in Early Canada* (Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1977), 72-3.

settlements of Nova Scotia and Terre Neuve were ceded to Britain.[102] No longer subject to the *congées* and *pérmis* that restricted movement within and without the French colonies and that still circumscribed the movements of Mary and Priscilla, Rachel was now free to move throughout the territories claimed by England – including, of course, her native Maine. Jean Berger's flights of temper and imprudent judgment, therefore, had the ironic consequence of procuring for his wife what her own *activa* could not. And Rachel, once a pawn of imperial politics that tied her to France's New World territories, was now a beneficiary of them.

If Rachel had indeed regretted her folly as Reverend John Williams suggested, her fidelity to the path paved by debauchery eventually accomplished the very goal it seemed to undermine: return to the bosom of her Maine family. Though little is known of her post-captivity life in New England, it is certain that she did return and reestablish relationships with the extended Storer family in both Wells and Boston. When his will was proved in 1730, Jeremiah Storer left his daughter "Rachel Bargee" a share of his estate equal to those of her other New England sisters.[103] Tellingly, her sister Priscilla, still wayward in Canada and the mother of many French children, was, just like her cousin Mary, worthy of no such recognition.

In July, 1727, Mary Storer St. Germaine wrote to her brother Ebenezer in Boston, requesting that he

> inquier after an ingliesh man which is maried in bostowne his name is greenhill his wife is yet living and his tow sons in Morial I pray you to

---

[102] R. Cole Harris, *Historical Atlas of Canada.* Vol. 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), Plate 25.

[103] *DGMNH,* 664; *NEC,* I:424-5.

> send me some nues of him whear he is a dead or a live ask my cousin barger knows him well…[104]

The man about whom Mary inquired was Joseph Greenhill, a captive of unknown origins who became a naturalized French citizen in 1713.[105] During captivity, Greenhill had married a French woman and had children. He converted and acted as godparent to at least one other New England captive.[106] Yet Greenhill seems to have abandoned his *canadien* wife and their children when an opportunity to return to New England presented itself.

Mary requested that Ebenezer enlist the help of "Cousin Barger," who was of course Rachel Storer, in repairing the broken union. To Mary, the bonds of marriage were tighter than the bonds of birth family and country. They transcended the violent circumstances that created such unions in the first place. Viewed through the lens of her own, ultimately happy acculturating odyssey, as well as the role her own agency played in that outcome, it does not seem strange that she hoped to help to bring another New Englander back into the captor culture that had provided such a "fortunate fall" for herself.

Rachel no doubt saw things differently. Though she may very well have helped her cousin with the Greenhill case (the records are silent on this), it is certainly easy to understand that her own feelings toward captor culture and the bonds of marriage within it might have been clouded by the memories of her decidedly less happy journey.

Yet in Protestant eyes, Rachel Storer Berger and Joseph Greenhill, had he indeed succeeded in returning to New England or any other English colony, were far more

---

[104] MS to ES, 17 July 1727. Mary Storer Papers, MHS.

[105] *NEC,* I:129, II: 92.

[106] *NEC,* II: 92.

fortunate than Mary, living grandly in her *ménage des anges*. Despite her "follies" – attraction to a French soldier, conversion, self-marriage, taking the counsel of others, or all four – Rachel Storer did not remain in the "horrible pit" of French religion and marriage to which John Williams consigned her. The larger factors that brought her to Canada in the first place had eventually worked in her favor, even if her ability to determine her own worldly fate had been thwarted at every turn. Redemption was not always an issue of personal agency. Like the Protestant definition of salvation itself, sometimes it seemed to be a simple matter of the mystery of grace – or just plain luck.

Regardless of worldly success, a Protestant son, daughter, brother or sister who converted to Catholicism had taken an enormous step backward on the path to salvation. If Protestants were heretics to Catholics, Catholics were idolaters and slaves of despots.[107] If a captive simply accepted baptism, the possibility for redemption was still strong. When captive kin went a step further and married in New France, the possibility for dual physical and spiritual redemption was severely hampered. Maine's captives had reasons for remaining in the captor culture that New Englanders failed to anticipate and understand. Those who changed religion were now privy to a series of life choices that necessitated deeper ties to the captor colony. Their Protestant families back in Maine, however, would not completely relinquish them either. To do so was to allow the poor captive to wallow in his or her vices in Catholic New France. This was a gross abnegation of familial duty.[108] Though time, distance and difference led to its steady

---

[107] For common pejoratives used for rival Christian groups, see Hanson, *Necessary Virtue,* 4 and Cogliano, *No King, No Popery,* 9, 15.

[108] Mary Beth Norton, *Founding Mothers and Fathers,* 107, 128.

erosion, contact hinted at hope – though more often than not it was a promise that remained unfulfilled.

John Demos's *The Unredeemed Captive: a Family Story from Early America* describes the captivity experiences of the oft-quoted Reverend John Williams, and offers a psychological reading of that of his daughter Eunice, the person to whom the titled refers. Unlike most of the Maine captives in this study, Eunice Williams remained among the Christian Mohawks at Kahnawake, outside of Montreal, and became a fully-transculturated Native American. Her father and brother Samuel both returned from captivity and brought none of its trappings with them except the will to fight popery.[109]

Captives like Mary, Rachel, and Priscilla Storer – married and acculturated *canadiennes* - fell somewhere in between the extremes represented within the Williams family. The Storers, as well as a host of additional Maine captives, male and female, who married in New France, returned to their families to a certain degree yet remained unredeemed. Captives were problematic members of any family, but the contact captives shared with their blood kin demonstrates that these families attempted some form of toleration of acculturated kin, despite disparities in religious affiliation and new cultural and imperial identifications. But this toleration should not be construed as acceptance. Instead, the experiences described in this chapter detail carefully negotiated relationships made up of love and suspicion, in equal parts. Captives who were carried to Canada and never came back left voids in their family that occasional visits could not fill.

---

[109] Reverend John was a chaplain with Samuel Vetch's 1711 failed invasion of Quebec. His son Stephen, who had briefly accepted Catholicism while in captivity, was chaplain for a regiment during the first assault on the fortress of Louisbourg. Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive*, 216.

To Mainers, family members who engaged in self-marriage with a *canadien* complicated the borderland of faith that the Province's location and circumstances engendered. It added both theoretical (the rights and duties of families) and emotional ("love the sinner, hate the sin") elements that all members of mixed-faith families were challenged to transcend. Some captives lived among Catholic colonists and returned to New England to tell tales of either spiritual victory over popery or gratitude to their wrong-headed, yet sympathetic French hosts. But captives who married French mates, persisted in dual relationships to New England and Canada, to Protestants and Catholics. Unlike their counterparts who returned, these captives became the objects of encounter themselves. Though their parents and siblings might have been spared experiencing life in the French colony for themselves, they would now remain tied to it for generations. As such, married captives were responsible for incorporating a larger circle of Maine settlers into the greater story of the religious encounter of competing Christian visions on the Maine frontier.

In the finally calculus, was someone like Mary Storer, the unredeemed captive who returned to her Canadian hearth, home, and spouse, really so very disobedient? Was she really turning her back on true religion? The answer is no. Mary's life in Canada seems to have conformed to forms of Christian helpmeet and parenthood that both Protestantism and Catholicism valued. In borderlands like early Maine, a world frequently turned upside down by religious encounters long before revolutions, the saints and sinners who ventured back from Canada were sometimes hard to distinguish from one another. Certainly, their life choices and possibilities were more complex than their New England loved ones were likely to realize. And though colonial Maine made steady,

though episodic, progress toward stabilization after the Treaty of Utrecht, many of its captive daughters and sons remained, to a certain degree, hostages to fortune.

CHAPTER FOUR:

THE WAYS OF "HIS INDUSTRY:" MEN OF GOD AND THEIR MINISTRIES ON THE MAINE FRONTIER

Joseph Baxter was a competent, though perhaps not the most brilliant, New England Puritan minister. In both his ministry in Massachusetts and his missionary work among the Kennebec Wabanakis, he reported modest successes.[1] Like so many other men of God in Maine, however, Baxter contended with numerous challenges above and beyond the usual squabbles over salary and maintenance of congregational peace faced by so many of his compatriots. In addition, Protestant ministers who committed themselves to Maine also faced a long roster of environmental, linguistic, cultural, and denominational differences that increased their burdens.

That was not all. Protestant ministers, particularly those who came to Maine during the wars of empire, faced another potential enemy. Their Catholic equivalents had long-established ties to many of the Wabanaki groups, who were fundamentally distrustful of the colonists in the English settlements. Catholic missionaries frequently

[1] The largest Native American congregation Joseph Baxter ever had was five. However, his journal is filled with references to visits with individual Indians and records of conversations with them. Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 251; Joseph Baxter, "Journal of the Reverend Joseph Baxter," *NEGHR* 21 (January 1867), 45-59.

exploited these tensions to their fullest advantage. Others took a more passive route of resistance by claiming they were tending souls, not creating French subjects, and simply refused English pressure to decamp. Well-established, well trafficked, and well-fortified, the Catholic missions and the priests and catechists connected to them, loomed large on the Maine frontier. They threatened to block Protestant expansion, and periodically also made it clear that they intended to roll it back. Their successes in converting many Wabanakis, and a significant percentage of Maine captives as well, demonstrated that the threat they posed to Protestant expansion was not idle.

When Joseph Baxter committed himself to ministry in Maine, he did so willingly. As a Protestant minister, he had his own motive for accepting the challenges posed by frontier life. There is no doubt that one was piety: Baxter's journal of his time spent in Maine indicates that he approached his tasks with sincerity. But while he hoped to convert the Wabanakis to the religion of the English, he also hoped to do his part to ally them with English interests that transcended religious affiliation.[2]

The region offered other attractions for Baxter, who had a talent for business. This interest was born out of necessity: his home congregation in Medfield, Massachusetts, had paid him only a modest salary for decades. Since he did not come from a family of means and had not married into one, Baxter had no choice but to engage in worldly pursuits that protected the long-term interests of his family of six children. As a minister of the gospel, Baxter was welcomed – indeed, encouraged – to partake in the prosperity that a stable Province of Maine could guarantee to all patient investors.[3] To

---

[2] Baxter, *Journal of the Reverend Joseph Baxter,* 52-3, 55, 57, 58.

[3] These compensational assurances were only as attractive as the ability of the Massachusetts government and local militias to protect the region for settlement. Peter N. Carroll, *Puritanism and the*

benefit from these investments, he accepted the challenge to lead a Protestant juggernaut into the wilderness around the Kennebec and woo the Wabanakis away from that most pernicious of frontier enemies, a Jesuit. Along with the schoolmaster and the manager of the trading post, the New England minister formed a triumvirate of key figures meant to bring security, prosperity, and good Protestant religion into the wilderness.

This particular minister later emerged from his Maine experience as both a loser and winner. In the contest for souls, he failed in his struggle against the influence of the more deeply-entrenched Jesuits. But he left the Maine frontier with prime parcels of land and the good will of the Massachusetts authorities – a lucrative "golden parachute" for a minister who had brought few new souls to Protestantism.

Baxter and his coreligionists blamed the failure of the Protestant mission on Jesuit Sebastien Rale, "the great Incendiary" of this and subsequent Anglo-Wabanaki skirmishes in the region.[4] But Rale's own imperatives – keeping the Kennebecs close to France and, more importantly, Catholicism - were not the sole reason for the failure of the mission. Indeed, when it came to the Kennebec Wabanakis, Rale or any Frenchman lacked the authority to compel them to deviate from their own prerogatives.[5]

Why were the French Jesuits and their Catholicism the preferred allegiance for the region's eighteenth century Wabanakis? Tradition and religion affection were of course of monumental importance. But in the contest of Christianities on the Maine frontier, clerical celibacy came to play an important role as well. As celibates, Jesuits were not

---

Wilderness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier, 1629 – 1700 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), 119 – 20; Silverman, *Life and Times of Cotton Mather*, 50.

[4] Samuel Shute to Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil, 14 March 1721. *Coll MeHS* 2 (1): 379.

[5] For assessment of period Wabanaki politics throughout the colonial period, Kenneth Morrison, *The Embattled Northeast*, passim.

weighted down with the "baggage" that most Protestant ministers brought to Maine. To the Kennebecs, who repeatedly threatened to "plunder and burn ye Englishman's Houses if they did not move off their lands," Baxter, with his family and business interests, was not in a position to alleviate the problems that plagued Indian/Anglo relations on the Maine frontier. Joseph Baxter's joint mandate to tend to his ministry *and* care for his family's interests rendered him part of that problem. Protestant men of God brought to the frontier a mandate to be fruitful and multiply which, if done successfully, would by its very definition mean displacement for the Wabanakis.

Most Wabanakis knew that Baxter's successes could open the door to even greater English expansion and were determined to resist him. Still, Joseph Baxter was determined to try his hand at converting them. What ensued in 1717 was a brief, though pointed, interfaith skirmish in which representatives of both Catholic and Protestant vied to win, or, in the case of the former, maintain Wabanaki support. In the process, each side relied upon the best conversion devices of its own faith – and at times attempted to discredit their rivals by using their own tools against them.

Cotton Mather spoke authoritatively about the conversion strategies and exhaustive endeavors of Catholic priests that could put Protestant ministers to shame. "God forbid, That a Popish Priest should outdo a Protestant Minister in his Industry," he lamented.[6]

In all likelihood, Mather never actually met a "popish priest" in person. His image of the Jesuit was formed by popular literature and accounts of the borderland hostilities

[6] Cotton Mather, *A Letter to Ungospellized Plantations* (Boston, 1702), 10. Qtd. in Richard P. Gildrie, *The Profane*, *the Civil, and the Godly: The Reformation of Manners in Orthodox New England* (University Park: Penn State Press, 1994), 138.

that rocked New England between 1688 and 1727.[7] But Joseph Baxter met at least one Jesuit in the flesh. So did another Maine minister, Hugh Adams.[8] And Massachusetts clergyman Samuel Sewall, who traveled to Maine in the same year as Joseph Baxter, got close enough to one to extend both greetings and a gift. Thus Maine became a staging ground for flesh and blood post-Reformation encounters which in many parts of the colonial world existed only in rhetoric.

The contraction of the line of English settlement often led to greater levels of contact between peoples on opposite sides of the struggle for empire. For men of God, this had an ironic outcome: the more frequently they were thrown together, the more likely these clergymen were to use the other side's tactics to secure the souls of the faithful. As with other aspects of the competing Christianities on the Maine frontier, the encounter of the ministerial classes shows how Protestants and Catholics struggled to assert their particular Christian vision among Maine's inhabitants.

For the men ordained to assist souls to salvation and interpret points of theology for their congregations and neophytes, religion was not simply a tool of conquest – it was important on its own terms and worthy of the battles fought in its name.[9] In this sense, the religious encounter on the Maine frontier pitted two reforming forces against one another. Yet, over time, their motives and their tactics gradually merged and fed off one another. By 1717, a minister like Joseph Baxter requested the Massachusetts Assembly

---

[7] For an extensive treatment of the anti-Jesuit tradition in early modern English literature, see Garry Wills, *Witches and Jesuits: Shakespeare's Macbeth* (New York: Oxford, 1995).

[8] Adams later became pastor of the congregation at Durham, New Hampshire. Mary Calvert, *Black Robe on the Kennebec* (Monmouth, ME: Monmouth Press, 1991), 172; Kidd, *Protestant Interest*, 108.

[9] Charles Clark asserts "To the Jesuits in Canada and the Puritans of Massachusetts, however, religion was not an excuse but a real motive. Their fervor itself powered changes in history." Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, 36. Though I fundamentally agree with Clark's and James Axtell's assertions, I suggest that the pool of evidence transcends traditional definitions of what constitutes religious material culture.

to supply him with funds and "curiosities" to lure Indian children to attend the school he established.[10] Reliance on such items to grab the attention of potential converts most likely would have scandalized the average Massachusetts minister. But to a borderland missionary, such tactics had been tried once and had worked.[11] Borderland evangelization during the wars of empire demanded innovative tactics, and even those borrowed from competing clergy were worth a try.[12]

But if imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, it did have its limits in the borderlands. To priests and ministers alike, education and proselytization went hand in hand, co-equals in the mission environment. Intellectual competition caused as much tension between borderland clergy as efforts to claim additional Indian souls for Christianity.

To fully comprehend the encounter between Euroamerican clergy, it is necessary to understand the movements that formed their respective attitudes towards preaching and religious education. In general, both Protestants and Catholics bristled at the idea that the learning of their clergy was less than superlative. Pride in one's erudition had its roots in the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Many Protestants continued to equate the mission priests with the medieval clergy, which relied on inspiring Christian conversion through the appeals of the senses rather than the intellect. They saw contemporary Catholic clergy as a unified human force steeped in superstition and collectively determined to "keepe the Scriptures shut up in an unknowne tongue."[13] Even John Eliot,

---

[10] Henry O. Thayer, "Ministry of the Kennebec, Period of the Indian Wars." *Coll MeHS,* 2nd ser.,, 9: 266-7; Samuel Sewall, "A Memorial Related to the Kennebec Indians, 1717," *Coll MeHS*, 3rd ser., 1: 365.

[11] Cogliano, *No King, No Popery*, 9.

[12] Axtell, *Invasion Within,* 275.

[13] Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment,* 240.

who would later welcome the French Jesuit Gabriel Druillettes into his home for a protracted visit, voiced his disapproval of Catholic missionary techniques, and the lack of learned grounding behind them, in stingingly sarcastic terms: "If wee could force them to baptisme (as the Spaniards do about Cuzco, Peru, and Mexico, having learned them a short answer or two to some Popish questions) … we could have gathered many hundreds, yea thousands it may be by this time."[14]

Eliot penned this observation some time before 1648, and applied his vitriol to the Spanish model of religious colonization. But it is unlikely that, at that time, he would have felt any differently about the French Jesuits who came to the mission field from Canada. Other would-be Protestant missionaries discovered more directly that there was more to Catholic missionary success than incense, statues, medals, and rosary beads. Though Catholics certainly relied on pious objects to attract the faithful (and these were, after all, legitimate components of Catholic worship), the missionaries of the Maine frontier were probably taking their cues from the Puritan tradition of "heart religion," which drew on devotional forms that it shared with Catholicism.[15]

Due in large part to the Counter-Reformation, Catholic missionaries were linguistically better equipped than Protestant ones. The new emphasis on linguistic skill was a byproduct of reforms in Catholic higher education. Unbeknownst to the Protestant clergy of New England, the Catholic priests who found their way to Canada were

---

[14] Qtd. in David Murray, "Spreading the Word: Missionaries, Conversion and Circulation in the Northeast," in *Spiritual Encounters: Interactions between Christianity and Native Religious in Colonial America*, ed. Nicholas Griffiths and Fernando Cervantes (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 45.

[15] The concept of "heart religion" transcended boundaries of faith. Saint Teresa of Avila, one of the great Catholic mystics of the sixteenth century was one of those drawn to the concept through reading Augustine's *Confessions.* She wrote in her own spiritual memoir, *The Interior Castle*, that Augustine's story had coaxed her conversion from her so-called "frivolous and dissipated life." Teresa declared, "When I reached his conversion, the voice which he heard in the garden, the Lord, I believe, made it ring in my ears, so keenly was my heart touched." Hambrick-Stowe, *Practice of Piety*, 27.

products of a Counter-Reformation that had forced radical reinterpretations of late medieval Catholicism. To them, the early incarnation of the church would have been just as alien as it seemed to their Protestant equivalents. Many ordained Catholic clergy were educated in universities and seminaries that privileged a considerably broader range of disciplines than the pre-Reformation church. Divorced from the reformist movements in the Church of Rome, New World Protestants were less likely to comprehend the ramifications of these reforms for Catholic educational and missionary practices. Had they known (as they later did), they would have recognized profound similarities between their own reformed faith and post-Reformation and Counter-Reformation Catholicism.

The Society of Jesus, for one, did not even exist before the Reformation, and was a pure product of the reactive environment the Reformation created for education of the ministerial classes. Though they eschewed some lines of post-Reformation intellectual inquiry (Cartesian philosophy, for example), the Society's schools were among the most progressive educational environments, in curricular terms, in all of Europe – including both Protestant and Catholic territories. The Society required the highest levels of education available to Catholic Europeans for members who wished to become New World missionaries. Leading Jesuit colleges like Le Flèche became incubators for Canadian vocations. As James Axtell notes, the vast majority of these Jesuits had spent most of their lives in colleges and universities and did not come into the mission field until they were in their mid-thirties.[16] They knew their Latin, but they were also capable of preaching and writing in the vernacular, encouraging the reading of Scripture among

[16] Most Jesuits spent at least several years refining their communication and teaching skills in the order's secondary schools and universities before applying them to the mission field. Axtell, *Invasion Within,* 75*; n. 344*.

the faithful, and adapting pious readings to new populations. Such skills were easily adapted to the North American mission field.

Both Reformation and Counter-Reformation stressed the need for a well-educated clergy that was flexible enough to engage the faithful in church or meetinghouse, university or mission. The clergy of both faiths were expected to apply their learning to the saving of souls. Jesuits and New England ministers alike were proud of their education and the schools that produced them. The verbal feuds that played out between clergymen like Rale and Baxter were not exclusively bound to creeds: the honor of Harvard or Cambridge or La Flèche or the University of Paris was also at stake.

But pride in educational bloodlines and erudition was not the only element that Protestants and Catholic men of the cloth shared. Ministers like Baxter were expected to perform "double duty" by ministering to Euroamerican Christians and attracting Native Americans to the faith. Even under the best circumstances (one minister/one established congregation), Protestant ministers in Maine were entering Euroamerican communities that lacked denominational homogeneity. Though they took support where they could get it, they were frequently caught in the middle of interdenominational tension – a common phenomenon in Maine. These divided loyalties - even among established Christians - could divert Protestant ministers from any serious missionary enterprise.

Jesuits were often similarly torn. Virtually none of the missionaries who worked the borderlands from 1688 to 1727 had the luxury of giving undivided attention to the Maine Wabanakis. And even when they had the time and energy to devote to Native American ministries, their Protestant counterparts were disadvantaged in a critical way. Efficient and effective communication with Native American groups was a major, and

chronic, problem for these ministers, who simply did not have the same pre-mission training that the Society of Jesus gave to its members.[17] Joseph Baxter, for instance, was completely reliant on interpreters to carry his message, and his attempts to compose a lexicon were extremely limited. No direct communication took place between him and a prospective convert. Furthermore, the "Indian Bible" he brought with him was John Eliot's Natick translation, written in a dialect unfamiliar to the Wabanakis.[18]

A longstanding presence in the upper reaches of Maine, a lack of competition for resources that were vital to the region's Native Americans, and the willingness and ability to live among and communicate with the Wabanakis in their own language and gestures all contributed to greater success for the Jesuit missionaries. But they did not have absolute control over their missions or proselytes. In addition, they frequently discounted the individual needs of Wabanaki communities and the abilities of Wabanaki leaders to determine where their own best interests lay. Wabanakis accepted and even embraced Catholicism, but they did not always see their faith as inextricably tied to French interests. When cooperation with the English suited them – and occasionally it did – they cooperated.[19] This angered and terrified Jesuit missionaries, who feared that embrace of *l'heresie calviniste* was the next logical step.

In addition, Jesuits were not the only clerics in New France and were therefore dependent on others to reinforce and support their efforts in the mission field. They

---

[17] For detailed maps of the dispersal of Wabanaki peoples in the seventeenth century, see Nash, "The Abiding Frontier," 56, 150.

[18] This translation was one of the few produced for Protestant missionary work available in any Indian dialect. This choice of text shows the sheer volume of "catch-up" work that Protestant ministers would have to do before they could openly challenge the Jesuits' Christian hegemony.

[19] See Emerson W. Baker and John G. Reid, "Amerindian Power in the Early Modern Northeast: A Reappraisal," *William and Mary Quarterly* 2004 61(1): 77-106.

relied on a strong French colonial clergy to reinforce their teachings among their neophytes. But the regular clergy were not always successful at keeping the Euroamerican population sufficiently devout and supportive of missionary work. Indeed, the *canadiens* were considered so debauched in their own habits that missionaries strove for decades to keep them from polluting their neophytes and the culture of the missions.[20]

The *habitants* themselves were hard to control, and the "few acres of snow" that comprised New France and its environs did not always attract male religious who were up to the challenge. Many would-be missionaries were less interested in the regular ministrations of a parish made up exclusively of *canadiens*, who left much to be desired as parishioners (particularly in places where *curés* were few and far between).[21] As the bishop of New France himself lamented, *"La perte d'un seul Prêtre est considerable dans un temps où n'a pas encore assez d'ouvriers évangeliques."* ["The loss of one priest is considerable at a time when there still are not enough to do the work."] [22] And for those whom Catholics counted as their greatest spiritual assets – zealous missionaries – warfare, death, and, worse yet, the possibility of apostasy lurked around every corner. Even Sebastien Rale felt the tug of transcultural conversion. He interacted frequently enough with his English neighbors to impress upon them that his thirty years of

---

[20] Multiple church officials of New France complained that the *habitants* and, more frequently, the *coureurs de bois* subverted the missionary work of both religious men and women. But the need to bring revenue into the colony meant that these efforts were often subverted by Canada's own government. James T Moore, *Indian and Jesuit: A Seventeenth Century Encounter* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1982), 193; Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 64-7; Moogk, *La Nouvelle France*, 38-40.

[21] As late as 1730, only one in four Canadian parishes had a resident *curé*, which hampered the clergymen's efforts to support moral reform. Magnuson, *Education in New France,* 96-7.

[22] Author's translation. Jean-Baptiste de Saint-Vallier, *Estat présent de l'eglise et de la colonie française de la Nouvelle-France* (Paris : Robert Pepie, 1748. Reprint Québec : Coté & Cie, 1856), 6.

missionary work had led him to "see, hear and speak… only as an Indian"[23] Furthermore, priests in the missions ran the risk of straying too far from their initial purposes by becoming entangled in borderland politics. In Rale's case, this came to smack of pride – and contributed significantly to the downfall of his mission and the joy the spread throughout New England in the wake of his death.

In short, the two cultures that collided in Maine both suffered from labor shortages and handicaps in serving their Euroamerican Christian populations. Both struggled to secure capable men and supplies to meet each population's spiritual needs, which, for Protestants and Catholics alike, became just one need out of many as England and France competed for regional control. Both attempted mission work and were at times hamstrung by their own inabilities to grasp the comprehensive needs of their indigenous proselytes.

But here again, there were important variations. If conversions to Protestantism among the native populace were going to happen, they would have to be performed by Protestant ministers who already had regular congregations to lead, families to support, and homesteads to manage. And this was during times of *peace.* War brought additional responsibilities and dangers. Missionary work therefore became, at best, an extracurricular activity for Maine's married ministers. Many of them found it impossible, or were ultimately disinclined, to take on additional work. Even unmarried ministers usually committed themselves only briefly to frontier work, and then moved on to search

---

[23] Qtd. in James Phinney Baxter, *Pioneers of New France in New England* (Albany: J. Munsell's Sons, 1894), 96.

for spouses and more suitable situations.[24] The reformed clergy were meant to marry and bring forth offspring. This mandate seriously undermined their ability to make the sacrifices required of any missionary to Wabanakia.

But the absence of family concerns and regular parish duties was not an automatic guarantee of success. Celibacy was enforced by the Church of Rome, but not all priests wished to live lives of absolute physical deprivation of other types (exposure, unpalatable food, not to mention danger), and die as martyrs. Many did their best to live as comfortable an existence as possible in Canada. Others, all of whom undoubtedly knew the stories of the 17th century martyrs of Iroquoia and Huronia, chose not to die passively or silently, but to take up weapons and fight their coreligionists' (and in some cases, their own) enemies. This was perhaps easier when the enemy at hand was not an unconverted "heathen" who had never known the light of Christ (battling such people might have been questionable in terms of the precepts of just war), but misguided fellow Christians who were perceived to have rejected it. When one evaluates the techniques of the colonial clergy on both sides of the encounter, neither side emerges as a paradigm of pure Christian sacrifice and virtue. This is the final and perhaps the greatest irony of the contest for souls in colonial Maine.

The enduring image of the dreaded Jesuit missionary, an abstract evil relic of the wars of empire, persisted in New England memory and popular culture long after the order itself ceased to exist. To distant observers, the Jesuits who lived in the Wabanaki

[24] The Massachusetts government hoped that the "civilizing program" of Protestant ministers would greatly reduce the Wabanakis' need for land and succeed in luring them away from the Jesuits. As the rest of this chapter will discuss, the reverse almost happened, but with a few nuances that still permitted for the growth of English settlement. Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 249.

missions were nonetheless viewed as pernicious enemies of the New England Way.[25] Their perceived ability to disguise and insinuate themselves into almost any situation, and to convince the Wabanakis to menace Maine's thinly spread, underdeveloped settlements, made the Jesuits figures of great fear and loathing.

The ministers on the Maine frontier who met Jesuits found them to be canny strategists as missionaries and liturgists. But they found them to be fallible and human as well. Jesuits who encountered New England ministers scoffed at their techniques, but likewise, frequently demonstrated a certain amount of reserve and respect for the way the English managed their own relationships in Wabanakia. In short, the strengths, weaknesses and vulnerabilities of each group led to as many similarities as differences. As with other elements of competing Christianities on the Maine frontier, the Jesuits left a mixed legacy of successes and failures, accommodation and manipulation. They were not all as successful as even their New England detractors made them out to be. Like Protestant ministers, some Jesuits displayed natural charisma and leadership abilities that melded well with the spiritual, political and economic needs of their flocks. Others, however, were kept close as spiritual guides but ultimately rejected from full engagement in other realms. Still others wore their soutanes lightly, falling back on their authority when necessary, conveniently ignoring their Christian symbolism when convenient.

Jesuit cunning cannot alone provide an explanation for Catholic successes and Protestant failures. Though Protestant ministers would eventually try to beat Catholic missionaries at their own game, they first had to devise methods of meeting their flock's

---

[25] However, New England critics were careful to distinguish between unchristian people and unchristian acts. In what was perhaps an effort to legitimate the use of missionary techniques, William Dummer wrote to Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil that Jesuits, especially Rale, should strive to "[preach] Peace, Love, and Friendship Agreeable to the Doctrines of the Christian Religion." "Lt. Govr. Dummer to Govr. Vaudreuil," 19th January 1724. *Coll MeHS* 2nd ser., 1:386.

needs and those of their families before beginning their evangelical ventures. Given the many drawbacks of English Maine as a place to settle and secure one's future, it took many men, and many decades, before a mission such as Baxter's could be assured of logical support and the qualified minister it needed to survive. In the period of this study, Baxter's mission represented a high-water mark for Protestant aspirations in the area.

Part of the problem was intrinsic to Maine as a borderland that was frequently the locus of intercolonial upheaval. It had indeed never been easy to attract these qualified ministers – well-educated, established, and in some cases, even respectable - to the cold and dangerous frontier. Throughout Maine's early history of settlement, the quality and conviction of the ministers it attracted, and the circumstances they encountered when they got to the province, varied greatly. Some had their hands full with the simple ins and outs of managing a single frontier congregation, let alone the challenge of winning new souls for Christ. Others eschewed Native American ministry altogether in favor of building stronger ties of faith among Euroamerican settlers. Still others attempted to vie for Wabanaki and Euroamerican souls alike. In disclosing his strategy for strong frontiers, Cotton Mather did not differentiate. Instead, he simply called for settlers to "Both Publicly and Privately Endeavour that you may have a People of *Well-Instructed Protestants.*"[26]

Historically, challenges had come not only from the Catholic mission outposts, but from among self-identified Protestants themselves. The Province of Maine had a long history of attracting religiously problematic settlers. It frequently drew problematic ministers as well – among them suspected or accused Quakers, Baptists, apostates,

[26] Mather, *Frontiers Well-Defended* (Boston, 1702), 10.

witches, drunkards, wife-killers, and adulterers. Others were outspoken opponents of Massachusetts and Puritanism. Hence ministers were sometimes indistinguishable from their most unruly congregants, and stood accused of instigating the same destabilizing forces that their influence was meant to counteract.

Consider the case of York's first minister, George Burdett. Burdett came to Maine while it was still under the control of the Gorges family. He soon ran afoul of his neighbors and stood accused of conduct unbecoming for a minister, seducing at least four married women. Burdett was tried and found guilty of disturbing the peace, incontinency, and "dangerous speeches the better to seduce that weake sex of women to his incontinent practices."[27] While Burdett might have been an ill-tempered rake, he was also a radical antinomian partisan. During the Gorges period, this might have contributed to his downfall as much as the putative "incontinent practices."[28]

The lack of uniform orthodoxy or predictability among men who identified themselves as clergy provided a near-constant headache for the Massachusetts authorities. In Maine, it had a particularly long tradition, and created so much trouble that missionary efforts were not even considered for decades. It started as early as 1659, when Henry Josselyn and Robert Jordan complained that the minister of Black Point, John Thorpe, was preaching unsound doctrines.[29] Two years later, the settlers added their own denunciation, accusing Thorpe of "notorious Crimes in his Convarsation as may appere by severall testimonies upon oath and sevarall prsentments in Court of Drunkenes & Revilings & slaundring of neightbours & others and divars Inordinat Cariges verie

---

[27] "Proceedings of the General Court," 8 September 1640, *MPCR,* I:74.

[28] *GDMNH,* 120.

[29] William S. Southgate, "History of Scarborough from 1633 to 1783," *Coll MeHS,* 1st ser., 3: 22.

unsemly for any Christian mvch more uncomly for a minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ." They found such a person unsuitable "to Instruct us in the wais of salvation."[30] Thorpe was subsequently removed from his post.

An ironic twist to Thorpe's case is that one of the instigators against the minister was Robert Jordan, himself one of the most scandalous of the early Maine ministers. It is important to note, however, that Jordan did not stand accused of moral infractions. His were far more serious to Massachusetts's aspirations in Maine. He was a devoted "Orthodox Deane of the Church of England," an admirer of the policies of William Laud, and an outspoken enemy of Massachusetts Puritanism.[31]

English-born and Oxford-educated, Jordan followed practices permissible under the Gorges administration. He found Massachusetts' demand of religious conformity intolerable and was determined to hold his ground. Jordan was working more as a civil authority and lawyer than a minister when he ran afoul of the new Puritan administration in 1660. His crime was "baptizing his children in the episcopal mode," for which he was briefly jailed.[32] Disgusted, angry, and unable to hold his tongue, Jordan was later pulled up before the court for "saiing the Gov. of Boston was a Roge."[33] But that was not all: the minister saved special vitriol for the Massachusetts ministerial elite. He faced jail yet again in 1667, this time for calling the deceased John Cotton "a liar, [who] died with a lie

---

[30] *DHSM,* 4:169.

[31] *DHSM,* 4:151; James Finney Baxter, "The Abenakis and Their Ethnic Relations," *Coll MeHS*, 2nd ser., 3: 202.

[32] Edward Bourne, *History of Wells and Kennebunk*, 66.

[33] Qtd. in John Reid, *Maine*, *Charles II and Massachusetts: Governmental Relationships in Early Northern New England* (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1977), 53. Reid shows that Jordan was far from unique in his sentiments: many of Maine's Anglicans were incensed by Massachusetts' religious incursions in the province.

in his mouth, and … has gone to Hell with a pack of lies."[34] In yet another court case, the Anglican minister was accused of alienating a wife from her spouse – though for denominational, not salacious, reasons.[35]

Despite the spread of Puritan control throughout the region, Jordan continued to hold Anglican services in Spurwink until he was driven into New Hampshire during King Philip's War. There he enjoyed the protection of Major Nicholas Shapleigh, a less vulnerable friend and fellow opponent of Massachusetts. A Quaker, Shapleigh was himself a religious outsider who had sought safety in New Hampshire after he also ran afoul of Massachusetts law.[36]

Though they were religious dissenters, Jordan and Shapleigh had reasons to fear the extension of Puritan hegemony over Maine and New Hampshire for other reasons. With control of resources as well as souls at stake, the Protestant factions of northern New England before the wars of empire had few compelling reasons to seek common cause. Through canny maneuvers and the influence of powerful friends, Robert Jordan managed to retain his sizeable plantation, preserving it for his children. However, returning to Maine to claim their patrimony, Jordan's children suffered the same acute personal and financial losses throughout the wars of empire as their reformed neighbors did. Several members of subsequent generations were killed in raids on English settlements. Others were taken to Canada and never returned.[37] Perhaps the Jordans'

---

[34] Qtd. in Bourne, 104.

[35] Southgate, "History of Scarborough from 1633 to 1783," *Coll MeHS,* 1st ser., 3: 154.

[36] *GDMNH* 624; *Coll MeHS* 1st ser., I: 58, 171.

[37] Robert Jordan's son, Dominicus, "the Indian Killer," successfully thwarted an assault on his garrison in King William's War, only to be killed himself in Queen Anne's. His wife and six children were taken captive. *GDMNH,* 389.

Puritan neighbors would have attributed the family's misfortunes to the spiritual failures of its patriarch had they not suffered so acutely themselves.

As the century wore on, the situation regarding quality ministers did not change. Burdett, Thorpe, or Jordan spread vice and sowed discord, but many more respectable ministers left the province after only a brief period of time, refusing ordination and seeking more comfortable quarters closer to colonial metropoles. And the rogue ministers continued to cause problems, casting suspicion on all: as late as 1690, Increase Mather complained of "a Debauched Priest, … one Vandenbosch" who was making the rounds throughout New England and who had "besides the good work of Baptizing a noted whore or two of his acquaintance, made private marriages without the Publication of Banns."[38] Still other men of God took a different tack once they found themselves on the frontier. They cast off the ministerial role altogether and applied themselves to the organization and defense of the Maine settlements. A case in point was Benjamin Blackman, a Harvard graduate and son of a Connecticut minister. Blackman came to Black Point shortly after graduation to take up the post at the church there. He was the first Puritan minister to commit to the region after the disastrous tenure of John Thorpe. By 1680, however, the young minister had discovered that there was more to be gained from Maine than just a rich harvest of souls. Declining to settle at the church at Black Point, he moved to Saco and pursued multiple business interests, including milling,

[38] This was Laurence Vanderbosk, who was most likely a Walloon Huguenot. Whitmore, ed., *Andros Tracts*, 1:37.

timber, and land speculation.[39] Blackman later became a justice of the peace and militia captain.

In contrast to the ministers who had left Maine to pursue their calling elsewhere, and similar to Joseph Baxter, whom he predated by almost half a century, Benjamin Blackman had civic and business connections that tied him to the province. He chose to remain there in times of war to protect his interests. As a militia captain, he took the implied commitment to protect his neighbor's property seriously. This led some to accuse of excessively tough dealing with the Wabanakis, and this triggered a series of events that released the full fury of war on the Maine frontier. His arrest of twenty Indian neighbors in 1688 for killing cattle at North Yarmouth and their subsequent incarceration in Boston caused a significant escalation of King William's War.[40] In response to the capture of their kin, the Wabanakis took sixteen Maine captives and killed four in skirmishes with the English. Blackman's maneuver also ultimately increased New England's collective anger toward Sir Edmund Andros, who released the prisoners against the wishes of Blackman and other Mainers.[41]

For the Harvard men who eventually drifted toward the frontier, Maine was a place of both spiritual and physical destruction. There were ample examples from which to draw. Though some early ministers drank, swore, insulted the memory of

---

[39] *GDMNH,* 94; George Folsom, *History of Saco and Biddeford* (Saco, ME: Alex G. Putnam, 1830), 168. An early biographer claimed Blackman "loved wealth as well as religion, and the praise of donors more than the praise of saints." Williamson, "Sketches of Early Maine Ministers," *Coll MeHS*, 2nd ser., 4: 70.

[40] Mary Beth Norton terms Blackman's initiative as a "tragedy of errors." Having seized the Indians, "Maine's military and political leaders did not know what to do with them." Their retention led to more frontier raids by the Wabanakis. Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 95.

[41] "Thomas Stevens's Deposition," 4 September 1688, *DHSM,* 6:421; Drake, *The Border Wars of New England,* 11*;* Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts-Bay* ed. Lawrence Shaw Mayo (Cambridge: Harvard, 1936), I:364-5.

Puritan saints, seduced married women, or cultivated dissent against Massachusetts, few outdid George Burroughs in contemporary terms of depravity. Burroughs, a minister at Wells who already had a roster of complaints against him, was accused of witchcraft in the Essex County hysteria of 1692. Found guilty and executed, Burroughs' story, as Mary Beth Norton has pointed out, speaks of the general unease that Massachusetts residents harbored about the northern frontier. In the accusations against Burroughs, evil men disguised as gospel ministers murder their wives, swear fealty to the devil in exchange for superhuman strength, and bewitch soldiers to keep them from triumphing over God's enemies.[42]

Perhaps the root of the accusations lay in the fact that Burroughs had inherited a deeply troubled pulpit – one that encapsulates all of Maine's problems in establishing the strong Protestant ministerial presence that the province so desperately needed. Wells had chronic difficulties attracting and maintaining a minister – any minister – throughout most of the second half of the seventeenth century. It started with Hugh Gunnison, who began his ministerial career in Wells in 1654, then quickly moved to Kittery, and was eventually denied ordination because of his "low character."[43] Shortly thereafter, Seth Fletcher was likewise called to preach and was ordained to the church three years later. But he courted controversy and left in 1660 for Saco, and his descendants later allied themselves with highly unpopular and religiously-suspect Andros faction.[44] Next came Joseph Emerson, who served two brief stints in Wells before moving permanently –

---

[42] Norton, *In the Devil's Snare*, 130.

[43] Bourne, *History of Wells and Kennebunk,* 96.

[44] Ibid., 99.

where else? – back to Massachusetts.[45] After Emerson came John Buss, who stayed in Wells for at least a decade and struggled through King Philip's War with his congregation. But ultimately accusations that he was "indifferent to religion" proved too much for him to take. Buss moved on to Durham, New Hampshire, where he made liars of his Wells critics by spending the next thirty-three years in relative peace and ministerial fulfillment.[46] Next to Wells came Percival Green, who died after only five months in the pulpit. Green's loss was doubly grievous: he had been in the process of setting up a school for the town's children, a potent symbol of the community's persistence in trying times.[47] Green was followed by his classmate, Richard Martyn, who two years later also died young, his health broken by the climate.[48] Wells had six ministers in thirty-six years – a high turnover by any standard, given the longevity that some ministers enjoyed elsewhere. No one managed to stay more than a decade, and there were long gaps between pastorates. Perhaps the Wells pulpit had come to be regarded as tainted, making the accusations against the ill-fated George Burroughs, who was already unpopular and his orthodoxy suspect, all the more convincing.[49] His downfall was by far the most spectacular of all the unfortunate Wells ministers. Accused of witchcraft and several other crimes, he was executed at Salem on August 19, 1692.[50]

---

[45] Joseph Emerson was the great-grandfather of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Well-respected for his spiritual leadership, his departure to Massachusetts was felt keenly by his Maine flock. *GDMNH*, 220.

[46] Bourne, 167

[47] Ibid., 170.

[48] *GDMNH,* 464.

[49] On "cursed" and "blessed" places and spaces, see David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment,* 178 ; Gildrie, *The Profane, The Civil and the God*, 173; Jon Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1990), 39-41, 44-5, 54, 56-7, 63-5.

[50] *GDMNH,* 122.

If Well's failure to keep its pulpit filled puzzled ministerial candidates, the death of York's minister, Shubael Dummer, brought home the gravest of dangers that plagued Maine settlements. Dummer and all his family met their ends in the Candlemas Raid of 1691/2.[51] Moreover, as the town's minister, he was apparently targeted for assassination in the presence of his panicked congregation.

Readers of Cotton Mather's sermons learned of the event in graphic detail. Dummer was apparently struck down as he "was just going to take his Horse at his own Door, upon a Journey in the Service of God, when the Tygres that were making their Depredations upon the Sheep of York seiz'd upon their Shepherd; and they shot him so, that they left him Dead among the Tribe of Abel on the Ground." Mather believed that the minister's death had been plotted by elusive instigators, "some Romish Missionaries [who] had long been wishing, that they might Embrue their Hands in the Blood of some New-English MINISTER." His attackers were later seen wearing his clothes.[52] The sheep – an obvious metaphor for the true followers of Christ – were deprived of their good shepherd through evil design. To New Englanders, the act was particularly loathsome – and ungodly – because Dummer had been one of the few, settled ministers who seemed content to minister to Mainers.

Dummer's assassination was invested with symbolism for both the French and he English. Details of the minister's death come from Cotton Mather, who knew the murdered man and had held him in high regard. Having heard a different account, the

---

[51] There is some confusion over the Dummer family. Some sources list his wife, Lydia, as a daughter of Edward Rishworth and sister of Mary Plaisted (who is discussed at length in Chapter 2 of this study). Sybil Noyes et al claim that Lydia Dummer was born into the Alcock family of York. She and her young son were taken captive after her husband was killed; both died on the trek to Quebec. Bourne, 211; *GDMNH*, 210-1.

[52] Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana,* VII: 77.

French Intendant Jean Bouchart de Champigny painted a portrait of Dummer as a coward, who abandoned his congregation in a futile attempt to save his own skin. Champigny reported matter-of-factly to Governor Frontenac that the minister was shot "while escaping on his horse," suggesting that New England ministers, unlike the martyrdom-seeking Jesuits, were more concerned with body than soul.[53] The English, French and Wabanakis appear to have agreed that Dummer, like any New England minister, was a key symbol of settlement, stability and cohesion, and that killing him in front of his congregation sent a potent psychological message to friend and foe alike about the persistent vulnerability of Maine's settlements.

But Dummer's work had extended beyond the pulpit to land speculation in Wabanaki territory. In 1687, Dummer renewed his claim to two parcels of land on the outskirts of York, which together amounted to more than 100 acres.[54] The fact that a minister, whose calling kept him from pursuing full-time agriculture, could claim so much land for himself, might have raised fears about increased migration and stability that would permanently alter the landscape among indigenous observers.

Shubael Dummer's murder also happened against a backdrop of fear that New England's skirts were beset from enemies from within. Even quality ministers would be kept from doing their jobs, and possibly killed. One of the key suspects of these subversive practices was the hated governor of the Dominion of New England, Edmund Andros. Long suspected of playing the French and Wabanakis against the English, Andros was accused by his detractors running trying to sell out New England to Quebec, cavorting with Native American women and supplying their men with English weapons,

---

[53] Qtd. in Charles E. Banks, *A History of York, Maine* (Boston, n. p., 1931), I: 292.

[54] *DSHM,* 4:273.

and, of course, practicing popery.[55] Andros's faction countered that if the frontier settlers were having problems with the Wabanakis, they had no one to blame but themselves. At least one pro-Andros author charged that "French Priests and Jesuits have dwelt and inhabited [among the Wabanakis], and endeavored to propogate their Religion amongst them, which is more than any of our English Priests or Teachers have done, for although by the Piety of our Forefathers Considerable Sums of Mony have been given, and a corporation erected for the Evangelization of the Indians in N-E, very small progress hath bee hitherto made therein."[56] If the colonists were going to play the popery card, so were the besieged royalists – and they tossed in accusations of hypocrisy and misappropriation of funds that were meant to support frontier ministry for good measure.

This position found a highly unlikely ally in Cotton Mather, who chronically bemoaned the failure of the ministry to provide spiritual reinforcements for the frontiers and attract new Christians. He even included an example of this oversight in Hannah Swarton's captivity narrative. Hannah was subject to the taunts of her "Indian mistress … [who] would say that had the English been as careful to instruct her in our religion as the French were to instruct her in theirs, she might have been of our religion."[57] Mather, however, did not cast blame exclusively on the ministers who were already tending provincial flocks. Instead, he argued that the government should support further efforts

---

[55] According to Louise Breen, Andros's success in bargaining with Maine's Indians and other groups led to the accusations of illicit dealings. Among the frequently-leveled charges were that Andros "loved" the Indians more than the English, and this his drinking with Native American women and providing them with ammunition was something far more sinister than an attempt to woo them into an English alliance. Breen, *Transgressing the Bounds*, 217-8.

[56] Increase Mather, "True Reformed Religion," (1690), *Andros Tracts* II: 218.

[57] Hannah Swarton, "Narrative," in Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans Among the Indians,* 150.

for Native American proselytization.[58] Seeing the light, the government eventually rose to the occasion, one which saw its fulfillment decades later in the appointment of the established Harvard man, Joseph Baxter.

In the period spanning King William's and Queen Anne's wars, the need to shore up New England's spiritual borders took on new and greater urgency. Even those outside of New England helped. In 1700, Lord Bellomont, governor of New York, suggested that Massachusetts divert a French-speaking minister from New Oxford to counteract the effects of "French Jesuits debauching … Indians" through use of common language.[59] The suggestion would have brought badly-needed spiritual workers to the area. By 1700, there were a mere nine ministers serving the settlements to the Eastward. Of them, only John Newmarch (Kittery), John Wade (South Berwick), Samuel Emery (Wells), and Samuel Moody (York) were ordained and serving regularly-constituted churches. Most were also young and fairly inexperienced.[60]

Concerned over the ministerial deficit, Massachusetts Governor Joseph Dudley warned the Board of Trade that Maine suffered from moral decrepitude, due in large part to the uneven and ineffective application of the Word of God in the frontier regions. To Dudley, the situation was critical. He reported, "there was nothing done towards the Maintenance of a Minister in several places."[61] For settlements decimated by war, there was little to give. Government intervention was badly needed.

---

[58] Increase Mather, "Further Queries upon the Present State of New England Affaires," (1690), *Andros Tracts* 1:202.

[59]Bellomont to the Board of Trade, 9 July 1700, *DHSM,* 10: 69. The idea was still being considered as late as 1746. Gov. Shirley to the Duke of Newcastle, 21 November 1746, *DHSM,* 11: 347.

[60] Clark notes that all were under the age of thirty. The youngest, Samuel Moody, was twenty-two. Clark, 82.

[61] Joseph Dudley to the Board of Trade, 1 March 1708/9, *DHSM,* 9:264.

At first glance, the Board of Trade seems like an unlikely place to turn to address religions concerns. But Dudley's appeal makes sense when considered against the backdrop of the corporal needs of ministers and their families. The Maine ministers who managed to stay on the frontier during the wars of empire suffered the same misfortunes as their congregants. They lost family members, homes, livestock and belongings. Further complicating their sorry state was the fact that they relied on their congregations to pay their salaries. When entire communities suffered, how could ministers possibly expect their compensation from those who had suffered identical losses? Thus funding ministerial salaries assumed a lesser priority when congregants faced rebuilding their livelihoods and settlements from nothing. And ministers, unlike many other settlers who had little or no other recourse, had a moveable trade: there was nothing intrinsic to their situation that forced them to stay in such trying circumstances.

During the wars of empire, the best hope for these "frontiers well-defended" therefore lay in the efforts of military chaplains, whose importance to colonial security rose throughout the late seventeenth into the eighteenth centuries. As Charles Clark notes, "Several of the Maine ministers had begun their careers in the pay of the General Court as chaplains to frontier garrisons during King William's War."[62] Responding to the need, at least one Maine minister successfully juggled both spiritual and military duties at the same time, and for his efforts became a legend. Like most of his predecessors, Samuel Moody of York had been born in Massachusetts and educated at Harvard.[63] Remembering well the destruction of the last meeting house and parsonage in the Candlemas Massacre, the inhabitants of York built their new chaplain cum minister a

---

[62] Clark, 83.

[63] Noyes et al describe Moody as "a frontier parson and fighting chaplain." *GDMNH,* 487.

home and meetinghouse within the stockade, complete with flankers for added defense. It was there that "Father Moody" became the "spiritual dictator" of York, a post he held until his death forty-seven years later.[64]

The spiritual architecture of York was thus similar to a Catholic mission, where protection and religion were intimately intertwined. In addition, Moody's directness in spiritual matters smacked of the absolute spiritual authority that missionaries claimed over their neophytes – another manifestation of the merging of practices while beliefs became increasingly, strongly polarized.

And like the Jesuits, who served political functions as well as religious ones, Maine's ministers during the wars of empire increasingly played multiple roles that straddled both the spiritual and material worlds. In one case, another Samuel Moody (a cousin of the first), was given an explicit directive to draw Indians away from Catholic missionaries.[65] In 1712, Governor Dudley wrote to this Moody, requesting "The next visit the Indians make you at the fort receive them friendly and acquaint them that in order to a firm and lasting peace between the Queen of Great Britayn & the french king there is a cessation of arms Concluded for four months to give the Necessary time to make it perfect & that the governments of the french and English are commanded not to Hurt each other till they shall hear the Issue and be further Directed."[66] The implication of "further directed" suggests a switch in spiritual authorities. Certainly Sebastien Rale, who by 1712 was missionary at the well-established Norridgewock mission, interpreted

---

[64] Clark, 85.

[65] Major Samuel Moody started his career as a minister but "prompted by duty some times as chaplain, or a lasting memory of the refugees he had seen as from childhood," decided to plow his efforts into military work. *GDMNH,* 487.

[66] Joseph Dudley to Samuel Moody, 12 November 1712, *DHSM,* 9:332-3.

Moody's actions that way. Shortly after, a clearly-threatened Sebastien Rale wrote Moody that he would consider any attempt to lure Norridgewock proselytes away was an "*acte d'hostilitié*."[67]

Even when France and England were at peace, the missionaries were clearly willing to prosecute the war for souls on their own. By the time Rale penned his threat to Moody, the Massachusetts government had for years been puzzling over the problem of their presence in English territory. In 1701, and with the support of a reinforced English law that forbad Jesuits from English territories on pain of death, William Stoughton wrote a stinging letter to Vincent Bigot, Sebastien Rale's predecessor at Norridgewock. The missive, addressed "to Vincent – a *Bigot*," accused the priest of "a Licentiosness of tyrañising over our Consciences and destroying our Souls." Stoughton warned Bigot to "speedily [betake] your self to Quebeck, or Paris, or Rome or where you please out of this Jurisdisction. Except you can find it in your heart to forego your superstitions for Christ and embrace the true reformed Religion which most firmly retains everything that is Christian in yours"[68] Stoughton's letter was not a simple request to evict a theological squatter from English territory. It was actually a response to a letter that Bigot himself had sent to George Turfrey, commander of the garrison at Saco. Mocking and derisive, Bigot's own letter warned that he intended to continue the contest for souls in Maine and that English efforts to eject him from the area would be futile. It was clearly not the first exchange between the two men. "What is the matter most friendly George that now for a long time we have not read the least line from you in answer to

---

[67] Sebastien Rale to Samuel Moody, 18 November 1712, *DHSM,* 9:334.

[68] William Stoughton to Vincent Bigot, 10 April 1701, *DHSM,* 10: 109-10.

ours?" Bigot inquired. But the mocking soon stopped, as the Jesuit came to the real point of his letter:

> My George, believe me, this one thing I aim at in writing, warning … that you may be sensible in the vanity of your Religion, that so you may [unlegible] out and take care of your Salvation; which if it were possible I would willingly secure to you with my blood.[69]

Even though England and France, and hence their colonies, were at peace, the Jesuit warned the local English military leader that he intended to fight to exert spiritual authority over Maine's indigenous people. Another war and more than a decade later, Sebastien Rale would repeat his predecessor's threat and back it up with action. The generation of missionaries who gave selflessly of their bodies in order to win converts through example had clearly passed. The generation that matured in their work during the wars of empire was willing to fight, and in some cases, enjoy the spoils of war. As such, they not only followed their own dictates of conscience, but conformed to French modes of fighting, even enjoying the fruits of his neophytes' plunder from captured English vessels.[70]

Maine's Jesuit missionaries for the most part enjoyed the support and protection of the governor of Canada, Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil. However, Vaudreuil could – and did, on occasion – disavow anti-English agitation when Jesuit instigators jeopardized the interests of the colonial government and stepped too far. Maine's Jesuits would have preferred to act with the blessing of the French government, but they also had their own models for frontier action. They took their cues from the example of Ignatius Loyola, the

---

[69] Vincent Bigot to George Turfrey, 09/1700. Massachusetts Archives, 51:99-100. Massachusetts State Archives [hereafter "MSA"], Boston, MA.

[70] Sebastien Rale to Pierre Joseph de la Chasse, 23 August 1712. Baxter, *Pioneers of New France in New England*, 256.

order's founder and the great "soldier saint" of post-Reformation Catholicism. Ignatian teachings made the Jesuits the "shock troops" of Counter-Reformation reforms.[71] The military metaphor for the labors of the men of Ignatius proved consistent with their activities on the Maine frontier. At least one Black Point settler, Joshua Scottow (Benjamin Blackman's father-in-law), knew the Ignatian reputation, calling the founder "Igne-nate, Hell-born Loyola" whose "Jesu-ite" priests should "Depart from Jesus."[72] Scottow denounced the Jesuits for actions that were, at best, only tangentially linked to the example of Christ. Certainly the New Englander recognized that the priests did not limit their activities to spiritual affairs, instead plying their talents to their political partisans. The Jesuit Joseph Aubery, who had been a Norridgewock missionary, lent his artistic and cartographic talents to arguing that the Treaty of Utrecht was cheating the French.[73] Sebastien Rale was both a missionary and a reliable intelligence agent of the French state during Dummer's War.[74] Étienne Lauverjat was endlessly active in his attempts to maintain control over the Penobscot Indians and exert control over lay French settlers.[75] And Pierre Joseph de la Chasse publicized their exploits in both Canada and abroad and kept the money and other forms of support flowing into his order's missions.

And these were just the Jesuits. For Protestants, the most notorious missionaries were the seminary priests, like Simon Thury, the missionary of Pentagoët who preceded

---

[71] Jesuit mission work was laden with militaristic language: priests like Pal Le Jeune, the first superior of the Canada missions, and his colleagues, spoke of themselves as "brave soldiers" who "built batteries" to "destroy the empires of Satan." Such usage was not new to the context of the Atlantic World: much of it was coined by Ignatius of Loyola himself and was applied to efforts to conquer Protestantism. Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 91.

[72] Southgate, "*History of Scarborough", Coll MeHS* 1st ser., 3: 116.

[73] *DCB,* III: 24.

[74] Ibid.*,* II: 544.

[75] Ibid., III: 359.

Lauverjat and actively engaged in raids against English settlements, and the ubiquitous Père Meriel, who successfully converted so many New England captives to Catholicism and therefore bore responsibility for their permanent "bondage" to the French colonies.

Maine's early Protestant ministers were frequently ineffective, and it took intervention by the colonial government to shore up the Protestant identity of the region's inhabitants. Stabilization led to a new militarism among the ministers themselves, and the most successful were both ministering to civilians and also offering spiritual protection and military leadership to the militia. Their rivals, the Catholic clergy, were engaged in similar enterprises, ministering to the Wabanakis and, when appropriate, providing intelligence to the government of New France in exchange for protection of mission territory. This was the world into which Joseph Baxter, the Massachusetts minister, stepped in 1717. What qualified him to tip the spiritual scales in favor of English interests?

Baxter was an attractive choice for several reasons. For one – and in contrast to most of his Protestant predecessors – he was armed with ample zeal to accomplish the task. In addition, he had the full support of Massachusetts Assembly. And as a Harvard-trained minister, he was presumably armed with the theological tools to take on the erudite Jesuits. Last, his new English congregation was small and should have provided him with ample time to devote to his missionary work.

But little in his background prepared him for the challenges of daily life as a frontier minister. Born in Braintree, Massachusetts, in 1676, he graduated from Harvard in 1693. In 1694, he returned to Braintree and was admitted to full communion with the

church, and preached his first sermon there. A year later, he was called to settle at the church in Medfield, a relatively remote town west of Boston that had been burned during King Philip's War and was still struggling to recover.[76]

His long, often-difficult experiences in Medfield offer clues as to why Baxter would have found the Maine post attractive. His relationship with the congregation had been troubled almost from the start. Joseph Baxter had been a compromise candidate for the Medfield pulpit (the fractious congregation had rejected thirty-one candidates in the preceding four years). When the time for ordination came, some congregants complained about Baxter's youth and inexperience. Others thought his voice too weak for effective preaching. Still, the pulpit needed to be filled, and Joseph Baxter was ordained in 1697.[77]

These inauspicious beginnings proved to be a model for the rest of his ministerial life. The next twenty years were punctuated by occasional congregational upheavals during which congregants frequently slandered each other as "ungodly and pernicious."[78] And the congregation was not just chronically cranky, it was also cheap: as late as 1743 Baxter was still receiving only £55 annually for his ministerial services. In 1699, the minister himself was involved in a dispute of an undisclosed nature with the Medfield congregants. The situation grew so serious that his friends tried to locate new positions for him. A similar situation had again arisen in 1717 – the very year he accepted the Kennebec post.[79]

---

[76] Shipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates,* 4:144.

[77] Ibid., 145.

[78] 147.

[79] 148.

Joseph Baxter had only limited success as a New England minister. But he *was* a successful frontier entrepreneur. His extra-ministerial business activities ranged from investments in early industrial enterprises (iron works in Stoughton and Walpole), to aggressive land speculation on Massachusetts' western frontier.[80] He was also keenly interested in lands on the upper reaches of English settlement in the Province in Maine. In 1717 – the year of the second recorded controversy within his congregation - Baxter was deeded an island in the Pejepscot River that he christened with his own name. Later he was given additional land, including the ironically-named "Friar's Island."

Soon the missionary would encounter a real "friar," the Jesuit Sebastien Rale, who was determined to thwart the Protestant missionary's pretensions and make Baxter pay dearly for his real estate. Rale had much more than just Baxter to combat, however, for the missionary was certainly not alone in pursuing land ventures that threatened the Jesuit missions. In the years following the Peace of Utrecht, Baxter was only one of a sizeable number of speculators from other parts of New England who were convinced that the terms of the treaty ensured the safety of their investments. In actuality, the terms remained mired in vagueness and confusion, and the border, which Utrecht was said to definitively settle, still remained a source of contention among the tripartite interests in the region. One of the regions that became "Ground Zero" for conflicts was the area around the Kennebec River. And, of course, the largest Jesuit mission in the Province of Maine, with the most combustible mixture of zealous missionaries and proselytes, was situated in the heart of this contested region.

The Norridgewock of Rale and Baxter's day was an outpost of syncretic Catholicism. It was also, in geographical terms, the closest French outpost to any of the

[80] 147.

English settlements to the Eastward. To the English who were pressing northward and Eastward, a Protestant minister who could successfully counter the Jesuits' effects with a more palatable version of Christianity was not just desirable, but critical. Such a person could dislodge the Kennebecs from their spiritual connection to the Jesuit mission and keep them from disturbing English interests in the region. But first such a person would have to combat a formidable enemy – the infamous Rale.

In 1717, Joseph Baxter was their man. Beset by troubles within his own congregation, Baxter was undoubtedly flattered by the manner with which the Pejepscot proprietors expressed their interest in his candidacy:

> Your known zeal to so good & serve the interest of religioun where you come, as it recommends you to all that are acquainted with it, so it has invited us to address our labors to you at this time, & make a proposal, which, if accepted, we hope will put into your hands the opportunity of being instrumental to the great good not of a particular congregation only but the whole land.[81]

The meeting house and town were not yet built, and the future congregants could only offer £40 per anum, £15 less than Baxter's annual salary in Medfield. With six children of his own and other interests in Massachusetts, why would Joseph Baxter find such an offer attractive?

The answer was simple: there were good fringe benefits. Governor Shute knew of the minister's investment activities and perhaps his desire to leave Medfield and used them to sweeten the offer. Shute assured the minister that security in the region was all but guaranteed:

> Wherefore we would inform you that having considerable interest in the Province of Maine, we are carrying forward settlement there & having

[81] [Pejepscot proprietors] to Joseph Baxter, 1717. Doggett Family Papers. Maine Historical Society [hereafter "MeHS"], Portland, Maine.

> entered into engagements with the Province to build a Fort, there, have lately finished it beyond all expectation, which is owing not so much to our industrious application, tho that was not wanting_ as the remarkable smiles of Providence on the undertaking too long here to relate, & which gives us hopes of our future success: It is a fine strong stone fort well built with lime, mounted with ten pieces of canon & garrisoned with a captain and fifteen men.[82]

The English settlement did not yet have a meeting house, but it had critical protective mechanisms in place to ensure the settlement's growth.

And, perhaps most importantly, it had souls in need of God. The post would not be an easy one. The proprietors of the new town of Brunswick, where Baxter was to settle and maintain a congregation and school, carefully prepared him for extensive duties. They wrote "we desire religion, not only among the garrisons and the inhabitants which we expect will be a good number went thither in the spring, but also the Indians, who are almost daily there. It is necessary that the person engaging in this work should be full of self-denial, zeal for religion & compassion to ignorant & perishing Idolaters & one who will be constant to forego many … enjoyments & endure some hardships & hazards for the satisfaction of doing good here & the prospect of a future reward."[83] Baxter was further armed with the blessings of both Samuel Shute and the prominent Massachusetts minister Samuel Sewall. Baxter was expected to accomplish three tasks: minister to a frontier flock that at present had no credible religious leadership; entice the local Indians, already at very least nominally Christian, to adopt "the same Religion" as the English; and bring a forceful Protestant vision into a region suffused with "foolish superstitious and plain Idolatries."[84]

---

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] *DHSM,* 23:94.

In return, the minister was offered an attractive package to decamp from the relative security of Medfield for the less stable environment of the Kennebec, including lodgings, proximity to his own undeveloped lands, and the satisfaction of bringing souls closer to God – and the English. Taken together, Baxter's promised compensation amounted to £150, a net increase of almost 200 percent over his Medfield income.[85]

Baxter was introduced to his new flock at the Arrowsic Conference of 1717. It was not long after that he encountered his first Jesuit. Étienne Lauverjat had replaced the Sulpician Thury at Penobscot and was in close council with Joseph d'Abbadie and Bernard Anselm de Saint-Castin, sons of the "French baron of Pentagoët" and a daughter of the late sachem Madokawando, who had eagerly fought the English in King William's War.[86] As a fellow Jesuit missionary, he was also a close associate of Sebastien Rale.

Lauverjat visited Baxter at least once and corresponded with him several times.[87] The encounter was civil and included "a great deal of Discourse." This probably gave Baxter hope that all Jesuits would be reasonable and comply with his aims. Other events added to this hope: at one point, John Gyles, an ex-captive cum interpreter for the English, reported to Baxter that Lauverjat had told his flock "there is a strong Peace between y^{e} French and English and I believe it will be a lasting one," thus seemingly encouraging them to be pliant.[88] But as Baxter was soon to discover, not all Jesuits were alike. If the comportment of the "Penobscot friar" Lauverjat suggested mediation and cooperation, or at least polite interaction, this was by no means universal to the order as a

---

[85] Skipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates,* 4:148.

[86] *DCB,* I. 649.

[87] [Joseph Baxter], "Journal of the Rev. Joseph Baxter of Medfield, Missionary to the Eastern Indians, 1717," *NEGHR* 21 (January 1867), 53.

[88] Ibid., 52.

whole.[89] In contrast to Étienne Lauverjat, who was younger and less experienced, Sebastien Rale was a veteran missionary who understood the political ins and outs of New France and its Native American allies on the Kennebec. He had come to the mission field ill-prepared for such work, having previously served as a professor of rhetoric and Greek at a Jesuit college. But almost three decades among numerous Indian communities in the *pays d'en haut* and Maine had served the priest well. He was fluent in Wabanaki, respected in Quebec, and sufficiently influential among his Indian companions to be a near-constant target of English military forces in times of tension.[90] By the time Baxter arrived on the scene in 1717, Rale had seen and experienced all. At seventy years of age, he saw little need to waste his time on polite discourse with the Protestant minister. He wanted Baxter and the rest of the English out of the Kennebec region. So did many of his catechists. So did the French government in Quebec. Governor Vaudreuil wrote the Jesuit "I am of the opinion that, if the [Wabanaki] have taken a Sincere resolution not to allow The English On Their Land, they must not hesitate to Drive them Therefrom as Soon as Possible."[91] Rale, concerned about rival Christian visions operating in the area and targeting Wabanaki Catholics, was eager to do his part.

But despite the events of 1717 and beyond, Sebastien Rale had, when the situation suited him, a history of embracing those elements of English life that crept into his mission sphere. French authorities had years before suspected him of only lukewarm

---

[89] Charlotte Alice Baker, *True Stories of the New England Captives during the Old French and Indian Wars* (Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1990), 339.

[90] The first attempt to "capture" Rale happened in 1705 during Queen Anne's War, when forces under Winthrop Hilton sacked Norridgewock and burned its church. The Kennebecs later insisted the English rebuild the destroyed church. For a more thorough description of these events, see Chapter 5 of this study, in addition to *DCB,* II. 543-5; *JR* 67:209-10.

[91] See Kenneth Morrison, *Embattled Northeast*, 184.

support for the French during Queen Anne's War, and accused him of imbuing his neophytes, whose cooperation was important to French success, with the same ambivalence. For this he was briefly recalled from Maine.[92] In addition, he did not hesitate to seek the assistance of certain English neighbors when needed. Rale's interactions with the English suggest that they resulted less from sectarian pugnacity than from the physical needs of his flock – and himself. The fact that he even engaged in dialogue gave some English ministers the hope that he was redeemable. Cotton Mather himself had fantasies about converting the Jesuit through the seductive powers of clever pro-Protestant arguments cloaked in the priest's own exquisite Latin.[93] Other ministers were also curious about the Jesuit and his work. These included Samuel Sewall, who never met the priest but was well-aware of his reputation as an effective minister and linguist. At the close of the conference at Arrowsic Island which he attended in 1717, Sewall sent Rale a gift, a collection of personal meditations, delivered to the priest by Captain John, a Kennebec sachem. Though the content of these meditations is unknown, one wonders if they were purely a gift of good will from one man of God to another – or if Sewall's intent was more didactic in nature. When married with the English text, Sewall's inscription, *"Samuel Sewall Sebastieno Rale Salutem mittit,"* ["Samuel Sewall sends greetings to Sebastien Rale"], presents a clear point of contrast between reformed Protestantism and Catholicism: though just as erudite as any member of the Catholic priestly cast, true Christian messages were accessible to all in the vernacular, not obfuscated by a language that was available only to a small, elite group of educated adherents.

---

[92] *DCB,* II: 542.

[93] Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 252.

Rale also sought English assistance in more personal matters. By 1716, the aged priest was suffering from a badly-healed wound to his leg (incurred in a fall from a church steeple). Unwilling or unable to journey far from Norridgewock in pursuit of a French doctor, he sought the help of Hugh Adams, an Arrowsic settler who also served as a physician and a minister. In an extension of cross-cultural accommodation, Adams treated Rale's broken body and apparently enjoyed the old man's company.[94] But this fragile friendship led to other expectations that were not met – another casualty of shifting borderland priorities. According to Jeremy Belknap, Adams cherished the hope that Rale "would thenceforth exert his influence for peace" in the region.[95] But unlike medical help or wars for which his people saw no real territorial assurances, the events of 1717, and the clear attempt to replace him with a Puritan counterpart, were obvious encroachments on the old priest's spiritual, and literal, mission territory – an act of spiritual aggression that threatened to undermine decades of ministry. Adams's hopes were dashed during Dummer's War. Upon hearing of Rale's death at the hands of an English force in 1724, he rejoiced that a "man appointed to utter destruction" had met his fate.[96]

Seasoned by years of experience in the field, Rale was obviously more grounded in Native American imperatives, habits, and culture than the parvenu Baxter, and by 1717, was up for a fight. But he possessed his own biases and blind spots. Despite his assertion that he had come to "see, hear and speak… only as an Indian," Rale could not

---

[94] Calvert, *Black Robe*, 172-3.

[95] Baxter, *Pioneers of New France in New England,* 67; Calvert, *Black Robe,* 172-3.

[96] Qtd. in Kidd, *Protestant*, 108. By the time of Rale's death, Adams was pastor at Durham, New Hampshire. He further bemoaned that the Jesuit had "so subjugated the Savages under his Arbitrary Power as to influence them into all their so barbarous hostilities."

escape his own cultural antecedents.[97] His greatest achievement – a Wabanaki/French lexicon – served as a valuable didactic tool for those who followed.[98] The consummate educator, Rale employed his post-Reformation training in as many aspects of his ministry as possible.

This is also apparent in the liturgical environment he created at Norridgewock. For years, Sebastien Rale attempted to create an island of reformed Catholicism in the Maine wilderness. Baxter came to Maine with similar hopes and expectations for his own Protestant vision. In many ways, Joseph Baxter and Sebastien Rale were similar in their representations of reformed and reactionary Christianity. Both were educated at the highest level available in their societies. Both were steeped in the byproducts of the great waves of religious enthusiasm that swept Europe in the wake of the Reformation. Both were committed to bringing souls to the Christian God. And though they disagreed over the definition and uses of this erudition in the mission field, Baxter and Rale were both members of a cadre of religious men known as much for their erudition as their piety.

It is no surprise that Rale found Baxter's derision of the fundamental objects of Catholic piety intolerable. But the minister was canny in his knowledge of Wabanaki attachment to these objects and did not seek to discard them altogether. Such an act would have been too much of a shock to the Wabanaki Christian worldview, no matter how corrupt he considered it to be. Instead, Baxter cleverly planned a slow period of transitions, during which he would remake Protestant Christians out of Catholic ones. By replacing objects (Protestant works of piety for Catholic ones, "toys and curiosities" for

---

[97] Baxter, *Pioneers of New France*, 96.

[98] *DCB,* II: 543-4.

the tactile elements of Catholic worship), Baxter apparently hoped to insinuate himself as the primary man of God, and with this his message, into the lives of Christian Wabanakis.

When faced with the possibility of losing his flock, however, Rale retrenched. Describing dreams of terrible events to come should the Norridgewocks accept English friendship, Rale created a vision of torment that combined both Native American diabolism and the apocalyptic horror of the New Testament. According to Baxter, Rale attempted to keep the Wabanakis by describing to them "an Apparition yt the Jesuit at Nerridgewock saw who Lying alone in his wigwam, awaked in ye night and saw a great Light as if his wigwam had been in fire, whereupon he got up , and went abroad, and after some time he returned to his wigwam, and went to sleep again; and after awhile he waked, and felt as it were a hand upon his Throat yt almost choaked him, saw a great light again, and heard a voice saying it is in vain for you to take any pains with these Indians, your children, for I have got possession of them, ad will keep possession of them … [t]he letter was written in ye Indian tongue."[99] Rale's descriptions of his dreams were sure to strike at chord with some of the older leaders, who were inclined to make peace with the English and respect Shute's promises. But if they persisted, he warned them, "you will do ye Devils work, &c., the Devil will take you."[100]

Heaven and hell, saints and devils intermingled in the frontier missions of both Catholics and Protestants. But so did intellectualism, that coequal trait to piety that both Jesuits and gospel ministers prized so highly. Ironically, one of Rale's most durable achievements as missionary at Norridgewock was not in the field of piety or politics, but in a work of scholarship, his Wabanaki lexicon. Rale created the lexicon as a tool for his

---

[99] [Baxter], "Baxter Journal," 54.

[100] Ibid., 18.

fellow Jesuits to use to communicate effectively in Wabanaki vernacular to teach, in an ideal environment, the prayers, meditations, and other pious practices of reformed Catholicism. Such gentle spiritual endeavors were more consistent with the zealous yet patient and peace-loving Francis Xavier, and not the warrior-saint Loyola. It was Xavier, after all, who rose as the prominent saintly guiding light for the Canadian missions, lending his name to the settlements and their churches. His figure graced their alters and niches. And in a final irony, Rale's Wabanaki lexicon, his greatest contribution to Catholic missionary efforts in Maine, is now part of the scholarly collections of Harvard, the alma mater of his rival, Joseph Baxter.

Contemporary accounts of the Indian wars are replete with the conviction that it was Jesuit missionaries were the key political players in Maine's Native American communities. This view persisted, unchallenged, in historical accounts through the nineteenth century.[101] Modern scholars, however, find much to debate in this claim. During the last twenty years scholars have concluded that whatever influence the missionaries themselves held over the Wabanakis was limited by numerous factors, including trade, political identity, and preexisting intertribal relationships.[102] Jesuits played a circumscribed role in these networks of political, social and trade alliances. In many cases, however, they did act as cultural mediators between the Wabanakis and the

---

[101]Edward Bourne and Charles Banks, the nineteenth century chroniclers of Wells and York respectively, assume that Jesuits incited the Wabanakis to attack English settlements, even against their wishes. Such assertions seem to reinforce older views that Jesuits relied on supernatural means to force their neophytes to do their bidding.

[102] For examples of works that grapple with these very issues, see Axtell, *Invasion Within*, Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and the Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650 – 1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), Daniel Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), and Morrison, *Embattled Northeast.*

French government in Quebec. Nonetheless, their power and ability to affect change varied from village to village and depended largely on the group's attraction to Catholicism and the spiritual charisma of the particular missionary. In some cases, Jesuit missionaries were tolerated only because of their significance to the French, but were otherwise marginalized and held aloof from tribal politics.

A letter from the Norridgewock Indians of Sebastien Rale's day to Massachusetts governor Shute confirms the point. Addressed to the "*Grand Capitaine des Anglais,"* the letter sets down facts that the Norridgewocks wished to make incontrovertibly clear. It contained such definitive statements as "My land is not thine by right of conquest, gift, or purchase … the King of France could not give it. I am not his subject."[103] Though dictated to and presented by a Jesuit, Pierre Joseph de la Chasse, the letter indicates that both Protestant and Catholic missionaries who lived among the Wabanakis were there on sufferance. While military force might bring about a change of custom, religious affection remained a matter of choice that the Wabanakis wished to preserve for themselves alone.

When Jesuits and New Englanders came into contact in Maine, familiarity often bred contempt – especially during the depredations of Dummer's War. Not surprisingly, Jesuits were regarded with distrust even after peace had been concluded. But the loss of Norridgewock and Rale's leadership marked an endpoint to the unbridled influence of missionary priests. The English now had a bargaining chip for subduing them. A Maine-born interpreter and ex-captive, John Gyles, risked destroying a conference with the Penobscots in 1727 because the Wabanakis came equipped with their Jesuit. The priest incurred the interpreter's full wrath when he presumed to include

[103] Qtd. in *NEC,* 1:134-5.

himself in the negotiating party. Gyles refused to allow this offending priest (most likely Lauverjat or Aubery), to partake in the conference and represent the interests of the Penobscots. For his part, the Jesuit objected to the presumption that he would behave dishonestly. But Gyles disagreed, asserting "I think it altogether Improper for any Jesuitt to Pen Down my Enterpretation."[104] In addition, he took the liberty of admonishing the priest, asserting his belief that the Jesuit's very right to be present at the proceedings was suspect. Gyles stated firmly

> I must aquaint you Mr. Jesuitt & you Mr Casteen if you are Com as Privat Gen'men to Give me a Vicett you ar Welcom, & shall be treated Sinely, but if as Spies & to take advantig of my Interpretation & Insult me, I shall Resent it, &c. And I must further a quaint you chief Indians, and you Mr. Jesuit it it not Custemay wth Us for Ministers to set in Council, only as Sent for before & after Council to pray & move off…[105]

Offended, the Jesuit protested that he attended "not … to Insult but to hear." Nevertheless, he agreed to "put by" his pen and ink. But for John Gyles, who was from childhood suspicious of Jesuits, this gesture was insufficient. He ordered his own man, an accompanying militia captain, to record the proceedings. This move prompted a mild protest from the Penobscots and came close to jeopardizing the conference. In addition, it also sparked a debate over the role that such priests had in political proceedings in the aftermath of English victory in Dummer's War.[106]

Hoping to convince the Penobscots to solidify their peace with the English (and perhaps learning a lesson from the mistakes of Joseph Baxter), John Gyles sought to recast the Jesuit's role in an apolitical light. In this frontier-style display of the concept of separation of church and state, he insinuated that a churchman might offer a blessing

---

[104] "Memorial of a Conference at Saint Georges River" (1727), *DHSM,* 23:214.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid., 215.

of the proceedings for the Wabanakis but should participate no further. The message to the Penobscots was clear: the Jesuits of the Maine frontier had been overstepping the proper boundaries of conduct for men of God – particularly Catholic men of God – for decades and, from the English perspective, had ruined previous negotiations that might have stemmed the tide of war. If they occupied the same sphere as English ministers (as Gyles intimated they should), bargaining would cease to be a tripartite venture in which French and Wabanaki interests remain difficult to distinguish, to one of two parties meeting on equal terms.[107]

The Jesuit remained at the conference, though he accepted the fact that he was merely a voiceless observer. He contented himself with chiding his Wabanaki companions for enjoying too much English rum.[108] But more importantly, the Wabanakis stayed as well. When English settlers and Wabanaki groups determined to protect their own best interests by making lasting peace with each other, the English hoped they could also set the terms of religious encounter.

Incidents like the St. George's River conference were a serious cause for concern among Jesuit missionaries. Alarmed at the prospect of English incursions, Joseph Aubery wrote to Jean-Baptiste DuParc, the new Superior of the Canadian missions, that "Religion has up till now been the only motive that has made the Abenakis French, and as soon as there are no more missionaries they will become English and will be capable

---

[107] For a complete treatment of Wabanaki strategies for English containment and efforts to play a deciding role in determining the Province of Maine's future, see Emerson W. Baker and John G. Reid, "Amerindian Power in the Early Northeast: A Reappraisal," *William and Mary Quarterly* 2004 61(1), 77-106.

[108] "Memorial of a Conference at Saint Georges River" (1727), *DHSM,* 23:216.

by themselves of putting the English in possession of the whole country at the first war."[109]

But despite the Jesuits' concerns, many of the northern indigenous groups remained tied to their priests and elements of Christian practice. In 1728, the Penobscot sachem Loron and two other Indians wrote to Massachusetts Governor Burnett (in a letter entrusted to the care of John Gyles, no less), to protest that their "Priest has been us'd very Ill by the Gouvernour of Annapolis in being stript of his Cloathes and alsoe has been prevented performing his Priestly Office due." The Wabanakis reminded the governor that they had promised to communicate freely any problems with their terms of peace with the English, provided that "as to our Religion, Wee were not to Interrup't one the other in the Injoyment of itt."[110] Such language strongly implies that the Penobscots did not want to be bothered with Protestant proselytization. Lacking a priest of their own, they continued to make annual journies to Canada that corresponded with the Catholic liturgical calendar. Their Christian vision now their own, they directed and protected it to the extent they wished, and they used Euroamerican intervention selectively. So, by declaring the priests outside of the political realm, the English were forced to accede to their dominion in the spiritual one. This recognition was critical to maintaining political relationships, suggesting that at least among the Penobscots, these matters were secondary to spiritual ones. The English had won the battle to insinuate themselves into the scene, but they could not completely dislodge the French priests or their religion. Though some Indians expressed dissatisfaction with the Jesuit interpretation of Christianity, New England Protestantism never succeeded in gaining a strong hold among

---

[109] Qtd. in *DCB,* III. 24.

[110] "Letter from Indians to Gov. Burdett," 2 November 1728, *DHSM,* 23: 232-3.

the Wabanakis during the colonial period. Nor, however, did the post-Reformation vision of the Jesuits. In the scramble to assure souls for a specific faith and, by extension, a related geo-political alignment, the actions of neither Protestant nor Catholic missionaries displayed the purest forms of reformed Christianity.

This history of Maine's ministry is cluttered with problematic figures. But none were as troublesome as the Catholic "friars" (a term of derision) who operated on the province's fringes. The image of the mission priest is cluttered with positive and negative stereotypes. New England writers of the 17th and 18th centuries often viewed these priests as evil incarnate. In the 19th century, Francis Parkman, Samuel Adams Drake, and even Reuben Gold Thwaites, the translator of the *Jesuit Relations*, reduced them to incivility. Other historians, who worked from the Catholic perspective, depicted them as paradigms of self-sacrifice. More recent historians have regarded them as the destructors of Native American culture and implementers of hegemonic European systems.[111] Still others adopt an ethnohistorical perspective that regards Christianity as one of many elements of encounter.

Contemporary New Englanders offer a clue into their own feelings by their use of the term "friar" to describe the Catholic missionaries. The word itself derives from *frére*, the French work for brother. Male religious orders were self-described brotherhoods, creating fictive kinships of *fréres*, or friars, as the English transmogrification, came to be. But the image of the friar was a dubious one in English

[111] For two important works from this perspective that also take a hard, critical look at all missionary enterprises, see Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (New York: Norton, 1975), and Denys Delâge, *Bitter Feast: Amerindians and Europeans in Northeastern North America, 1600-1664* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1985).

history. An English literary tradition that predated the Reformation saw Chaucer, Shakespeare, and many other English popular authors poking fun at the supposed debauchery and skullduggery of local and continental mendicants. The tradition gained even greater currency with the birth of reformed religion. But the fun masked a range of unpleasant possibilities. Friars often succeeded in their goals. They seduced women. They wheedled money out of the unsuspecting. The successfully sold their counterfeit religious vision to a gullible public. They performed unauthorized sacraments. And on the extreme end, they consorted with witches and regicides.[112]

While what was probably an insult might have communicated this ancient disdain from one Englishman to another, it did little to mask the reality that, in the contest of religious cultures for the souls of New World peoples, the "friars" were way ahead of them. They would do well to at least emulate at least some of their tactics.

Like the Jesuits decades before, Joseph Baxter labored to discredit the "shaman" – in this case, the Jesuit, by ripping down the latter's liturgical tools and values and reconstructing his own in their place. Rale complained bitterly that the minister "turned to ridicule the Sacraments, Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, the Beads, the Crosses & Images, the lighting of our Churches, & all the pious customs so sacredly observed in the Catholic Religion."[113]

---

[112] For a detailed description of the literary history of friars, see Anne Barbeau Gardiner, "Judas-friars of the Popish Plot: The Catholic Perspective on Dryden's 'The Spanish Friar,'" *Clio* Winter 2003 vol. 32 (2), 177. For a New England interpretation of the dangers of peripatetic preachers, see Mather, "A Letter, containing a Remarkable History of an Imposter." The author tells the story of one Samuel May, a high Anglican who attempts to make inroads while seemingly adapting himself to the New England way. Mather describes May "not supposed for to be a *Minister*, but rather a *Mendicant.*" Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, VII: 36.

[113] Baxter*, Pioneers of New France*, 144.

But he also tried to latch on to his successes. As with so many Protestant ministers before him, Joseph Baxter had come to Maine lacking detailed knowledge of the challenges that the region posed to its clergy. His predecessors varied greatly in their preparation as well. But Baxter and his supporters knew this, and for models for their frontier ministry, they turned not to Protestants of the past but to Catholics of the past and present. Even as they sought to undermine them, this forced Protestants to confront the similarities between their own beliefs and those of Catholicism.

These interactions also reveal other similarities between clergy that were born out of borderland encounter. Both Protestant and Catholic clergy were simultaneously ministers of God and of the state. They had much to gain from self-preservation and little to gain from martyrdom (even Rale, who would later be lauded as a martyr, put up a good fight). And they were not averse to deploying both their academic learning and their less-than-scholarly skills to achieve their goals. They also did not refrain from using each other, or appropriating each other's tools, when the situation suited them.

It was the proselytes themselves, however, who would later set the terms for this interaction. The Jesuits and other Catholic missionaries did succeed in sharing their religion, which for the most part "took" among the Wabanakis. But they could not always imbue them with a commitment to French interests. Though clergymen frequently failed to distinguish between sacred and worldly interests, their canny proselytes were skilled at making the distinction and acting in the best interest of their collective souls and bodies.

It is unlikely that the Jesuit felt flattered that the New England minister attempted to turn his own techniques against him. But Baxter's knowledge of these methods, and

the tools of the trade used by his rivals, speak of a genuine knowledge that could only be gained in a religiously-charged borderland, where encounter with the other was often simultaneously dangerous and instructive.

CHAPTER FIVE

PROTESTANT ORNAMENTS AND POPISH RELICTS: MAINE'S MATERIAL CULTURE OF LIVED RELIGION

A small fraction of the Maine captives who returned to New England wrote about their lives in captivity. Some, like Hannah Swarton, recorded thorough accounts that eventually appeared in print. Others, like Rachel Storer, left behind only fragmentary records of their experiences that appear in depositions before provincial authorities, in miscellaneous correspondence, or other venues. Some remain only as part of local folklore or popular memory.

Fortunately, some captives, including the interpreter John Gyles, left both accounts and records. Gyles is arguably Maine's best-documented captive. Like some of his fellow male ex-captives, Gyles parlayed the cultural knowledge he acquired during his captivity into the productive service of his birth province's government. By the time he penned his own captivity narrative in 1736 (*Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, etc. in the Captivity of John Gyles, Esq., Commander of the Garrison on St. George's River*), Gyles had held numerous diplomatic and military positions both in Maine and in Massachusetts. He drew liberally on the experiences he garnered over the

course of a nine-year captivity. The skills he acquired included some facility with Native American languages and knowledge of the complexities of French/Indian alliances in Acadia, and he was determined to put them to good use in the service of New England.[1]

Gyles's captivity was marked by frequent exposure to many elements of French and Indian frontier Catholicism. Though he managed to resist throughout his ordeal, pressure to convert was never far away. But though the Pemaquid of his youth was notoriously "unchurched," Gyles seems to have been able to differentiate between Protestant and Catholic practices at an early age.[2]

Or could he? Evidence in the *Memoirs* suggests that the young Gyles did not. His knowledge of the practices of popery – and what made it fundamentally different from Protestantism – were not clear to many of the borderland dwellers who, on the surface at least, identified themselves as Protestants.[3] Certainly this was the case within the Gyles family's own religious compass. While Gyles's father Thomas, who was killed in the raid, was described by his son as pious, the captive's mother inhabited a different world of lived religion. [4] In particular, she expressed her worry over the perceived ability of papists to bewitch and enchant using words, deeds, and magic. Margaret Gyles's last words to him were a warning that he might fall into Jesuit hands. She told the young

---

[1] Gyles was about nineteen when he was redeemed and was seventy-five at the time of his death. See Vaughan and Clark, *Puritans among the Indians,* 93; *NEC,* I:169–171.

[2] In a discussion with a "Machies" (Machias) Indian, Gyles told a prospective convert that "ye french have Compeld People so far as to burn em at ye Stake, to make them Pray as they Do, which is not according to Gods word, etc." In all likelihood, Gyles got this information from other first or second-hand knowledge of *Foxe's Actes and Monuments*, but this treatment of Protestants would have been reinforced by the mode of death of his brother, James, who was indeed "burned at the stake" at Penobscot Fort – a punishment for attempting to run away. *DHSM,* 10: 384.

[3] For the persistence of Catholic practice and supernatural components in Protestant worship, see Robert Scribner, "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World,' " *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 23(3), Winter 1993, 475-494; Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment*, 156-61.

[4] John Gyles, "Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, etc.," in Vaughan and Clark, eds., *Puritans among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1936), 97.

John, "If it were God's will, I had rather follow you to your grave than you should be sold to a Jesuit, for a Jesuit will ruin you, body and soul." As he faced the prospect of captivity alone, Gyles was determined to remember valuable lessons of his childhood to help him persevere. "When I was very young and had heard much of Papists torturing the Protestants, etc.," Gyles noted.[5] Were the stories to which Gyles refers a popular form of religious education in a settlement like Pemaquid that lacked a firm religious identity of its own?

As with most New England captives, Gyles's introduction to Catholicism and Catholic people was traumatic, and reinforced the idea that tormenting Protestants was part of Church teaching. And who could blame Gyles or any captive for believing such assertions? He had first witnessed the brutal death of his father, then was separated from his mother and other siblings.[6] He later discovered that a brother had been tortured and killed while trying to escape his captors.[7] Reunited briefly with his mother at the trading post of French trader Jean d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin's fort, the boy (all of ten or eleven at the time), encountered his first Catholic priest. The introduction was not a positive one: instead of offering succor to the traumatized child, "the Jesuit," as Gyles called him, engaged in the business end of captivity, communicating to the captors that he "had a great mind to buy" the boy.[8] John Gyles interpreted the priest's further actions as an attempt to buy him, body *and* soul. He further interpreted older man's gift of food as an attempt at bewitchment, just as his mother told him. As Gyles told the tale, "The Jesuit

---

[5] Ibid., 99.

[6] Gyles's father was mortally wounded but had time enough with his sons to bestow a blessing on them and advise them on surviving their upcoming ordeal. He was then led away and executed. Ibid., 97, 99-100; *NEC,* I:169-70.

[7] *NEC,* I: 170.

[8] Gyles, "Memoirs of Odd Adventures," 97.

gave me a biscuit which I put into my pocket and dare not eat but buried it under a log, fearing that he had put something in it to make me love him … I hated the sight of a Jesuit."[9]

Gyles's assumption that he was dealing with a Jesuit – he was not – is tied to older embedded perceptions about the Society of Jesus whose origins long predated this particular case of mistaken identity.[10] But the assumption, and the fact that it persisted throughout the author's life, suggests an enduring belief among Mainers that Jesuits would stop at no form of manipulation, including black magic, to win unsuspecting souls to their ways.

By the time he wrote his *Memoirs* nearly four decades later, John Gyles had become a worldly frontiersman, wise in the ways of intercolonial and intercultural politics (as evinced by the critical role he played at the Indian conferences during Dummer's War) and the more militant Protestant self-assurance that crept into Anglo-Indian relations of the late 1720s. He had also become more mainstream in terms of his own Protestant religious practices. As the *Memoirs* show, the seeds of this transformation had been planted in captivity. It was there that John Gyles's version of Catholicism was "disenchanted." On one hand, he witnessed the meting out of sacramentals by an ineffectual priesthood – activities that seemed more laughable than menacing.[11] On the other, he met French Catholics, laypeople and clergy alike, who

---

[9] Ibid., 99.

[10] The priest was Louis Pierre Thury, a Sulpician and close associate of the Baron de Saint-Castin. Thury was known for the particular enthusiasm with which he supported violent incursions against the English settlements. *DCB,* II: 272.

[11] Gyles wrote skeptically of a sacramental to protect crops from birds which, the failure of which was blamed by the priest performing the ritual on the sins of people. Gyles, "Memoirs," 127-8.

treated him with great kindness. He became devoted to these captors, so much so that he gave up an opportunity to return to New England in order to protect their property.[12]

While captive as an adolescent and young man, Gyles's reported life among French and Indian Catholics suggests that he was unfamiliar with what it truly meant to be an active papist – a priest, a Wabanaki, a French man or woman.[13] But he would learn through exposure. These captive lessons served him well. Later in his life, John Gyles would become a deeply religious man who used his skills to woo the Wabanakis away from their own Jesuit missionaries. Like the missionaries described in Chapter Four, Gyles used lessons learned from his adversaries to effect peaceful religious transformations enacted through diplomacy, not war. Ultimately, Gyles recognized that the best hopes for creating Christians – acceptable ones, that is, according to English standards – of the Catholic Wabanakis allies was to insinuate Protestantism into their Christian worldview and eventually supplanting Catholicism altogether. Physically attacking the religion's missions, objects, and people would not work. Discrediting them might. In addition, Gyles determined that Protestantism, too, had a rich material connection to the world of religious culture, and worked to swap these elements for the older Catholic ones.

The point is illustrated by his discourse with one of the Indian representatives at the St. George's River conference of 1727. Aware of the importance of sacred time to both all Christians, an anonymous Wabanaki confided to Gyles his belief that the English

---

[12] For a complete narrative of Gyles's "odd adventures," see Chapter Four of Foster, *The Captor's Narrative*, passim.

[13] Gyles's adventures brought him into the hands of virtually every Catholic borderland character that existed on early Maine's fringes. He lived with the priest (most likely Thury) who attempted to buy him, as well as Christian Maliseets and a French *habitant* couple, Marguerite Guyon and her husband, Louis Damours de Chauffours. Ibid., 114-5, 123.

knew how to keep the Sabbath better than the French did. Gyles readily concurred, offering a standard Protestant interpretation of the Sabbath as a scripturally-based mandate:

> I find Gods word, (in his Book) whear God Commands us to keep y^{e} Sabbath Day holy which is y^{e} Seventh Part of time, Set a Part to worship y^{e} only true & Liveing God, that made ye heavens ye Earth ye Sea & all Creaturs, and man in six days, and on y^{e} Seventh Day (which is the Sabbath) to his service to Praise him.[14]

Gyles seized the opportunity to use the Indian's disparagement of Sabbath practices to make a larger point about the scriptural inadequacies of Catholicism. To Gyles, the clearest manifestation of Catholicism's debauched view of Christianity, with which the "Machies" (Machias) Indian would have been most familiar, was the sensorial world on which it was so heavily reliant. English Protestants, Gyles asserted, were more careful to obey God's commandment "to have no other Gods which are images & ye worke of mens hands, they Can neither hear See not smell nor Do us any Good, but that only true & Living God, Knows all our thoughts & Actions & tis of him we Live move & have our being, our health Breath meet Drink & Clothing & all we Enjoy is from him &c."[15]

John Gyles's frontier religion swapped appeals to the senses for those of the heart and head. The "Machies" Indian, at least in principal, agreed that this was a good thing. But other Native Americans were not so quick to see the distinctions. Already introduced to or actively engaged in practicing Catholicism, they remained skeptical of the forms of Christianity practiced by the English. This skepticism rested less on theological or liturgical grounds than on the fact that it was the English who practiced them. Even after

---

[14] "Letter of Capt. John Gyles to Lt. Gov. Dummer," 25 April 1727, *DHSM,* 10: 382-4.

[15] Ibid., 10: 384.

Dummer's War, Catholicism continued to play a preferred role among Christian Wabanakis, even though it was now disassociated with its French origins when it made sense to do so.

A rough borderlands equivalent of "you practice your way and I'll practice mine" became the more common form of frontier interaction. When the destruction of the Norridgewock mission removed a vanguard of militant Catholicism from Maine frontier, some Wabanakis appeared to prefer to sidestep the question of religion altogether. Syncretic Catholicism had long been an element of their own culture. And Protestantism, with its clear *similarities* as well as intrinsic differences, held little appeal as a new and different faith system. Thus ensued a rough separation of "church and state," so to speak, where Catholic Wabanakis often evaded the issue, or removed it from their discourse altogether. One Christian was as good as another when it came to business. Sometimes, faith had no bearing whatsoever.

The similarities between Protestantism and Catholicism were often lost on the practitioners of *sola scriptura.* One of these was the adult Gyles, a Protestant culture broker who tried to affect religious deals based on gospel truths. The Pemaquid he left as a captive, however, was far from the ideal Protestant community. Indeed, the superstitious advice of his mother, and his own fears of the efficacy of priests who dealt cannily in popery's dark arts demonstrate a persistent belief in the efficacy of occult practices. The young captive Gyles scoffed at the practices he observed among both the clergy and laypeople, suggesting that he had at least some knowledge of what the

differences between Protestantism and Catholicism should have been. But both before and after captivity, settlers like the Gyleses moved in a world of religion that did not always reflect the distinctions between pre- and post-Reformation Christianity. Basic identifications aside, these distinctions had been murky at best for the young John Gyles and remained so for many Mainers.

This problem was common throughout the province. Though some early New Englanders came to Maine to practice extreme forms of Protestantism, others were less committed, or less sure, of their own religious convictions. And at least one group was "half way out the door" of reformed Protestantism or had co-opted a spirit of religious experimentation. Though they were not voluntarily moving toward Catholicism either, some borderland people were more susceptible to conversion techniques that came with additional benefits, such as land and money, which were offered to them by the French.

In addition, however, as David Hall, Jon Butler, Mary Beth Norton and others have demonstrated, many New Englanders retained the memory of older, pre-Reformation views of piety and popular religion despite the efforts of New England officials to stamp them out. Charles Hambrick-Stowe has pointed out that even the most strident New England Puritans clung to vestiges of the pre-Reformation Church that were considered genuine forms of Christian spiritual expression and revelation that could not be ignored simply because they predated Protestantism's birth. The writings of St. Augustine were a critical influence on the development of Puritan theology.[16] So was

---

[16] In *The Practice of Piety,* Charles Hambrick-Stowe identifies the numerous texts that were considered for both Protestant and Catholic audiences. *Practice of Piety,* 35. Because of this broad, interfaith appeal, however, such "crossover" texts were sometimes the source of controversy in Puritan New England. Contemporary confirmation comes from Thomas Hutchinson, who wrote "There had been a press for printing at Cambridge for near twenty years. The court appointed two persons in October 1662 licensers of the press, and prohibited the publishing of any books or papers which should not be supervised by them,

Thomas à Kempis's *Imitatio Christi*. And though the General Court of Massachusetts intervened in its printing, arguing simplistically that it was "wrote by a popish minister, and containing some things less safe to be infused among the people," the Cambridge press decided to print and sell the book anyway.[17] Even Cotton Mather himself penned meditations on works of these, as has pre-Reformation theologians before him.[18] Ironically, these same works were profoundly influential on the spiritual writings of Ignatius of Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus.[19]

As the seventeenth century gave way to the eighteenth, and the line of English settlement moved ever closer to the places in Maine inhabited by Catholic people, both religions struggled to establish or maintain Christian legitimacy through emphasizing differences *and* commonalities. A case in point was keeping of the Sabbath. As one of the Ten Commandments, keeping the Sabbath in Protestant territory had long been considered one of the key outward expressions of reformed religion. It was protected by law and enforced by civilians and ministers, who kept an eye out for infractions. The Sabbath took on added importance because it was the *only* day in Puritan theology mandated by God. The holy days and feast days of Catholicism had no biblical mandate and, to most Protestants, suggested with great audacity that certain times of the year were reserved for God while others were not.[20] Thus many Protestants tended to tar Catholics

---

and in 1668 the supervisors having allowed the printing 'Thomas à Kempis de imitatione Christi,' the court interposed, 'it being wrote by a popish minister, and containing some things less safe to be infused among the people, and therefore they commanded to the licensers a more full revisal, and ordered the press to stop in the meantime." Hutchison, *History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts-Bay* III: 38.

[17] Ibid., I:257.

[18] Hambrick-Stowe, 35.

[19] John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1993), 259-60, 264-66.

[20] The roots of Puritan disdain for holidays are based on the idea that *all* time is holy time, and therefore belongs to God. It was not to be relegated to certain days or blocks of time, as it appeared to be

with the "holy day" brush, intimating that yet another of the religion's flaws was its separation of sacred time from profane time. This extended to proper observance of the Sabbath, as Gyles and the Machias Indian discussed.

Keeping the Sunday Sabbath was also not new to post-Reformation Christendom. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 reinforced the importance of keeping the Sabbath. Ideally, the pre-Reformation Sabbath was to begin the night before, and the day itself reserved for religious observances and abstinence from using sacred spaces for play.[21] The importance of the Sabbath was reinforced by the Council of Trent, which stipulated that "The faithful are bound to assemble in the church and hear the Word of God … Rulers and magistrates should be admonished and exhorted to lend the sanction and support of their authority to the pastors of the Church, particularly in the upholding and extending the worship of God."[22] Regardless of the efficacy of its enforcement in New France, or in any other places where adherents of reformed religion heard stories of or viewed Catholics at play on Sunday, reverence for the Sabbath was part of Catholic doctrine, and had been for centuries.

Like their counterparts in Massachusetts, Maine's Catholic missionaries sought to create Catholicism anew, and they idealized the role that fresh new souls would play in the process. Missions, in particular those founded by the Jesuits, were meant to be showplaces of Counter-Reformation reforms. Thus the missionaries took pains to imbue

---

according to the Catholic concept of the liturgical year. See James P. Walsh, "Holy Time and Sacred Space in Puritan New England," *American Quarterly* 23 (1) Spring 1980, 79.

[21] These reforms were aimed at improving "the morals of the clergy and the laity," notes Richard Gildrie. "An important element of this reform was a more orderly Sunday observance, extended back ideally to Saturday evening, and suppression of wrestling, ale-drinking, dancing, and gambling in the churchyards on Sunday afternoons." Gildrie, *The Profane, the Civil and the Godly,* 115.

[22] See *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, Issued by Order of Pope Pius V*, trans. Theodore Alois Buckley (London: G.. Routledge, 1852), 248.

both ancient and new pious practices into the daily lives of the proselytes. They succeeded in inculcated the message into some of their converts, for whom Sabbath piety became a point of pride and a badge of Christian identification as much as it would have been for a gospel minister. This was made abundantly clear at the Georgetown Conference of 1717, an important Anglo-Wabanaki meeting attended by John Gyles and the revered minister Samuel Sewall, among others. After haggling over property rights during a late Saturday negotiating session, a frustrated and peevish William Dummer, lieutenant governor of Massachusetts, closed the proceedings by abruptly stating: "To Morrow is the Lord's Day, upon which we do no Business. On Monday we will give you an Answer to what you have said; and we will Order the same Signal when we are ready as we did today." Loron ("Laurent"), a Penobscot sachem, responded tersely to the commissioner that "To Morrow is our Sabbath-day, and we also keep the Day."[23] Thus the neophyte reminded to the Puritan lieutenant governor that Catholicism, in the perfected, post-Reformation form promulgated in the missions, extolled reverence for the Sabbath long before the advent of Protestantism itself.

This was quite a switch from Gyles's "Machies Indian" who had criticized the French way of keeping the Sabbath to the English negotiator. According to Gyles, the full encounter included the Indian (probably a Penobscot), confronting the local missionary about his church's inadequacies: "I tould ye Jesuitt that I believed the English kept the Sabbath best for they Praied all Day, but the French Shott Guns and Go to Play,

[23] "George Town on Arrowsic Island, August 9 1717: A Conference of His Excellency the Governor, With the Sachems and Chief Men of the Eastern Indians," *Coll MeHS* 1st ser., 3: 384.

but ye Jesuitt tells me I am above ye English which are not Good."[24] Gyles countered with his conviction that all good things, including material possessions, came from God.

The Indian assented to Gyles's reasoning, though there may have been more at stake in agreeing with the Englishman than just his soul. In an effort to end Dummer's War in favor of New England, the General Court agreed to provide trading houses at the St. George's, Kennebec and Saco rivers that offered goods priced to undercut the French.[25] Was Gyles explicitly linking empathy for Protestantism with greater access to English-supplied goods? Or did the "Machies Indian" tell the interpreter that he sided with the English on matters of worship to secure favorable trade terms for himself and his people?

On the other hand, the "Machies Indian" may have observed the all-to-common problem of Sabbath breaking by the French first hand. Catholic Wabanakis were frequent visitors to New France, especially during key parts of the liturgical year, when pilgrimages, processions, sacraments and sacramentals brought them to the churches of Montreal and Quebec. Flouting Sabbath observances was common in New France, and a subject of concern for bishops Laval and Saint-Vallier. The latter was particularly appalled when *habitants* complained to him that masses and sermons cut too deeply into the usable hours of the day, leaving little time for Sunday activities like playing cards, gambling in the cabarets, and visiting friends and family in the countryside. All of these had become customary ways for the laypeople of the colony to enjoy Sunday. The

---

[24] "Letter of Capt. John Gyles to Lt. Gov. Dummer," 25 April, 1727, *DHSM,* 10:383-4.

[25] Hutchinson, *History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts-Bay,* II:241.

pursuit of pleasure even followed the settlers into Mass itself, where congregants frequently left the church during the sermon for a quick drink, smoke, or chat. [26]

But the Machias Indian's comments on Sabbath-breaking in New France were less of a reflection on Catholicism's respect for the Sabbath than a commentary on that faith's failure to enforce its own laws. And this problem was not exclusive to the French. While John Gyles himself might have faithfully marked every Sabbath, many of his borderland coreligionists failed in their own duty. Throughout seventeenth and eighteenth century Maine, Sabbath-breaking infractions accounted for a significant percentage of all civil cases. It is undeniably true that the wars of empire tore apart Protestant congregations. But even in times of peace, attendance at services, and the orthodoxy such attendance was meant to impress upon the faithful, was a law that was frequently flouted. Similar to the bishops of New France, the Massachusetts Court of General Sessions of the Peace augmented its preexisting Sabbatarian legislation in 1717 with "An Act in Addition to the Act for Better Keeping of the Lord's Day." Like their counterparts in New France, Mainers also frequently stood accused of "'Playing and rudeness' on the Lord's day, [creating] disturbances during religious services, [and] the publishing of 'filthy, obscene or profane songs, pamphlets or mock-sermons.'"[27]

And, of course, Sabbaths were not the only days of religious significance for the English or the French. As the two religious cultures came into contact with each other, they constantly reminded each another that the Reformation had redefined each faith's use of time. The events that punctuated this use of time, however, also served as constant

---

[26] Jaenen, *The Role of the Church in New France*, 143; Scalberg, "Church in New France Under Laval and Saint-Vallier," 47.

[27] *MCPR,* IV:liv-lv.

reminders of pre-Reformation forms of worship, keeping them alive at least in name. When contact relied on working around the old liturgical calendar, Protestants and Catholics were still subject to its dictates and at least tacit forms of recognition of the importance of these days.

The Reformation had repudiated the old church calendar and virtually all of its attendant feast and fast days.[28] But these traditions crossed the Atlantic with the French and their missionaries and, to a certain extent, with English Anglicans. As the English sought to cultivate Maine's Christian Wabanakis, they had to recognize that the Indians operated on a yearly schedule that varied greatly from their own. Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, indigenous people continued to traverse Maine to partake in a regular cycles of religious holidays. Some of these holidays were spent in the missions; others required seasonal trips to Canada for rites that were part of Catholic sacred time.[29] Any negotiating with the English therefore had to be done around the Catholic liturgical year. Until the middle of the eighteenth century, Catholics and Protestants used different calendars that forced a literal separation of the two faiths for part of each year. The disjuncture between the Julian and Gregorian calendars corresponded to the holiest time of the Catholic sacred calendar: the period between Christmas and Easter. Though no saint's days, and virtually nothing from the Catholic tradition of sacred time, survived in Puritan New England, borderland Protestants were frequently reminded of this Catholic past when they sought to do business with other borderland Christians. When John Parker purchased access to land from Nanriddemance,

---

[28] See Hambrick-Stowe, *Practice of Piety,* 49; Walsh, "Holy Time and Sacred Space in Puritan New England," 80-3.

[29] For seasonal devotional travels of a Pequawket woman, Molly Ocket, see Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *The Age of Homespun: Objects and Stories and the Creation of an American Myth* (New York: Knopf, 2001), 258.

a Wabanaki sachem, the seller requested payment in "the rent of one bushel of Corne, and a quart of Liquor to be paid unto Nanriddemance and his heyres for ever at or before every five and Twentieth day of December yt being Christmass Day."[30] Not only was the date easy to remember, but the coordination of payment acted as a reminder to the lessee that the Indian planned to commemorate the day. Thus an English Protestant became the means of providing holiday cheer to a papist Indian. Parker's own form of Protestantism is unknown. If he were an Anglican, such an exchange would have come with little personal recrimination. If he had Puritan leanings, however, the exchange would have had the ironic effect of subsidizing a Christmas celebration that was expressly forbidden in his own faith system. Still, the date remained a convenient annual benchmark for Protestants and Catholics alike on the calendar. Even Joseph Dudley, the governor of Massachusetts, reported to the Board of Trade his plans for military maneuvers at Casco "about Christmas."[31] In another missive, Shadrach Walton noted with relief that outbreaks of violence early in Queen Ann's War had ceased as the Wabanakis as they made their way "to the Eastward" and the Penobscot mission there, to observe Advent and Christmas.[32] Others, like Joseph Baxter and John Gyles, feared the solidarity such holy day gatherings could inspire. In January 1717/18, Baxter reported that over one hundred Kennebecs had used the opportunity of "ye Romish Christmas" (December 14th on the Julian calendar), to congregate near Pemaquid and discuss the fate of their relations with the nearby English – a conversation which could bode well or ill for Baxter and his company.

---

[30] *YD,* 2:Fol 13.

[31] Joseph Dudley to the Board of Trade, 15 November 1703. *DHSM,* 9:153.

[32] Walton saw in their absence the opportunity to cover the region with seven hundred men "from casco bay fort to Saint Croix." Shadrach Walton to Joseph Dudley 20 November 1703. *DHSM,* 9:180.

Further accommodation of the liturgical calendar was forced on the English as they made more aggressive attempts to cultivate the Wabanakis. Many of Maine's Native Americans operated not only on old seasonal patterns that predated European incursions, but integrated these peripatetic traditions into their seasonal duties that were part of the Catholic liturgical calendar. English observers describe these practices persisting well into the 18th century, even after Quebec fell to the British. These travels also provided convenient opportunities to maintain decades-old trade relationships, providing cash for pelts and ready markets for selling other goods. [33] In addition, saint's days became opportunities to the French to count on numerous Indian allies to visit the established centers of *la Nouvelle France*. Thus, saint's days, holy days, and other sacred times during the year provided a venue, for the French government to make its political wishes known, and to discern what the Indians demanded in return. When they returned to ordinary time, they dealt with the English. Governor Vaudreuil recognized this dichotomy when he wrote to Sebastien Rale that he hoped to have the opportunity to persuade them back to the French cause when they came to Quebec for All Saints Day.[34] As late as 1741, the Massachusetts government observed that these liturgical travels were also times when the Wabanakis negotiated with the French government, and wanted to be kept apprised of their frequency and duration.[35]

One of the most important of these feasts was All Saints Day. In Canada, it was a significant event in the Catholic social calendar, and spoke of the perceived efficacy of

---

[33] These patterns continued well into the nineteenth, and even the twentieth, centuries. Ulrich, *Age of Homespun*, 258.

[34] Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil to Sebastien Rale, 25 September 1721. *DHSM,* 23: 109.

[35] The reporter was John Gyles. John Gyles to the Government of Massachusetts-Bay, 15 November 1741. Massachusetts Archives, 31:334. MSA, Boston, MA.

key supernatural protectors. It was not the only day reserved for such devotions. Just as they had throughout Europe before and after the Reformation, Catholic devotions to some saints took a politicized form.[36]

In Catholic/Protestant borderland relations, this is perhaps nowhere more apparent then in forms of veneration of the Virgin Mary, the saint who to Catholics stood head and halo above the rest. While Puritans for the most part rejected her cult entirely, New France Catholics and their allies militarized her and considered her the protector of the colony[37]. Though the Jesuit Charlevoix was relieved to learn that no Canadian children believed her the creator of heaven and earth, as their counterparts in Brittany did, others went to her first, even before God the Father and God the Son, for assistance in all worldly matters. The Blessed Virgin had successfully protected Quebec not once, but twice, from English attempts to conquer New France.[38] To commemorate one of these feats, a church in Quebec's *basse-ville* was reconsecrated Notre-Dame des Victoires in her honor. A popular song, *"Cantique sur la retraitte des Anglois"* celebrated the failed 1711 attempt to take the city. Though it mentions the Virgin Mary only once, the fact that the song bore the title of "canticle" connotes praise and thanksgiving. Proclaiming "Vous triomphez, Vierge!," there was no doubt to whom the song's composer, known simply as "a Lady of Quebec," thought praise and thanksgiving for this military victory

---

[36] The Jesuits supported reverence for Marian power when they declared that "New France, with its King, acknowledged the Blessed Virgin as the Lady and Protectress of his Crown and all his Estates." William B. Hart, "The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Seventeen Century New France," in Griffiths and Cervantes, *Spiritual Encounters,* 71.

[37] For Puritans and their relationship with the Virgin Mary, in all its complexity, see Ursula Brumm, "The Virgin Mary among American Puritans: A Difficult Relation," *Amerikastudien* 2002 47(4), 449-68, and William Hart, "The Cult of Mary in Seventeenth Century New France" in Griffiths and Cervantes, *Spiritual Encounters*, both passim.

[38] These events were Sir William Phips's 1690 and Samuel Vetch's 1711 campaigns. Moogk, *La Nouvelle France*, 239.

should be attributed.[39] As one of the three members of the Holy Family, Mary was also one of the patrons of the Holy Family Militia, New France's largest volunteer military force. This volunteer force counted among its members Jacques Le Ber, the Montreal merchant who became deeply involved in the lives of so many converted Maine captives.[40] Even common soldiers were united in their Marian devotions. While traveling through Canada, Peter Kalm noted that "every morning … [soldiers read] the litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary; … this was never overlooked."[41]

The Virgin Mary as a protector of the French colony or secured French territory was one thing. But crossing her over to become protector and patroness of contested territory, or even New England itself, was quite another. It was through French intermediaries – Christianized Native Americans and converted captives – that the Virgin Mary made her presence known in New England.

In New England, the saint who for her followers more often than not served as the model for obedience, submission, duty, and obedience became something of a warrior queen, safeguarding her believers and striking down her detractors. Cotton Mather seemed genuinely disturbed when Bomazeen, a Wabanaki sachem and close associate of Rale who was being held in a Boston jail, told the minister that "the Lord Jesus Christ was of the *French Nation;* that his mother, the virgin *Mary,* was a *French Lady*; that they were the English who murdered him and that whereas he rose from the dead, and went up

---

[39] *Victoires et Réjouissances à Québec (1690 – 1758),* L'Ensemble Nouvelle-France, Oratorio, ORCD-1450.

[40] Moogk, *La Nouvelle France,* 71.

[41] Qtd. in Scalberg, "Religious Life under the Laval and Saint-Vallier Bishoprics, 1659-1727," 64. Kalm's narrative of his travels also includes on the most comprehensive descriptions of the public celebration of Marian festivals in Canada. The Feast of the Ascension of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which he observed in 1748, served double duty in celebrating Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil's own ascension to the governorship of Canada. Kalm, *Travels into North America*, 439.

to the Heavens, all that would recommend themselves unto his favour, must revenge his quarrel upon the *English* as far as they can."[42] The threat inherent in the Wabanakis' belief in a vengeful French Christ was sufficient cause for concern, but the added emphasis to His mother's story contributed to the fear. As Mather knew well, both Christ and his mother demanded veneration from the Catholic faithful. Thus the insults inflicted by the English were not on one deity, but on two. Mather disavowed the importance of Mary, but he knew the Wabanakis did not. Chapels at Jesuit missions were consecrated to her glory, such as Bomazeen's Norridgewock.[43] Other Indians learned from experience that Mary provided protection for the weapons wielded by believers. In his North American journal, Charlevoix related the story of an Indian in the *pays d'en haut* who prayed for the protection of his own gun and the misfire of his enemy's weapons. According to the Indian, the prayer worked.[44]

The Virgin Mary's image as a protector of those who go to battle in her name extended over Maine, and was considered to be a powerful source of spiritual support for borderland Catholics. Though most Maine Protestants had long ago stripped her of her importance to the Christian story because of her lack of scriptural credentials, they *knew* that she remained a powerful symbol for Catholics – sufficiently powerful to fight for. In one way or another, the Virgin Mary therefore retained her influence over both faith groups – one that believed in her efficacy and importance, the other that feared her as a unifying symbol.

---

[42] Mather, *Decennium Luctuosum* (Boston, 1699); 127-8.

[43] *JR,* 67:85.

[44] Charlevoix, *Journal of a Voyage to North-America*, II: 209. The owner of the original volume of the first English translation of this work wrote "damn'd stuff" in the book's margin next to this a*nec*dote.

The Virgin Mary was also offered to captives as a potential protector for women who had survived the captivity ordeal. Some, like captive Grizel Otis Robitaille, was an enthusiastic participant in Marian devotions.[45] So too, of course, were the eight "nuns of New England," for whom Mary's life as a virgin gave legitimacy to female celibacy – something not to be found in their native corners of North America. For credibility's sake, captors attempted to couch the Virgin's importance in terms that bible-reading Protestants would understand: in Scripture. For Hannah Swarton, who was determined to resist religious acculturation, the argument against the Virgin Mary's importance was a debate worth fighting. Though she bemoaned that it was "bootless" of her, "a poor woman, to acquaint the world with what arguments I used if I could now remember them," she did remember with certitude that she combated the Catholics' Luke-based arguments supporting veneration with specific ones from Revelation 19:10 and 22:9, which commanded believers to simply "worship God."[46]

In the contest for religious hegemony, the Virgin Mary served as a powerful symbol for both sides, representing both triumphal, militant Catholicism and, at the same time, the worst abuses of popery. Mary's detractors dotted Maine. But so did her *dévotes*. And though New Englanders did not venerate her, they were often forced to recognize her power as a symbol.

---

[45] For the complete story of this New Hampshire captive, see Alice Nash, "Two Stories of New England Captives," passim. For the public role for women in Marian devotional practices, see Susan E. Dinan, "Spheres of Female Religious Expression in Early Modern France," in Dinan and Debra Meyers, eds., *Women and Religion in Old and New Worlds* (New York: Routledge, 2001) and Chapter Three of Elizabeth Rapley, *The Dévotes: Women and Church in Seventeenth-Century France.* Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1990.

[46] Hannah Swarton, "Narrative," in Vaughan and Richter, eds., *Puritans Among the Indians*, 154.

As the English gained the upper hand in terms of population and settlement, they would try their best to replace the stuff of popery with comparable Protestant materials. The most obvious place for Protestants to start was with books. Catholic Wabanakis were catechized in an environment that emphasized the oral traditions and spaces filled with spiritual iconography that was meant to be "read." Even the most basic mission churches contained statues of saints and religious paintings.[47] Books were a next logical step, provided that Protestants had the means to offer training. The Jesuits and other religious orders of both men and women often attempted to educate indigenous people, but these efforts were subject to restraints of time and tools.

New England Protestants cannily recognized that destroying and discrediting Catholic objects and spaces would get them nowhere. Instead, they took a different tack by offering Scripture, in its object form as a book, as an alternative. An example of this devotional "bait and switch" happened at the Arrowsic Conference of 1717. Massachusetts Governor Samuel Shute addressed the gathered sachems through interpreters who were also ex-captives, including John Gyles and Samuel Jordan, grandson of the besieged Anglican priest of Scarborough. Jordan was related through birth and marriage to two women who spent the remainder of their lives in Canadian convents, and thus might have had a particularly compelling reason for luring some Catholic souls to his own faith.[48] Through these willing interpreters, Shute told the attendees that

---

[47] *JR,* 67:85.

[48] An active promoter of Protestant interests in the area, Samuel was also related to several Canadian *dévotes* – one-time captive women who had become enthusiastic participants in the Canadian Catholic Church. Samuel's wife, Olive Plaisted, was the daughter of Mary and James Plaisted and half-sister of Mary (Soeur de Saint Ange) and Esther (Madame Lestage) Sayward. His niece, Mary Scammon, who was one of the few captives taken from Maine during Dummer's War, was a student in the Ursuline convent at

> KING *GEORGE,* and the *British Nation*, are Christian of the Reformed Protestant Religion; That the great and only Rule of their Faith and Worship, and Life, in contained in the BIBLE … here in this Book which is the Word of GOD … is contained out Holy Religion; and we would gladly, have you of the same Religion with us, and therefore we have agreed, to be at the Charge of a Protestant Missionary among you to instruct you … And I hope also in a little Time to appoint a Schoolmaster among you to teach your Children, and that I hope and expect that they Treat this Protestant Missionary with all affection and respect, not only for the sake of the King's Government, but of his own Character, He being a minister of *Jesus Christ* our only Lord and Saviour, who will Judge them and us at the last Day.[49]

As he spoke, Shute held aloft a Bible aloft, a gesture that evoked of the elevation of the Eucharist by a priest in a Catholic mass. The message was clear: the Word was to become the focal point of neophyte spirituality, supplanting the transubstantiated Host. The sacramental replacement was enhanced when copies of "Indian Bibles" were passed out to the participants – another evocation of liturgical practice.

The Bibles – and the offer of Baxter's services to acclimate them to reading the text themselves – were politely declined. Wiwurna, a Norridgewock sachem, explained to the delegation "we desire to be Excused on that Point. GOD has given us Teaching already, and if we should go from that, we should displease GOD. We are not capable to make any Judgment about Religion."[50] The message implied acceptance of goods, but not of other forms of control.

Bibles were often the exclusive preserve of Catholic clergy and religious, pious books were standard tools of the missionaries' toolbox. Pious books and manuals for religious instruction, however, were also widely available throughout the French colony. One form in particular, the *livret blueu*, catalogued for French Catholics the same signs,

---

Trois Rivières until her illustrious marriage to Louis-Joseph Godefroi, Sieur de Tonnancoeur, in 1740. *NEC,* II: 149. Also see Chapter 3.

[49] "George Town on Arrowsic Island, August 9th, 1717," *Coll MeHS,* 1st ser., 3: 363-4.

[50] Ibid., 368.

wonders and portents and contained strong parallels to the collections of "wonder stories" that circulated throughout Protestant New England.[51] Frontier Protestants tended to treat most Catholic books, or at least books with recognizable religious symbolism that were written in French or Latin, with suspicion. For example, a Catholic devotional manual that was shown to some New England prisoners in the early years of their captivities during King William's War was transformed into a tool of Satan at the Essex County witch trials.[52] But the times were more responsible for the reaction than the content: with their spiritual exercises and meditations, these books were almost identical to Puritan manuals, and were commonly used by Anglicans as well.[53]

Why would such books cause alarm, especially in light of the fact that Protestants who encountered Bibles in the hands of Catholics assumed that they were, by their very nature, "Protestant?" In an area like colonial Maine, where books were in short supply, settlers were possibly not aware of the similarities these books shared with material that was also flowing from Puritan printing presses. Both Puritan and Catholic printing houses abroad, and later in the colonies, produced the works of pre-Reformation writers such as Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux and Thomas à Kempis. They also produced meditative emblem books, complete with illustrations that served both faiths.[54] One of these, Francis Quarles's *Emblemes, Divine and Moral*, was an extremely popular text

---

[51] In *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment,* David Hall identifies the full range of tropes in these wonder stories, some of which predate Christianity altogether. Others have pre-Reformation roots, and appear in early Christian works, including hagiographies. Hall,74, 111.

[52] The incident is recounted by Mary Beth Norton in *In the Devil's Snare*, 180.

[53] One scholar notes that "while raging theological and ecclesiological conflicts divided Christians, religious experience in the practice of devotional life was remarkably similar." Hambrick-Stowe, 36.

[54] Ibid., 28-9, 36.

with Puritan readers, had been copied from nearly identical Jesuit sources.[55] To borderland Protestants, who in general lacked a full range of written materials with which to engage their faiths, these little books with French and Latin inscriptions and iconography must have appeared uncompromisingly alien and demonstrated the worst abuses of Christianity that Catholicism could deliver.

The events at Arrowsic indicate that the English representatives clung to the old idea that Catholicism kept the faithful from the printed word of God. Maine's neophytes – and its ex-captives – often knew better. During their captivities, Hannah Swarton and John Williams both expressed surprise over the availability of English Bibles in New France.[56] Joseph Bartlett, another New England captive, engaged in lively, even playful, disputations over Scriptural meanings with Père Meriel, who had given the boy an English Bible (possibly a Douai version). [57]

The primary literary source that bridged Catholicism and Protestantism was indeed the Bible. Available in both cultures, it served as an important tool for religious communication in trying circumstances. Such communication could be truculent or peaceful, but either way it did reinforce the idea that all New World Christians held at least one monumental element of faith in common.

---

[55] 29.

[56] Hannah Swarton got her Bible and "other good books" from her fellow captives. John Williams received his from a French source, a "Monsieur de Beauville … who was a good friend to me … he lent me an English Bible, and when he went to France gave it to me." Swarton, "Narrative," 155; Williams, *Redeemed Captive*, 44.

[57] A number of New England captives, including Joseph Bartlett, Hannah Swarton (York) and Rev. John Williams of Deerfield, remarked in their narratives that they received or were permitted to use English bibles while in captivity. Given con*nec*tions to the network of continental Jesuit colleges that had English students, such bibles were probably fairly simple for missionaries to request from European sources. Though Bibles in English were available in New France, they were more likely to be Douai versions than Geneva or King James versions.

The Cult of Saints, holy days and liturgical calendars, and books had some commonalities that crossed faith-based lines. But there was no mistaking the importance of houses of worship. Though Catholics and Protestants harbored different understandings of sacred spaces, both faiths recognized that houses of worship were community meeting spaces that reinforced identity and common goals, and also spread news and demonstrated the strength and unity of numbers. Not surprisingly, they were often the first religious "objects" to be targeted in times of war. Just as frequently, however, the materials that made churches work for one faith were sacked by the other and "recycled" into another faith's practices. In a place like Maine, where known for its poverty on multiple levels, the value of a bell or a musical instrument or an alter was greater when it was adapted for spiritual reuse than it was when destroyed as a symbol of popery. The same held true for the Catholic missions and their own forms of adaptive reuse.[58] Such recycling became a frontier version of an old maxim with a twist: the best revenge is worshiping in style.

The importance of church buildings, both as targets and negotiation chips, emerges clearly in the proceedings of an English/Wabanaki conference in 1711 that preceded the cessation of hostilities by two years. Massachusetts authorities recognized the importance of French and Christian alliances among the eastern Wabanakis, and sought to ameliorate some of the harsher perceptions of Christians attacking other Christians. To that end, they agreed to an unusual concession in exchange for the right to build a new trading house at New Harbor: they would build the Wabanakis a church.[59]

---

[58] For a detailed description of adaptive reuse of religious object among the Hurons, see David Murray, "Spreading the Word in Northeast America," in Griffiths and Cervantes, 43-64.

[59] "Governor Lincoln Papers," *Coll MeHS* 2nd ser., 2:440-1; also told in Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 250.

The structure would replace the large church at Norridgewock, which had been completely leveled in 1705 during Queen Anne's War by Winthrop Hilton and Shadrach Walton. Its destruction was seen as a moral victory for Protestantism and was heralded in the *Boston News-Letter.* The author of the events crowed that the "Meeting-house" contained "only a few old Popish relicts" which were quickly dispatched by "our men, hail and lusty."[60]

But neither the Norridgewocks nor their Jesuit forgot the insult, and when it came to negotiate for trade, the Indians made rebuilding the chapel one of their conditions for cooperation.[61] The Massachusetts government understandably did not want to engage in the business of building popish churches for Indians, and seized on an opportunity for a religious compromise: they offered a new "meeting house" if it could be staffed with one of their own ministers.[62]

The Norridgewocks pondered the plan but, as they would do later with the Bibles, rejected it. They did, however, persist in insisting that the English make restitution for the destroyed church. Because tensions continued to thrive in the region even after the Treaty of Utrecht, both parties put off the task of rebuilding Norridgewock's main church until 1720. When the work was finally undertaken, it was done so grudgingly by the English workers. The Wabanakis lodged complaint after complaint over the quality of the workmanship, the poor state of sobriety of the workers, and the propensity of "Jebis," the "general contractor," to shake them down for additional money and goods.[63]

---

[60] *Boston News-Letter*, 3/05-08/1704-5.

[61] Axtell, 250.

[62] "Letter from the Indians to the Governor [of Massachusetts]," 1720. *DHSM,* 23: 47.

[63] Ibid., 23:89-92.

To the Wabanakis who lived at the Maine mission, fighting for the building they wanted and expected was more a point of principal than practical need. The mission had at least two other consecrated spaces that were suitable for Catholic liturgy. In addition, logic dictated waiting to rebuild something that had already been a target before hostilities until the tension had passed. For Sebastien Rale, their missionary, the destroyed wreckage itself, and the deprivation of a sacred building that had hitherto formed the centerpiece of Catholic life at Norridgewock, served as a convenient reminder of why the neophytes should continue to distrust the English. And, as Jon Butler notes, "Even destroyed church buildings could be made to proclaim Christianity, at least the kind demanded of the state."[64] The mission and its church had stood as literal testaments to France's claims to Maine, starting in the Kennebec region and extending to the Eastward. Thomas Coram understood that the mission formed a boundary of its own when he wrote to the Board of Trade, "the Jesuits of Canada built a great Church at Norridgewock near the River Kenebek as a Standing Proof of the French Right and Possession."[65]

If the Jesuits took the staking out of boundaries through use of sacred ground seriously, so did the people of New France themselves. French colonists would have viewed churches as creators of local identity.[66] An extreme example of this commitment happened in 1714, when Bishop Saint-Vallier attempted to have a parish line redrawn in the village of St. Léonard, near Montreal. Incensed by the proposed change, a group of

---

[64] Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith*, 13.

[65] "Thomas Coram to Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations," 28 January 1729. *DHSM,* 10: 436-7.

[66] This emulated the Parisian habit of identifying one's neighborhood with the name of one's church – a pattern that persisted even when the churches themselves were no longer there, or no longer Catholic. Choquette, 92.

parish women confronted the official sent to report on the situation, threatened to kill him, and throw his body into a swamp if her redrew the lines in a way that displeased them.[67]

The destruction of a church was particularly egregious and sent a powerful message to believers. By desecrating the church at Norridgewock in the first place, Hilton and his men demonstrated that religious practice in Maine was ultimately subject to the sufferance of local governments and the monarchs they represented.[68] Among his many threats to New Englanders, Rale threatened "upon my Land thou mayest depend upon it, That I will Revenge myself also and that upon thy Land in such manner as will be more sensible and more Disadvantageous to thee, for one of the Meeting houses or Temples, is of more value beyond Compare than our Church. And I shall not be satisfied with Burning only one of two of thine, but many; I know where they are." Rale left this note pinned to the door of the very church that was "ill built, because the English dont work well" as he fled in advance of New England forces who were coming to seize him.[69]

But churches were not always targeted because of their significance in proclaiming the power of a despised religion. Throughout the wars of empire, sacred properties were popular targets during time of war for alternative reasons. When Mainer Sir William Phips and his forces attacked Port-Royal in 1690, his troops sacked the church as much to demonstrate their commitment to Boston's religious principles that

---

[67] This a*nec*dote is told in Allan Greer, *The People of New France* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 36.

[68] Using the destroyed monastic institutions in the wake of the Henrician reformation, Jon Butler makes the point that even destroyed buildings "could be made to proclaim Christianity," or celebrate the triumph of a specific Christian vision. Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith*, 13.

[69] "Father Rallé's Address for the Indians." 1722. *Coll MeHS*, 2nd ser., 1:382.

banned idolatry as for treasure.[70] But in doing so, Phips might have been trying to avoid the fate of the recently-deposed Edmund Andros.[71] The ex-governor's failure to destroy the chapel of Our Lady of Holy Hope at the French trader Jean Vincent d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin's Pentagoët fort strengthened accusations of his popery back in Boston. The preservation of this particular building must have indeed puzzled Andros's forces, as the building seemed to be one of the fort's easiest targets. While its shape and bell-tower proclaimed its function as a French church, it was only a timber-framed and mud-walled structure, in marked contrast to the dressed stone walls that protected the trade goods and habitations.[72] Apparently, the chapel was either constructed in haste, or constructed without much thought. Either way, it would have been an easy symbolic target, but Andros's refusal to burn it raised questions about his own concept of the sanctity of sacred spaces.

But churches were as good for sacking as they were for burning – better, perhaps, because not all of their fittings were inappropriate to adaptive Protestant reuse. Anglicanism in particular had many church fittings in common with Catholicism. St. John's Anglican Church in Portsmouth, New Hampshire boasted a marble baptismal font that had been crafted in Senegal and was intended for a Catholic church in Canada. It was intercepted off the Maine coast by a New England privateer during the Seven Year's War. This same church called the faithful to worship with a bell taken from Louisbourg in 1745 by Kittery native William Pepperrell and his forces. Though Pepperrell's troops

---

[70] Emerson Baker and John G. Reid, *The New England Knight: Sir William Phips, 1651-1695* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 90.

[71] Ibid.

[72] For a comprehensive description of historical archeology at Saint-Castin's fort, see Alaric Faulkner and Gretchen Faulkner, *The French at Pentagoët, 1635-1674* (Saint John, New Brunswick: Maine Historic Preservation Commission, 1987).

apparently reveled in destroying the rest of the chapel, the bell was too valuable – and probably also too difficult to destroy – to be wasted.[73]

Some of these war trophies found their way to the heart of Puritan Boston. Decorative cherubim flanking the organ at Christ Churches were reputed to have come from a Quebec convent. A more obscure, decidedly less sacred relic was a chandelier crafted from the ribs of a French vessel that was destroyed during one of the wars of empire.[74]

As shown with the Louisbourg/Portsmouth bell, these large-scale objects were of particular interest to raiders. Aside from their size and their value, bells added a sensory experience to religious communities. Their "voices" became an identifiable part of essential religious practice. They called congregations together. They kept sacred and secular time. And they added a literal religious "tone" to a community that linked aural experience and communal worship with a specific landscape. It is little wonder that they were particularly valued as symbolic prizes. These frontier bells also fueled their own tiny literary genre. In her study "Narratives and Identities in the Saint Lawrence Valley, 1667-1720," Linda Breuer Gray discusses the oral legend that linked the 1703 attack on Deerfield to the theft of a bell that was intended for the Mohawk mission of Kahnawake. The residents felt the bell should not be allowed to "sing" for Protestants and determined to get it back.[75] A less fanciful legend, Maine-based legend contains a similar twist. Not

---

[73] See Mary Caroline Crawford, *The Romance of Old New England Churches* (Boston: L.C. Page and Co., 1903), 88-93.

[74] See George Francis Marlowe, *Churches of Old New England: Their Architecture and Their Architects, Their Pastors and Their People* (New York: Macmillan, 1947), 47.

[75] For the origins of the Deerfield bell story and its applications to popular memory and history, see Linda Breuer Gray, "Narratives and Identities in the Saint Lawrence Valley, 1667-1720," (Ph.D. diss: McGill University, 1999), 157-62.

wanting the Protestant attackers to appropriate the mission's "voice" as their own, a group of surviving Norridgewocks buried the modestly-sized chapel bell within the trunk of a hemlock tree.[76] It was found again in 1808, at a time when the old religious hostilities had been softened by time into romances of the forest.

Robert Scriber observes that throughout the post-Reformation Christian world, "evangelical forms of consecration reemerged and multiplied, and were applied to a wide variety of objects: church foundation stones, new or restored churches, pulpits, fonts, organs, alters, bells, [and] cemeteries."[77] Scribner, and others like David Hall and Jon Butler, assert that many of the elements that had been derided by Protestants as Catholic superstition actually were retained in some form in Protestant religious practices. Church yards and cemeteries in particular "sacralized" the landscape and "involved the dead as well as the living."[78]

The Jesuit Joseph Aubery used maps to mark the sacred landscape. Aubery was a diplomat as well as a missionary, as concerned with securing Maine territory under the terms of Utrecht as proselytizing to potential converts.[79] To that end, Aubery played a critical role in New France espionage. Making the most of his clerical cover during a time of peace, Aubery insured that his map of Maine included precise locations of Catholic missions and their proximity to English settlements. The Aubery map is rich with the symbolism of a landscape made sacred by missions. The pictorial

---

[76] The bell has been on exhibit at the Maine State Museum since the middle of the 19th century. Rale Collection, Maine State Museum, Augusta, ME.

[77] Scribner, "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World' " 483.

[78] Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith*, 14.

[79] *DCB,* III: 23-5.

representations of the missions themselves - churches, complete with large crosses on the tops of their steeples – loom large in comparison with the tiny dots that represent Kittery, York, Wells, and Falmouth.[80] Tellingly, Aubery's depiction of the English settlements show no buildings at all, let alone churches. A Jesuit or any Catholic would have had difficulty identifying the house of worship in a Puritan community.

But what Aubery failed to realize was that Protestants, and in particular Puritans, had their own sense of "sacred landscape," born out of their beliefs in the sacred nature of the family unit. Thus inherited lands and property became sacred in their own right. Passing them from one generation to another carried a religious as well as a social and legal function, and was protected by laws that reinforced the rights of fathers, mothers, oldest sons, and subsequent children.

In a place like Maine, however, captivity and borderland vagaries could challenge the inheritance customs that defined the smooth running of God's microcosm of heavenly order, the "Little Commonwealth." The experience of Aaron Littlefield of Wells provides an extreme example of how the province's once-unsettled religious state could carry long-term consequences. It also posed challenges to the very concept of who, and under what circumstances, had the right to claim a portion of a province that was increasingly solidifying its identification with Protestant New England. To some in the growing, developing province, applying a religious "litmus test" to determine who was eligible to join the neighborhood transcended the need for bodies to populate and develop it.

---

[80] A copy of this map is part of a permanent exhibit of the Maine State Museum, Augusta, ME.

When Mary Storer Saint Germaine of and Esther Sayward returned to their natal land for the first time since their captivities, they were accompanied by another Maine unredeemed captive, Aaron Littlefield. Littlefield was now a *canadien* farmer and lived in Saint-Mathias, outside Montreal. He undertook the journey without his wife and children, who remained behind in Canada. Clearly, he was only coming to visit, not to emigrate. It made sense for these three former captives to travel together. In Wells, the Littlefields and Storers had been neighbors and had family connections and common friends. The connection between the two families transcended their captivity. Regrouping years after the events that brought them to Canada, these members of Wells's "lost generation" were now part of a circle who built post-captivity lives in and around the cities of New France.[81]

Aaron's declared interest in returning to Maine to see his family and to sort out his affairs appears sufficiently straightforward. Undoubtedly he wanted to see his aging mother, Martha Lord Littlefield, who had outlived her husband and Aaron's father, Moses, by more than a decade, was widowed again by a second spouse, and was still living in Wells, now with her third husband. Also at stake, however, was the fate of Littlefield and Lord property in Wells and elsewhere in Maine. As the only surviving son of a family that had once been large, Aaron, as later events show, was eager to secure his patrimony. To this Maine captive, inheriting the property of his parents was a right secured by his gender birth order and traditions under English common law for passing real estate and possessions from one generation to another. The fact that he had lived for

[81] Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, and later Barbara Austin, have both demonstrated that the con*nec*tion between female New England captives in New France. Ulrich, *Good Wives,*212-3; Austen, "Captured … Never Came Back," passim. However, to date no one has examined networks among both males and females according to region in New England except Evan Haefeli and Kevin Sweeney, who limit their study, *Captors and Captives,* to the victims of the 1704 Deerfield, MA raid.

two decades outside of Montreal as Pierre-Augustine Litrefil, *agriculteur*, husband, father, and Catholic was a secondary, if not altogether irrelevant concern.[82] To Aaron, the realities of his life in New France did not fundamentally alter the fact that he was his parents' oldest son. It was only a cruel twist of fate that had carried him away from them, resulting in the establishment of a life in New France and conforming to that colony's customs and religion. But the fundamental truths of birth order, patrimony and the transfer had not changed. Littlefield traveled to New England expecting his to affirm his right to inherit, in spite of the elements of his life – his new name, his French family that the one in Maine did not know, and most importantly, his religion – that cast him in a role more alien than familiar. It is perhaps not surprising that extended members of his family fought him instead of embracing him and honoring his claims to his patrimony.

Like that of other captives, including Mary Storer, Aaron's visit to Wells was most likely the product of mixed motives. Both Aaron and Mary expressed their desire to see their parents, yet both their visits were also tinged with the possibility of material gain. Also like Mary's, Aaron's story provides a useful benchmark not only for the range of possibilities with which captives were regarded by their families. But it also suggests that for captives, self-image and self-fashioning did not necessarily for them entail rejection of one culture over the other. Instead, they made the most of the two they were forced by timing, circumstance, and fate to straddle. Aaron's story also suggests a useful counterpoint to Mary's post-captivity interactions with her family. In Mary's case, the sojourns with her New England Protestant family were welcomed, although subject to new understandings of filial and fraternal relationships. Aaron, on the other hand, faced

[82] Additional variations of the Littlefield surname can be found in New France, including "Lidfril," "Lightfil," "Litrefille," "Littlefiver," and "Litrephil." Gray, "Narratives" (Ph.D. diss.: McGill University, 1999), A-85.

family rejection outright. This rejection took a public turn when his maternal cousins, Benjamin and Nathan Lord, attempted to block him from claming ownership of some inherited land near Berwick, Maine. Though it appeared to be a clear-cut case of birth status and inheritance, standard practice in every corner of colonial New England, the Lords believed they had a case against their cousin for one simple reason. Aaron, they argued, had "turned papist," and as such, had lost his right to lands in the demesne of Protestant kings.

The Littlefields and their Lord cousins clearly embraced a definition of family that was narrower than that of the Storers. They were thus less inclined to come to terms with the mixed-faith components that Aaron's presence introduced into the extended circle of family. But, remarkably, Aaron pushed limits, arguing in none other than the courts of New England that remaining among the French did not fundamentally change his status within his own family. In the end, what the family itself refused to acknowledge, Massachusetts law conceded it must. Bound to British laws and customs, Aaron's own New England Protestant lawyer argued successfully that his client's embrace of popery did not equate termination of his rights within his family – or within the King's dominions, for that matter. Aaron's court case had the odd and undesirable consequence, at least on the local level, of affirming the rights of a papist to hold or benefit from the sale of a piece of the Province of Maine.

But it also demonstrates how every-day material realities became tools of religious control and conquest. To Maine's mixed-faith frontier families, willing and inheriting took on a religious significance. Many acculturated captives were left bequests by their parents or siblings. When the children or siblings who stood to inherit were alien

to their families through issues of culture and religion, wills became tools to win captives back into the God-ordained family covenant, and by extension, back to Protestantism in all its New England forms.[83] Thus the stuff of inheritance was transformed into sacred material, requiring the heir to come to terms with family obligations that included proper religious identification.

In Mary Storer Saint Germaine and Rachel Storer Berger's cases, wills were used to demonstrate their standing with in the family. But they also had another purpose tied to religion: the contents of them could be used to force the hand of an ex-captive and hasten their return to a region which allowed for only Protestant identity. Maine families often attempted to affect this process by requiring the errant heir to permanently resettle in New England as a condition to claiming the bequest. In setting this requirement they were clearly attempting to lure captives away from their adopted religion and fictive kinships. The acceptance of Catholic baptism by some captives beyond the age of reason was a simple expedient to make life more tolerable and reintegration into Maine's Protestant folds was seamless. But those who remained, bafflingly, long after the Treaty of Utrecht supposedly procured their freedom to return to New England, were believed by their families to be in need of additional encouragement.

Since communications across colonial borders became increasingly easy in times of peace, some Maine captives were aware that their parents had remembered them in their wills, and by doing so, preserved their child's status within the family. It was

---

[83] The "covenanted family" was a "web of mutual obligations" which, according to John Cotton, "God hath made a covenant with parents and householders" which bound "wives and children, and servants, and kindred, and acquaintances, and all that are under our reach, either by way of subordination or coordination." Hence, a child who lived outside of that covenant was ineligible to partake in its protections and spiritual and worldly benefits – unless, of course, said child could be convinced to rejoin the covenant. See David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford, 1989), 70.

logical to assume that the promised bequests would be distributed after family wills were probated. What was not expected, as is clear in the cases of Aaron Littlefield, Mary Storer, and various other acculturated captives, was that their status within the French empire and the Church of Rome would pose impediments to their right to inherit – and that these impediments would be enforced by their own blood kin.

Aaron Littlefield's case in particular is significant not only because it sheds light on the right, or perceived right, of a naturalized subject of the King of France to inherit and own property in Puritan New England, the demesne of the King of England, but also because it delineates the faith-based restrictions placed on colonists who failed to conform to religious norms. It also suggests that some Mainers applied their own understandings of "sacred landscape" to their own corner of New England. Keeping Maine Protestant, particularly after the wars of empire had proved so devastating and disruptive, became a practical proactive measure to ensure cohesion among coreligionists.

As a boy, Aaron Littlefield had not intended to turn papist. Like so many others, he was a childhood victim of war, taken from Wells with his mother and three younger sisters, Ruth, Tabitha and Josephine. Though his mother Martha Littlefield soon managed to return, she was forced to do so without her offspring. Taken as a group, the experiences of three, possibly four, Littlefield children covered a complete range of outcomes for New England captives who never returned to the fold of Protestant Maine. Aaron remained in New France, married a French woman, and for all intents and purposes, adopted the life of a French farmer in the outskirts of Montreal. His younger

sister, Ruth, was drawn to holy orders, taking the name Soeur Angelique when she entered the convent of the Hôtel Dieu in Montreal proper. Tabitha, whose story is more the product of family tradition than the historical record, was supposed to have remained among the Wabanakis who seized her. According to Littlefield family lore, she made her way back to Wells from time to time, where she addressed family and friends in English before disappearing into the woods with her new Wabanaki kin. Another Littlefield child, the putative Josephine, appears more or less lost to the historical record, but there are both Canadian and New England descendents who claim lineage. [84] The loss of these children severely reduced Moses and Martha Littlefield's family, leaving them but one son, Moses, a small infant in 1703 who was, remarkably, overlooked by the raiding party that netted the rest if his family. But the good fortune of Moses the younger didn't last: he died young, leaving his older Canadian brother the sole heir to his parents' property in the Province of Maine.[85]

Like many of the captives of Queen Anne's War, Aaron was quickly ransomed from his Indian captors by the French.[86] Within five months of his capture he was living with the curé of Boucherville as a *domestique*, having already been baptized by the ubiquitous Père Meriel. It was Meriel who christened the boy in 1704 with the name Pierre-Augustin, a pairing of names that together honored the two of the most significant figures of early Christianity.[87] Both Protestantism and Catholicism honor Peter and Augustine, two saints whose work spread the faith to unprecedented borders. Applying

---

[84] *NEC,* I: 403-410.

[85] *GDMNH,* 440.

[86] The trade in captives between the French and Indian allies was so brisk that Governor Joseph Dudley accused his New France counterpart, Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, of encouraging an "Algiers trade." See Evan Haefeli, "Ransoming New England Captives in New France," 113.

[87] *NEC,* I:404.

this combination of names was perhaps Meriel's way of indicating that even Christians from heretical New England shared some common origins with his own religion, and that the recreation of a singular Christian vision (albeit on Roman Catholic terms) was a desirable goal.

Though many New England boys and youths acquiesced to baptism and followed the forms of the Catholic Church while in captivity, most were not bound to the religion or their French captors by anything except pragmatism. When opportunity presented itself, they were eager to return to home. Up to this point in his journey of acculturation, Aaron Littlefield's actions did not deviate significantly from other young male captives from any part of New England, for he too was eager to return home when word came to him that such a possibility existed. His wishes must have been known throughout the informal networks of Canadian captives, for he had been identified as a potential member of the 1713 prisoner exchange orchestrated by Reverend John Williams and John Stoddard. The New Englanders were so confident of the boy's return that they took the advance step of providing him with new clothes for the journey.[88] But Aaron's ministerial master was on the counteroffensive and deployed his own strategies to block the boy's return. As the outflanked John Stoddard explained, the priest of Boucherville, "hid the boy's new clothes and prevailed with him to stay."[89] To Stoddard, the curé's actions were "barbarous and inhumane," low tactics by supposed men of God who combined corporal deprivations with threats of "the danger of perdition" that returning to

---

[88] [John Stoddard], "Stoddard's Journal," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register 5* (January 1851), 28-9. The hidden clothes and been supplied by Captain Thomas Baker, a member of the redeeming expedition and ex-captive himself whose wife, also an ex-captive, would later testify that Aaron had willingly "turned papist."

[89] *NEC,* I: 404.

New England and its heresies would bring to the neophyte's soul.[90] The French, however, saw things differently. Priests, nuns and laypeople were bore witness to the fickleness of New England males, who agreed to convert but then promptly left the colony when the chance arose. Retaining these uncertain converts was not simply a matter of imperial triumph. To the clergy and religious, it meant preventing captives, whose souls were now the responsibilities of the French clergy, from sliding back to heresy. Viewing the retention of a Catholic soul as the greater good, every tactic, including those that relied on deceit, became fair game.

But even if he had secured the clothes, there was another, more concrete impediment to Aaron's return. Most likely under the tutelage of the priest with whom he lived, Aaron had applied for and received French citizenship in 1710. This action, more than any creative roadblock the curé of Boucherville could devise, jeopardized the captive's chance for return. According to the laws of the colony, naturalized French subjects did not have unrestricted rights within and without French territory. It was therefore not as a captive, but as a *French subject*, that Aaron "could not have liberty to return."[91] Had he not become naturalized, no French legal impediment would have existed. As a naturalized French subject, Aaron was subject to these restrictions as any native-born or immigrant *canadien* would have been. Without the proper *congée,* he was not permitted to travel anywhere outside of the colony.

---

[90] Stoddard, "Stoddard's Journal," 29.

[91] The rule on naturalization was clearly not as absolute as it seems: Charles Trafton, Joseph Stover, William Hutchins and Patience Hammons were all naturalized in 1710 and all returned to Maine after the Treaty of Utrecht. *NEC,* I: 245, 247, 388-9, 392-3.

Though Vaudreuil later agreed that those who were under age were free to leave, the nineteen-year-old Aaron hardly qualified.[92] Still, after persistent pressure from Williams and Stoddard, Vaudreuil assented to the youth's return, and demanded the curé bring him to Quebec immediately. By then, the priest had had time to do his damage: as Stoddard complained, "[the cure] had made too thorough work with his proselyte." The lack of clothes, or the persuasive arguments about imminent damnation, or the impediments created and appeals for gratitude extended by the government that had redeemed him from Wabanaki hands, or perhaps a combination of all of them finally convinced Aaron Littlefield to stay behind.[93] He returned from Quebec to Boucherville and continued to live with the curé, an arrangement that probably only ended with Aaron's marriage to Marie Brunet in 1717.[94] Aaron had six daughters and a son, and settled down to life as a Canadian farmer in Chambly on a *concession* granted to him by the Frères Hospitaliers, who operated the Hôpital-Général de Montreal.[95] His life story gives every impression that, with his fate sealed by forces beyond his control, he resigned himself to life as an ethnically-French husbandman and father.

But throughout, as evinced by his choice of travel partner in 1725, Aaron, maintained ties to his old identity. He and Mary Storer Saint Germaine were undoubtedly part of a larger network of Maine captives who lived in and around Montreal. As Pierre-Augustin Litrefil, Aaron, like so many other captives, clung to networks of people with English origins – captives and other cross-cultural travelers –

---

[92] Stoddard, "Stoddard's Journal," 29.

[93] Ibid., 37.

[94] *NEC,* I:405.

[95] *NEC,* I: 405, 409; See also Fournier, *De la Nouvelle Angleterre en Nouvelle France,* 162.

who reflected his own origins and cultural assumptions but understood the personal losses that were an implicit part of New French lives that began with captivity. The sole witness to his wedding in 1717 was Daniel Maddox, an immigrant from England who by choice became a naturalized French citizen.[96] Aaron had also maintained contact with family and friends from Wells. His sister Ruth Littlefield, though a member of the cloistered order of the Sisters of St. Joseph at the Hôtel-Dieu in Montreal, was restricted by the rules of *clausura*, but regulated family visits were occasionally permitted. As she would later testify, Christine Otis Le Beau Baker, a captive from Dover, New Hampshire, was well-acquainted with both Littlefields before her return to New England in 1714. This suggests that Ruth, now Soeur Angelique, had sufficient access to the world outside of *clausura* walls, grills and gates to maintain relationships with whomever she chose – and that she chose to connect with her brother.[97] And Aaron undoubtedly knew Mary Storer St. Germaine in later life. Both had lived in Boucherville for some time after their redemption from the Wabanakis, and several members of Mary's family were godparents to Littlefield children.[98] Their contact continued well into adulthood and perhaps deepened during their joint journey to New England. In 1728, Mary wrote her brother Ebenezer that "aron Litelfielde is well and his familie he remembers his love to you."[99]

As a male acculturated captive, Aaron was an anomaly in New France. The vast majority of acculturated captives from Maine and elsewhere in New England had been

---

[96] *NEC,* I: 405.

[97] *NEC,*I: 408. For the rules of *clausura* in theory and practice, see Susan Dinan, "Spheres of Female Religious Expression in Early Modern France," in *Women and Religious in Old and New Worlds*, ed. Dinan and Debra Meyers (New York: Rutledge, 2001), 71-87.

[98] *NEC,*I: 408.

[99] MS to ES, 2 May 1728. Mary Storer Papers, MHS, Boston, MA.

girls and young women when taken.[100] For the period covered by this study, Aaron was among only nine male captives from Maine of any age who remained permanently within the captor culture (French or Indian) for life.

Those males who showed an inclination to stay were clearly prized by the French and subjected to levels of enticement – mostly in the form of gifts of land - that were never dangled in front of women and girls. As significant landlords in New France, religious orders such as the Frères Hospitaliers (who granted a *concession* to Aaron) and the Sulpicians (who gave one to Kittery captive Joseph Fry), did their part to encourage Maine's captives to remain not just through evangelization, but through more worldly gifts as well.

Spirituality and material goods were intimately intertwined elements of the cross-cultural traveler's experience. French captors assessed both and strove to create a level of enticement that secured the body for the New France and the soul for Rome. When captives were physically restricted from leaving New France, as New England observers asserted, the issue was mostly moot. But after the Treaty of Utrecht ensured the possibility of the return of many New England Protestant captives, the desire to secure those who had undergone spiritual and cultural "conversions" took on an added urgency. But material enticements could only go so far, and were dependent on the means and inclinations of those in the captor colony who had a vested interest in bestowing them. In granting Mary Storer St. Germaine and Aaron Littlefield each a *pérmis* "*pour aller à la Nouvelle-Angleterre y voir ses parents et régler ses affaires domestiques,*" the French

---

[100] Out of all female captives taken from New England between 1675 and 1763, 31.5 percent between the ages of two and six and 53.7 percent of those between seven and fifteen remained with their captors. For adult women (over fifteen), this number drops to 12 percent. Vaughan and Richter, "Crossing the Cultural Divide," 66.

government simultaneously expressed confidence in a completed acculturation process and indicated that its pockets were deep but finite. Allowing captives to see their parents was an important part of the mission, but it was only half of its purpose. Those who succeeded in winning recognition from their families, and, in ideal circumstances, their patrimonies, were tying New England lands and the fruits of New England economies to the rival French colony.

By the time Aaron visited his mother for the first time in 1725, Martha's youngest child and only other son, the younger Moses, was dead. She was also remarried. Mother and son's visit lasted three weeks – long enough for Aaron to discern the parameters of the property that was by right his to inherit. This included lots in Wells and in Berwick, the latter brought into her marriage to Aaron's father by Martha herself. Although legally Aaron had already come into two-thirds of his father's property, Martha seems to have retained control over all of Moses's estate, even after it was apparent that her son was alive and well in another country. In the three weeks that they were in each other's company, Martha and Aaron (whom she resisted addressing as "Peter," though Aaron preferred this name) surely discussed the subject of Littlefield property, leaving the son sufficiently conversant in the estate's details that he applied to take his deceased mother's place as administrator in 1727. [101] After three weeks, Aaron returned to Marie, his children, his French name, and his life in Canada, leaving his mother behind.

Martha Littlefield died intestate in 1726 - a curious thing, given she knew her son lived. [102] Perhaps she assumed that her son would simply assume his right to the estate in accordance with the laws of Massachusetts. But given the estate's disparate parts,

---

[101] *NEC,*I: 408.
[102] *GDMNH,* 440.

including those that she herself controlled in two communities on the Maine coast, it is surprising that she failed to leave explicit instructions for the estate's dispersal. Was she deliberately ambiguous about the state of her property to coax Aaron home again, perhaps to stay? Was it a form of punishment for her son for breaking the bonds of family yet again to return to Canada in 1725, and thus deliberately left the question of inheritance open-ended?

If the object was to make Aaron return permanently, it failed: Martha did not have the satisfaction of seeing him again. Aaron did come to Maine again in 1727, but only to replace his mother, who had just died, as administrator of his father's estate. The family property in Wells transferred to him smoothly.

It was his mother's land in Berwick, however, that became a sticky issue, resulting in a legal case that demanded Aaron blatantly declare his religious affinities, and deal with the consequences to his personal fortune. Aaron clearly assumed that the Berwick land would also come into his hands. Some time prior to 1738, however, a brother and two cousins of his mother refused him title and access to the property. Though he was still living outside of Montreal at the time, the ex-captive determined to fight these kinsmen. In 1738, Aaron brought suit against them in the York County Court to attempt to "recover Possession of one Seventh Part of a Certain Tract or Parcel of Land with ye Edifices & appurtenances in Berwick." The relatives, Benjamin and William Lord and William Lord Jr., brought their own suit, in which they contended that their Canadian cousin Aaron did not qualify to inherit this property solely because he was "a Papist." What makes the Lords' so germane to the purposes of this study – and relevant

to discussions of religious culture on an early American frontier –is the use of religion as a reason for contesting Aaron's right of succession.

The Lord cousins were not alone in seeing this point as a valid reason to deny ownership of Maine property. The Court of Common Pleas of York County agreed with them, ruling that, as a papist, Aaron had no legal right to use the court to protect his interests. The Maine judges ruled that Aaron,

> if a Papist, by Law Debarr'd from maintaining an action for a Real Estat then Cost for the ye Def^{ts} but if not the Jury find for the Plt ye Land Sued for & Cost upon w^{ch} Verdict of Court have maturel Considered and advised is of the opinion that a Papist Cannot by Law maintain an action for y^{e} Recovery of a real Estate. It's therefore Considered by the Court that the Def^{ts} Shall recover against the Pl^{t} Cost of Court."[103]

Aaron lost the case on the local level. However, he fought on, carrying the case to the appeals level of the Court of Suffolk County, Massachusetts. He might have had no choice: 1737 was a deeply difficult time for Canadian *habitants,* who were in the grip of a severe famine. From the relative comfort of the Quebec Hospital, Mother de Sainte-Hélène observed that "wheat was lacking, and the poor inhabitants were reduced to eating tree buds, potatoes, and other things unsuitable for the nourishment of mankind."[104] The very survival of his family might have been pinned to the hope that the Maine land would alleviate the suffering that touched so many throughout New France.

Aaron was represented by Noah Emery, a Maine-born Protestant lawyer. Instead of conceding that Aaron's right to inherit based on his gender and birth order, Emery took a more aggressive tack in the appeals case. He wrote to the Court of Common Pleas that his client deserved the property based on the following grounds:

---

[103] *NEC,* I:406.

[104] Qtd. in Moogk, *La Nouvelle France*, 229. According to Moogk, Canada's *habitants* found potatoes unpalatable, and consuming them was to their contemporaries an act of desperation.

1. Because Judgment ought to have been for ye Plt to recover against ye defts ye Premises sued for & Costs.
2. the Plts being a Papist or not a papist was not mentioned in the Issuable Plea & so not proper or Lawfull for the Jury to give a Verdict upon nor Could they lawfully take notice of ye Pleas made in abatement but only ye issuable Pleas.
3. there is no Euidence to proue that ye Plt is a papist not ought any deposition of any Person be deem'd as sufficient Evidence to prove it and ye Plt ought not to Loose his Inheritance (if there was such a Law) before he be Convict of Papish Recusancy in a Court proper to try the Same for ye Pet is now a Protestant for aught that now appears to the contrary and may settle on ye land himself.
4. This shows that he has proved his descent and rights.
5. Many of ye Kings Subjects in many parts of his dominion are Papists yet enjoy their estates altho they may not bear any office & there is no Law that does Debarr ye Pet. from maintaining this action is he was a Papist. [105]

To the attorney, the argument for Aaron's rights to claim the property rested less on the fact that Catholics were not explicitly barred from owning property – a relatively straightforward, incontrovertible argument – than on the fact that no one involved in the case knew for certain that Aaron had indeed renounced Protestantism for Catholicism. This was a curious strategy. Protestantism in any form was specifically prohibited in France's New World possessions. While some Protestants were permitted to reside in the colony "*comme des catholiques sans scandale*," a key practice associated with it – church formation and attendance – was strictly forbidden.[106] Other key practices such as the reading of Scripture and prayer were largely private endeavors and unlikely to arouse suspicion since such acts of piety were fostered in both cultures. And, of course, Aaron was indeed at very least a baptized Catholic. His godfather was Pierre Boucher, an

---

[105] *NEC,* I: 407.

[106] The 1627 charter of the Hundred Associates stipulated that all settlers to the colony must be "natural-born, French and Catholic subjects." Protestants were denied the right to settle permanently in the colony or acquire land. In 1676, the Sovereign Council of Quebec forbade Protestants to practice their religion together, and demanded that even temporary visitors "live like Catholics with scandal." Moogk, *Nouvelle*, 60; Bédard, "Les Protestants en Nouvelle-France," *Cahiers d'histoire* 31 (Québec : Société historique de Québec, 1978), 29-30.

active *parrain* in Maine captive circles, including Martha Grant of Salmon Falls and Sarah Randall of Saco, and had also ransomed Mary Storer from her Wabanaki captors. Indeed, the fact that the rite was conferred became the root of the case against him.

Deliberately or not, Martha Lord Littlefield had formulated a strategy, based on a lack of a will, to entice her son back to New England. In other cases, Maine families composed wills that did the opposite, using conditions for inheritance as a possible means for re-securing errant Canadian children permanently for New England. The promise of property – land, effects, and money – speaks to the conditions that parents placed on seemingly errant children. Presuming their children were at liberty to return after the Treaty of Utrecht (as has been shown, a tremendous presumption), Protestant parents in Maine hoped the demonstrations of affection through wills, which in some cases provided for equal or greater portions to captive children, would bring these captives to the realization that captivity, even captivity that continued long past Utrecht and appeared voluntary, had deprived them of their birthright, should they make the appropriate choice to reclaim it.

Wills were useful tools in breaking a captive's bonds with a new faith system. With good reason, Maine parents demonstrated in their wills that they understood resettlement in New England to be tantamount to a renunciation of Catholicism and a return to the true church. Put simply, it was virtually impossible for a person to live in a European settlement of New England and practice Catholicism. Catholic belief is heavily reliant on the faithful's regular reception of sacraments. Given its role to the ministration of these sacraments, an ordained priesthood was, and continues to be, critical to the

practice the religion. With priests excluded from New England by law on pain of imprisonment or death, however, *practicing* Catholicism there in early eighteenth century was virtually impossible. A captives' permanent return to New England was therefore by necessity a repudiation of the Catholic baptism they had received while detained.

Some captives responded to these restrictions with equal demands. Mary Storer went beyond her brother Ebenezer, the family gatekeeper in its dealings with her, and appealed to her mother to find the means to give her the bequest of £50 to which she clearly thought she was entitled. Aaron and another captive, William Hutchins, used the New England courts as a means to assert their rights to property and, at the same time, confirm their status within their birth families, even when those families repudiated them.[107] There were many others, however, who simply left the matter alone, and still others who neither knew nor cared that provisions had been made for them in the wills of family members.

Esther Wheelwright was one of those who was probably unaware that she was to receive equal treatment under the terms of her father's estate. Upon entering the Ursuline order, she ostensibly rejected worldly possessions by virtue of religious vows which stipulated that no sister own private property. Instead, goods that came to sisters became property of the religious community, shared by all in accordance with their status within said community. According to the rule of the Ursuline order, worldly possessions to a certain degree included family members as well, who were for the most part restricted

[107] The story of William Hutchins reads like a frontier version of the Martin Guerre. Hutchins, who was taken from Berwick with his mother and siblings during Queen Anne's War, was denied his inheritance by his brothers upon his unexpected return decades later. His mother was called by the Maine Court of Common Pleas to identify him, which, upon examination of some scars, she did. *NEC,* I: 391-3. For the related French event, see Natalie Zemon Davis's classic treatment *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge: Harvard, 1983).

from the convent.[108] The requests of both parents that she come to and remain in New England to claim her inheritance were therefore not only physically but as spiritually impossible because of her commitment to *clausura*.

As John Demos notes, bequests with conditions attached were used for children who failed to please and honor their parents and fulfill their appropriate role in their families. Thus inheritance was "made contingent on their maintaining a proper sort of obedience."[109] As a Mainer with clear Puritan sensibilities, Mary Storer Saint Germaine's father, Joseph, clearly drew on this tradition when he disinherited his disobedient daughter.[110] In leaving a bequest to his returned captive daughter and disinheriting the one who remained in Canada, Jeremiah Storer was no less subtle than his brother. Priscilla Storer might have hoped that her own husband, who had accompanied her cousin Mary to Maine in 1725, would act as her patrimony ambassador. If he tried, he failed, and was probably not a wise choice in the first place. Both Mary and Priscilla's marriages were contemptuous in the eyes of their fathers. No amount of loving regards and tidbits of family information tucked into her cousin Mary's letters could alter this perception or salvage alienated affections.

When it came to captives, inheritance was used as a tool for bringing children back under the control of their New England parents. Would Joseph and Jeremiah Storer have accepted their daughters, sons-in-law, and grandchildren had the Catholic *pater familias* agreed to settle the family permanently in Maine? It is impossible to know,

---

[108] For life in the cloister (as compared to the freedoms of other types of post-Reformation women's religious communities) see Susan Dinan, "Spheres of Female Religious Expression," in Dinan and Meyers, eds., *Women and Religion in Old and New Worlds*, 84.

[109] Demos notes that the link between discipline and inheritance was apparent in wills of many settlers of Plymouth colony. Demos, *A Little Commonwealth*, 103.

[110] See Chapter Three of this study.

especially since it is unknown whether or not Rachel brought Jean Berger with her when she reestablished herself in New England. But regardless, she bore his name: some piece of the experience stayed with her, an imprint on her identity.

When Aaron Littlefield came home, he reintroduced himself to his extended relations as Peter. His mother, however, persisted in calling him Aaron. The use of his Catholic baptismal name was used as evidence of his unsuitability to inherit Lord land. The Lords used the testimony of Christine Otis Le Beau Baker, daughter of the enthusiastic convert Grizel Otis Robitaille and wife of Captain Thomas Baker, to verify that the captive's use of his Catholic baptismal name was proof of his embrace of popery. Christine testified that she "Very well knew [Aaron] in Canada and that he was baptized Peter, & that he was a Papist by Profession and Living & his Marriage Was in a Place Called Boshervell in Canada nine miles from mount Royal and that I See his Sister in the Nunnery in Canaday."[111]

For Noah Emery, the case against Aaron hinged on proof that his client had indeed converted to Catholicism. To that end, he elicited additional testimony from Christine Baker that moved Aaron's reputed Catholicism out of the realm of circumstantial evidence, declaring "that she was not present not ever saw Peter Littlefield baptized in Canada nor any Priest ever tell her that he was baptized but she only concluded he was from y^{e} Custom of y^{e} Papists & that he always went by the name of Peter after she was acquainted with him."[112] But though Christine admitted that she had not seen the administration of Catholic sacraments to Aaron Littlefield, for her the use of his Catholic baptismal name constituted sufficient proof of committed popery.

---

[111] *NEC,* I: 408.

[112] *NEC* I:408.

To some Maine families, however, the religious compromises and new affinities wrought by captivity were not sufficient grounds for reinterpreting New England inheritance patterns. The case of Jabez Simpson, Aaron Littlefield's cousin, illustrates the point. Along with his mother and brother Henry, Jabez was taken from Maine in the Candlemas raid of 1691/2. Mother and brother returned to New England: Jabez did not. Almost two decades later, he still remained in Canada.[113] His surviving sibling argued over their father's estate in 1702, and the quarrel spilled into the York Court of Common Pleas.[114] Though the court had to devise the portions, and all parties involved agreed that "upon the Return of Jabez Sympson from Captivity: he shall have the Equall proportion of the Estate with his brethren: he allowing his part & portion of charges with the rest."[115] While other family members doubtless benefited from the land by continuing to improve it in his absence, this land did remain, in a legal sense, did remain his for the claiming. And such claiming was known to happen. Captives like Charles Trafton and William Hutchins, both of whom had accepted baptism and by all appearances seemed to have accepted the terms of life in New France, returned to New England when imperial politics rendered it possible. Both men had been active in religious affairs in the captor colony. Trafton, who was taken as an adult, had been baptized, served as godfather to both Bonaventure LaForge, a Huguenot captive from York, and the daughter of a Maine captive known simply as "Benelis." He was witness to the deathbed conversions of Esther Ingersoll, a Northampton, Massachusetts captive,

---

[113] "Dudley's list of unredeemed captives, 1710/11," Massachusetts Archives, 71:765, MSA.

[114] *MPCR,* IV: 144-5.

[115] Ibid., 145.

and Abigail Cass Turbet.[116] By all accounts, he was an active churchman while in captivity. But after the death of his father in 1716, Charles had a change of heart, or soul, or both. He abruptly left Canada and the life he had known there, shedding his French baptismal identity of Louis-Marie and resuming a life that probably would have deviated little had he never been a captive at all. Charles joined his brother Zaccheas, whom he had not seen for years, in several land ventures throughout the province.[117] He also returned to his religious roots: his will was witnessed by Kittery minister John Newmarch. Dying without issue, Trafton left the bulk of his own sizeable estate to his wife and his brothers.[118]

Parents of daughters also left bequests without conditions. Deborah Webber of York, first cousin of Moses Littlefield, left her daughter Barsheba, who was taken in an unspecified raid, an equal share of her tiny estate.[119] Barsheba's father, however, avoided the issue altogether and simply left his daughter nothing.[120] Though Dominicus Jordan set no formal conditions on inheritance for his captive sister, Mary Ann, her patrimony in land would be, as Aaron Littlefield learned, difficult to claim without resettlement and cultural and religious reconversion.[121] Nevertheless, Mary Ann did manage to sell her portion of her father's estate in 1761, years after the death of her oldest brother. Mary

---

[116] Fournier, *La Nouvelle France,* 149. Trafton was at Esther Ingersoll's beside with and appears to have been a "spiritual protégé" of Grizel Otis Robitaille, a Dover native and enthusiastic convert whose daughter, Christine Baker, would later return and identify Aaron Littlefield as an active "papist." See also *NEC,* II: 412.

[117] *YD,* VIII: Fol. 85.

[118] William A. Sargent, ed., *Maine Wills 1640-1760* (Portland, ME: Brown Thurston & Co., 1887), 571.

[119] By 1714, Barshaba was living in Canada as "Marie Wabert." Deborah Webber's will was probated on 23 April 1737. *NEC,* I: 250; Sargent, *Maine Wills*, 545.

[120] *GDMNH,* 729.

[121] Dominicus Jordan's will was probated on 6 June 1746. Sargent, *Maine Wills*, 640.

Ann most likely never married. But she was close to the Ursuline sisters at Trois Rivières and provided them with financial support, presumably from her patrimony. The inheritance of this Jordan – a legacy with roots that stretched back to Robert, the troublesome Anglican minister who repeatedly tweaked Puritan authorities – was in the end used to subsidize the income of a Catholic women's religions order.[122] Given his hatred of the up and coming Puritan establishment, it is difficult to know whether the Reverend Robert would have been concerned or pleased.

When Charles Trafton and William Hutchins came home to claim property, they stayed. But at least some settlers in the province thought all returning captives needed to make the same commitment. Since they all ended with his return to New France, Aaron Littlefield's brief forays into Maine became part of the case against him. To his Lord cousins and other observers, Aaron's return to the captor culture must have seemed unnatural, if not downright incredible. It also took control of the property out of the hands of local people and put it into those of the most unthinkable or absentee landlords: papists.

There was precedent for the Lord cousins' expectations as well. In the cases of other families, determining a captive was not coming home to stay meant that family property deserved to stay in the hands of Protestants, even if they were more distantly related. In some cases, the Protestant inheritors were not related at all. For Captain Roger Dearing, his church and non-related, though "religious," people were substituted for lost Protestant blood kin. A 1723 attack near Scarborough killed Dearing's wife and

---

[122] *NEC,* II:29.

carried several other family members who lived with the couple were carried into captivity. The grieving Dearing moved throughout New England before resettling in Scarborough decades later and lending his time and energy to civic and militia affairs.[123] He remarried again but had no issue. Upon his death, Roger left the bulk of his estate to his second wife. But he included two additional beneficiaries – his local Congregational church and "the religious industrious poor of ye Town of Scarborough."[124] Thus, this settler who had suffered so much during Dummer's War used the worldly instrument of his will to reinforce Protestant institutions and people in his frontier town, forming a religiously-based fictive kinship.

One of the most extreme cases of the intermingling of religious culture and inheritance involves the Wheelwright family, whose daughter Esther eventually became superior of the Ursuline convent in Quebec. Colonel John Wheelwright did not leave Esther an equal share of his estate, but instead stipulated that her four brothers were responsible for providing for her should she return, stating that

> I give and bequeath to my Daughter Esther Wheelwright if living in Canada whom I have of for this many Years and hath been absent for more than Thirty Years if it Should please God that She return to this country and Settle here then my Will is that my Four Sons viz^{t} Iohn Samuel Ieremiah and Nathaniel each of them pay her Twenty five pounds it being in the whole One Hundred pounds within Six Months after her return and settlement.[125]

When Esther, either unwilling or unaware, did not return to collect this money, her mother submitted her own will-based plea:

> Provided my beloved Daughter Esther Wheelwright who has been many Years in Canada is yet living, and Should by the wonder working of

---

[123] *GDMNH* 191.

[124] Ibid.; Sargent, *Maine Wills*, 434.

[125] Sargent, *Maine Wills,* 525.

> Providence of God be returned to her native Land and tarry and dwell in it, I give and bequeath unto her one fifth part of my Estate which I have already by this instrument will'd Should be divided to & among my afores[d] Daughters & Grand Daughters to be paid to them in Proportion to their respective Share in the abovementioned Division unto her my Said Daughter Esther Wheelwright within one year after my Decease.[126]

Esther could not be swayed by the promise of these gifts, or, for that matter, of the assurance of loving reintegration into her Protestant family. As she explained to her mother, however, the joy of reunion would have to wait until the next life, where she hoped "the Lord to whom I have devoted myself will greatly reward me from his infinite goodness, since he himself assures us in his holy word that he who leaves for his sake, Father, Mother, Brothers, and Sisters, shall have an hundred fold in this life, and Life eternal in the next."[127] Aware of the disappointment her behavior caused in both parents, Esther sought to soften the blow by assuring her mother that they held more things in common than differences: "Oh, what joy, what pleasure, what consolation would it give me, my dear Mother if you had the happiness of knowing this holy religion which a kind providence hath made me embrace since I left you. [It is] an established religion which our Forefathers professed for a long time with much need and fervour."[128] By appealing to the "forefathers," Esther evoked the commonalities of New World Protestantism and Catholicism. In doing so, she likewise suggested that her mother *could* know the same religion, and perhaps be swayed to her daughter's thinking.

Esther Wheelwright remained a Catholic. Mary Snell Wheelwright remained a Protestant. Yet mother and daughter continued to exchange loving and sensitive tokens until Mary's death. One of the most valuable of these was a set of silver vessels. Incised

---

[126] Ibid., 771.

[127] Esther Wheelwright to Mary Snell Wheelwright, 26 November 1747. Qtd. in *NEC,* I:429-30.

[128] *NEC*, I: 430.

with the Wheelwright family crest, these costly items were immediately put into service in the convent's liturgies.[129] But the gift of silver carried perhaps the greatest significance for the family that gave it. As Barbara and Gerald Ward note, gifts and bequests of silver passed through New England families and "acted as a vehicle for communicating family prestige and honor and transmitting these qualities to the next generation."[130] Already several generations removed from the practices of the Catholic Church, the Wheelwrights were unlikely to know, or have much concern for, the uses of vessels made of precious metals in Catholic liturgical practices. The gifts of silver, therefore, most likely were meant to be object demonstrations of Esther's prestigious lineage – a common use for silver gifts to women in early New England that served doubly as a useful tool in her "marriage" to the Church of Rome.

In general, New England parents did not seek to exert posthumous control over the lives of their children. But the situation was different for acculturated children of frontier families who remained among their captors. For the most part, Maine parents of captives set conditions on bequests to these children because they clearly persisted in the hope that these gifts would change their life courses – changes they as parents had been unable to effect in life. Wills therefore became tools that used items of real, calculable value – money and household goods – to demonstrate to these children what they had to gain through obedience. Inheritances therefore crossed the boundary that separated the worldly from the spiritual, becoming *religious* objects in and of themselves, and

---

[129] These items are still in use in the chapel of the Ursuline convent.

[130] Barbara McLean Ward and Gerald W. R. Ward, "Sterling Memories: Family and Silver in Early New England," in *The Art of Family: Genealogical Artifacts in New England*, ed. Simons and Benes (Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 2002), 177.

contingent on religion, properly professed. Thus timing of these gifts became insignificant: a redeemed captive, even if such redemption happened long after a parent's death, was better than no return at all. In death, parents continued to press the hope that had failed them when they lived, and used any means at their disposal. Indeed, it was one of the few means that was under their control.

Still, in the years following the wars of empire that were most damaging to Maine, the province's Protestants were more concerned than ever in developing their own concept of the "sacred landscape." Echoing sentiments expressed by Sylvanus Davis in 1690, the first phase of Aaron Littlefield's inheritance case was predicated on the assumption that Maine needed to be made safe for the growth of Protestant communities, the land worked and waters fished by Protestant hands, the Native Americans brought to Protestant ways.

But the fifty years that separated Davis and Littlefield had also been a time in Maine's history when geography, war, and simple encounter muddied the waters of Protestant purity. By the end of Dummer's war, and well beyond, the byproducts of Catholic encounter in Maine had produced a mixed religious tradition with deep roots. The rhetoric of religion spoke of ideological separation, but the realities of borderland experience created long-term material realities that were ultimately far less straightforward.

CONCLUSION

When Benedict Fenwick, Bishop of Baltimore, proposed building a memorial to the Jesuit Sebastien Rale, he found an unlikely supporter for the project in the person of William Allen, Jr., the president of Bowdoin College and a devout Congregationalist. The intermediary between the two men was Edward Kavanaugh, the proprietor of the Damarascotta Mills near the town of the same name. A native of Ireland, Kavanaugh was the most prominent Catholic layperson in Maine in 1832. He agreed with the Bishop of Boston that tribute to such a man like Rale was, from the Catholic perspective, fitting indeed. But he also cannily recognized that such a project would never be built without the assistance and support of the truly powerful families in Maine, who, like Allen's, had lived in the province for generations. To cultivate Allen, Kavanaugh asserted that the bishop was truly American, a person made palatable because he had "the advantage not hitherto enjoyed by most of the Catholic clergy in the northern states of being an American by birth and he yields to no one in the ardor of national feelings; until his promotion to the episcopal dignity he belonged to the order of Jesuits of which his profound erudition made him a conspicuous member."[1] The learned and cultivated Fenwick had been a member of the newly-reconstituted Society of Jesus before his elevation. His erudition appealed to Allen. So did his patriotism.

[1] Edward Kavanaugh to William Allen, Jr., 14 November 1832. Miscellaneous Manuscripts (422), Me HS, Portland, Maine.

Before long, Fenwick and Allen were corresponding with each other directly. Allen even offered to act as the proxy for the Diocese of Boston for the purchase of the property on which the monument was to be erected. Allen's enthusiasm for the project amazed Fenwick, who probably assumed that a Mainer of old family would have heard the story of the Norridgewock mission from the New England perspective. The bishop mused

> I cannot but admire, my dear Sir, the generous interest you have taken in this affair – and your endeavors to justice to the memory of the long injured Rasle in spite of the infamous aspersions of a host of prejudiced historians upon his character/ It is indeed the more remarkable considering the few opportunities you have had at ascertaining the true history of that great man from authentic documents, which with the blessing of God, I shall present to the public next summer, if you are so happy as to succeed in the purchase of that lot.[2]

Fenwick's original vision for the monument called for a granite obelisk, eight feet square at the base and thirty-two feet high, topped with a large cross. Each of the monument's four sides contained the same epitaph in a different language – Wabanaki, French, English, and Rale's beloved Latin – inscribed on each of four white marble slabs.[3] The inspiration behind Fenwick's design was a similar monument at, of all places, Harvard, the college that brought forth the Protestant ministers who attempted to counter Jesuit menace on the northern frontier. The Harvard obelisk honored its founder, John Harvard. In borrowing its design and grandeur for Rale, Fenwick implied that the Jesuit deserved a place in history not as a warrior but as a scholar, intellectual, a proponent of early American spiritual education, and a founder of the state itself. The key difference between Rale and Harvard – their professed forms of Christianity – was irrelevant.

---

[2] Benedict Fenwick to William Allen, 13 December, 1832. Me HS.

[3] Ibid., 8 December 1832.

The design for the monument was not original, but the object of its veneration certainly was. For years before and following his death, Rale remained a contemptible figure in early Maine history. So did the Wabanakis he converted. And the missions, and the French in Canada and Acadia were also remembered with contempt and hatred. These passions fueled Mainers' participation in future events cast in anti-Catholic terms, including the attacks of the fortress at Louisbourg, the expulsion of the Acadians from Nova Scotia, and the American attack on Canada during the American Revolution.

Continental events throughout the century that separated Rale's death and Fenwick and Allen's efforts to memorialize the Jesuit fostered the growth of anti-popery and unified Protestant identity, though it existed as strongly in political and social spheres as it did in religious ones.[4] Protestant and Catholic Europe continued to do battle throughout the century, and these conflicts continued to spill over into the British colonial arena. The Quebec Act, one of the major catalysts of the American Revolution, was seen as an insult to American Protestantism and created fears of a papist resurgence on the northern borders.

But in the period following the end of Dummer's War, increased population in the English settlements, their movement steadily northward, and increased assurances that most of the region was secured for Protestant growth gave solidified the region's Protestant destiny and identity. The days where ministers could spout chapter and verse against popery, yet still encounter and borrow proselytization techniques from one of its ministers, came to an end. New Protestant groups crept into the region, and one of the

[4] The evolution of anti-Catholic and anti-French rhetoric in eighteenth century New England and the ameliorating effects of French support of the American Revolution are discussed in Kidd, *The Protestant Temperament*; Cogliano, *No King, No Popery*; and Hanson, *Necessary Virtue*.

most important of the old vanguards – the Puritans – were increasingly disliked and distrusted. One angered settler accused the "Congregationals" of adopting the tactics of "Papists."[5] It was not a compliment. Older settlers for their part continued to be wary of newcomers even if they were fellow Protestants. In 1730, the government of Massachusetts was petitioned to assist in the removal of some Irish Protestants who had moved into the area near what had been Pemaquid by Colonel Jeremiah Dunbar, a British officer. Though they were coreligionists, they were still there illegally, and thus unwanted.[6] Based on the events of the previous century, Massachusetts had good reasons to want to control who settled where. But there were other issues at stake, including issues of property rights and access to Maine's rich resources.

As the title of this study suggest, Catholicism was a "spice" that long lingered on Maine's palate. Other North American English colonies had Catholic colonists, but none, with the possible exception of Maryland, had a more fully-realized Catholic colonial culture. In addition, Maryland's Catholic past was fundamental to its seventeenth century identity. It was neither underground nor countercultural, but an intrinsic part of what the colony fundamentally was supposed to be. Maine was different. As an outpost of New England, the province should have shared in the religion's Protestant identity. But its proximity to French New World possessions, and the seeping influence of those possessions on the religion's indigenous people, its landscape, and even its New England settlers, led to a period in its history when its religious fate was anyone's guess.

---

[5] "Petition of William McClenachan," 20 August 1740, *DHSM,* 23:271.

[6] "Order in Council to restrain Governor Belcher from Military Execution against Fredericksfort," 12 November 1730, *DHSM,* 11:66-7.

Mainers proved to be a resilient lot. In some cases, they fought their adversaries using their own tools against them. In other cases, they sought safety in numbers and increasing regional cohesion. But they were also frequently on the losing end, with children, spouses, and extended family members going to Canada, going papist, and creating their own Catholic families that led to an indelible print of popery on some of the region's most prestigious families. Mixed-faith families were not anomalies in Europe. And despite concerted efforts to ensure that New World communities did not fall prey to these same family fissures, they were not in New England either. As James Axtell notes, "New England was a different land, and Puritans were a different breed. There a sterner environment and an aggressive religious zeal would unite to eradicate the idleness of the Old World while reducing the godforsaken wilderness to a garden divinely favored with moderate but wholesome abundance."[7] At various points in time, parts of New England did achieve something approximating this goal. But the Maine of 1688 through 1727 was not among them. Geography, the probability of encounter, warfare, and the pool of settlers themselves were all factors that undermined this goal. By the time the Province of Maine was sufficiently secure to attempt to realize this vision, it was already rapidly becoming an ideal of the past.[8]

Subsequent generations of Mainers sentimentalized this past, showing great sympathy for the vanquished missionaries and their brave proselytes. In his poem "Mogg Megone," John Greenleaf Whittier celebrates one of the Catholic Wabanaki sachems who

---

[7] Axtell, *Invasion Within*, 150.

[8] In *The Protestant Temperament,* Thomas Kidd notes that "By 1727 the friends of the Protestant interest in New England had become thoroughly committed to a board British Protestant identity, finding common cause with the Hanoverian monarchy and Whig Anglicanism. 26.

attacked English settlements in Maine during King Philip's War. Another poem, "Norumbega," gives Maine a pre-Christian – and explicitly Catholic – past, one uncovered by a French, not an English, hero. This hero is Samuel de Champlain himself, who in his explorations of the region comes across an ancient cross planted long ago by unknown Christian hands, but similar to those that the French themselves would literally "plant" to consecrate the land to France and mark the parameters of their territorial claims.[9]

Whittier was in good literary company. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, another native Mainer, also celebrated the state's French heritage. Composed less than one hundred years after the Acadian expulsion in 1755, Longfellow's epic poem "Evangeline" helped craft an image of these French New World peasants as peaceful and devout farmers, tragic victims of larger political circumstances rather than borderland gamblers who hedged a bad bet.

Entranced by the same spirit and under the influence of William Allen, a revered instructor at Bowdoin, Nathaniel Hawthorne memorialized the story of Sebastien Rale in his "Bell" sketches.[10] The subject of Maine fortunes and families won and lost during the wars of empire also surfaces in *The House of Seven Gables*. Maine ministers of the colonial period receive less than favorable treatment in "The Minister's Black Veil," a story of the tragically-demented minister son of "Father" Moody.[11]

---

[9] Whittier, J. G. *The Poems of John Greenleaf Whittier* (New York: Heritage Press, 1945), 62-5

[10] For the historical underpinnings of Hawthorne's interest in Rale, see Hugh Dawson, "Père Sébastien Racle in History and Fiction: The Background of Hawthorne's 'Bell' Sketches," *Essex Historical Institute Collections* 124 (3) 1988, 204-212.

[11] *GDMNH,* 487.

Perhaps the most spectacular rewriting, or reassessment, of the past by a native Protestant New Englander is Nathaniel Deering's play "Carabasset." And though the real Carabasset was a Wabanaki sachem with a passion for fashion (he was known for sporting "a blue lace coat and a silver Meddal" passed on to him by Rigaud de Vaudreuil himself), the hands of Nathaniel Deering transformed this borderland popinjay into a "noble savage" of almost Byronic proportions.[12] Given that he was of the same family as Roger Dearing, the Scarborough settler who lost his family in Dummer's War, Deering had indeed chosen a poignant focus for his career as a dramatist.[13] And indeed, he harbored far more sympathy for the subjects of his drama (the Wabanakis and their French priests) than he did for his suffering ancestors. In the preface to "Carabasset," Deering explained this sympathy as the simple byproduct of his own historical research:

> In the portrait of Rallé [sic], I have followed the French writers, rather than the English; it being the object of the latter to place him in an unfavorable light, to palliate [Rale's killing] which must ever be a blot on our history.[14]

Rale himself emerges as a gentle champion of the abused Wabanakis. For the title character, Deering constructed a parity of loss and victimization. At one point, Carabasset tells the sympathetic, peace-loving Jesuit that he "too have lov'd, and those I lov'd were murdered."[15]

---

[12] For an older yet insightful assessment of the Romanticization of Maine's colonial past, Herbert A. Jones, *Maine Memories: Little-Known Stories About a Well-Known State* (Portland: Harmon, 1940), 34-6; see also "Alexander Hamilton's Journal," 14 June 1722 in Baxter, *Pioneers of New France in New England*, 319-20.

[13] Though they spelled their surnames differently, both men were descendants of the original Roger Dearing, who settled in Kittery in 1663. *GDMNH,* 191.

[14] Nathaniel Deering, "Carabasset: A Tragedy," in Leola Bowling Chaplin, *The Life and Work of Nathaniel Deering, (1791-1881) with the Text of Two of His Plays, Carabasset and The Clairvoyants* (Orono, ME: University of Maine Press, 1934), 159.

[15] "Carabasset," Act III, scene II. Ibid.

But the same air of "Catholic sentimentalism" that crept into American arts and literature before the onset of nativism did not inspire everyone. Nor did a passion for Maine's colonial history, in the midst of reinterpretation by Allen, Fenwick, and others who sought to seed's of the nation's current greatness in its past. On September 27, 1836, Allen wrote to Fenwick that the newly-erected monument to Rale had been badly vandalized. The perpetrators were not caught. Though certain that the event would condemned "by every respectable paper in the United States," Allen, as well as the others involved in the monument's construction, most likely forgot that Maine's suffering during the wars of empire was at very least equal to the fascinating elements of its cross-cultural encounters. The power of Maine's past lay in its range of experience, for good or ill, and carried with it long-term consequences.

ABBREVIATIONS

Coll MeHS: *Collections of the Maine Historical Society.* Series 1 and 2. 19 vols. Portland, ME: Maine Historical Society, 1831-1899

DCB: *Dictionary of Canadian Biography.* 13 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966-.

DHSM: James Phinney Baxter, ed. *Documentary History of the State of Maine,* in *Collections of the Maine Historical Society*, 2nd ser., 24 vols. Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1869-1916.

GDMNH: Sybil Noyes, Charles Thorton Libby, and Walter Goodwin Davis, *Genealogical Dictionary of Maine and New Hampshire* (1928-1933; reprint, Baltimore, Md., 1996)

JR: Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents.* 71 vols. Cleveland: Burrows Brothers, 1900.

MSA: Massachusetts State Archives, Boston.

MHS: Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

MPCR: Charles Thornton Libby, Robert E. Moody, and Neal W. Allen, Jr., eds. *Province and Court Records of Maine.* 6 vols. Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1928-1975.

MeHS: Maine Historical Society, Portland.

MW: William A. Sargent, ed. *Maine Wills, 1640 – 1760.* Portland: Brown Thurston & Co., 1887.

NAC: National Archives of Canada, Ottawa

NEC: Emma Lewis Coleman. *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars.* 2 vols. Portland, ME: The Southworth Press, 1925; reprint Heritage Books, 1989.

NEHGR: *New England Historical and Genealogical Register,* New England Historic, Genealogical Society. Vols 1-101. Boston: NEHGS, 1880-1947.

YD: William Sargent, ed. *York Deeds.* 18 Vols. Portland: John T. Hull, 1887.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources:

United States

Massachusetts State Archives. Boston. MA.

Massachusetts Archives

Maine Historical Society. Portland. ME.

Doggett Family Papers
Miscellaneous Manuscripts

Maine State Museum

Collections

Massachusetts Historical Society. Boston. MA.

Fayerweather Family Papers
Gerald Kelly Papers
Francis Parkman Papers
John Pike Journal
Mary Storer Letters
Cyprian Southack Letters
Nathanial Wheelwright Diary

Canada

Library and Archives Canada

Série A23, Greffes de notaires de la Nouvelle-France et du Québec
Série C11A, Correspondence générale, 1540-1784
Série C8, Congés et permis enregistrés à Montréal

Newspapers:

Boston News-Letter

Published Primary Sources:

Baxter, James Phinney, ed. *Documentary History of the State of Maine.* 24 vols. Portland, Maine: The Maine Historical Society, 1869-1916.

Baxter, Joseph. "Journal of the Reverend Joseph Baxter." *New England Historical and Genealogical Record 21* (January 1867): 45-59.

Calloway, Colin, ed. *North Country Captives: Selected Narratives of Indian Captivity from Vermont and New Hampshire.* Hanover: University of New Hampshire, 1992.

Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, Issued by Order of Pope Pius V. trans. Theodore Alois Buckley. London: G. Routledge, 1852.

Charlevoix, Pierre F.-X. de. *Journal of a Voyage to North-America.* 2 vols. London: J. Doddsley, 1761.

Collection de Manuscrits contenant Lettres, Mémoires, es autres Documents Historiques Relatifs a la Nouvelle France. 4 vols. Québec: Côté et Cie, 1884.

Hutchinson, Thomas. *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts-Bay.* 3 vols. Edited by Lawrence Shaw Mayo. Cambridge: Harvard, 1936.

Kalm, Peter. *Travels into North America.* Trans. John Reinhold Forster. Barre, MA: The Imprint Society, 1972.

Lahontan, [Louis Armand de Lom d'Arce] Baron [de]. *New Voyages North-America.* ed. Reuben Gold Thwaites. 2 vols. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.

Libby, Charles Thorton, Robert E. Moody, and Neal W. Allen, Jr., eds. *Province and Court Records of Maine.* 6 vols. Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1928-1975.

Maine Historical Society. *Collections of the Maine Historical Society.* Series 1 and 2. 19 vols. Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1831-1899.

Mather, Cotton. *Decennium Luctuosum: An history of remarkable occurrences, in the long war, which New-England hath had with the Indian salvages, from the year, 1688.* Boston: B. Green and J. Allen, 1699.

_____. *Frontiers Well-Defended.* Boston: n.p., 1702.

_____. *Good Fetch'd Out of Evil.* Boston: Bartholomew Green?, 1706.

_____. *Magnalia Christi Americana.* London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1702; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1972.

New England Historical and Genealogical Register. 101 vols. Boston: NEGHR, 1880-1947.

Records and Files of the Quarterly Court of Essex County. 8 vols. Salem, MA: Essex Institute, 1911–21.

Records of the First Church of Wells, Maine from October 29, 1701, to October 21, 1810. New York: n.p., 1918.

Penhallow, Samuel: *The History of the Wars of New-England with the Eastern Indians.* Cincinnati: J. Harpel, 1859. Reprint New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969.

Pike, Rev. John. "Journal of Reverend John Pike." Ed. Alonzo Quint. Cambridge: J. Wilson, 1876.

Rowlandson, Mary. "The Sovereignty and Goodness of God." In *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption,, 1676–1724.* Edited by Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark. Cambridge: Harvard, 1981.

Saint-Vallier, Jean Baptiste de. *Estat présent de l'eglise et de la colonie française de la Nouvelle-France.* Paris: Robert Pepie, 1748. Reprint Québec : Coté & Cie, 1856.

Sargent, William A., ed. *Maine Wills 1640 – 1760.* Portland: Brown Thurston & Co., 1887.

_____. *York Deeds.* 18 Vols. Portland: John T. Hull, 1887.

Sewall, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Sewall.* Edited M. Halsey Thomas. 2 vols. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc., 1973.

Stoddard, John. "Stoddard's Journal." *New England Historical and Genealogical Register 5* (January 1851): 21-42.

Thwaites, Reuben Gold, ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610 – 1791.* 73 vols. Cleveland: Burrows Brothers, 1896-1901.

Vaughan, Alden T. and Edward W. Clark, eds. *Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676 – 1724.* Cambridge: Harvard, 1981.

Whitmore, W. H., ed. *The Andros Tracts.* 3 vols. Boston: The Prince Society, 1868 – 1874.

Williams, John. *The Redeemed Captive Returning to Zion.* Northampton: Hopkins, Bridgeman and Company, 1853.

Secondary Sources:

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. *A Religious History of the American People.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Austen, Barbara E. "Captured … Never Came Back: Social Networks Among New England Female Captives in Canada, 1689–1763." In *New England/New France 1600 – 1850.* Edited by Peter Benes. Boston: Annual Proceedings of the Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife, Vol. 14. Boston: Boston University, 1992.

Axtell, James. *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America.* New York: Oxford, 1981.

_____. *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America.* New York: Oxford, 1985.

Bailyn, Bernard. *The New England Merchants of the Seventeenth Century.* New York: Harper & Rowe, 1955.

Baker, Charlotte Alice. *True Stories of the New England Captives During the Old French and Indian Wars.* Bowie, MD: Heritage Books, 1990)

Baker, Emerson W. "Lithobolia: Frontier Prelude to Witchcraft in Salem." Paper presented at the American Historical Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, January 2001.

_____, et al, eds. *American Beginnings: Exploration, Culture and Cartography in the Land of Norumbega.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1994.

_____, and James Kences. "Maine, Indian Land Speculation, and the Essex County Witchcraft Outbreak of 1692," *Maine History* 40:3 (Fall 2001), 159-189.

_____, and John G. Reid. "Amerindian Power in the Early Modern Northeast: A Reappraisal." *William and Mary Quarterly* 61:1 (January 2004): 77-106.

_____. *The New England Knight: Sir William Phips, 1651–1695.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Banks, Charles Edwin. *A History of York, Maine.* Boston: n.p., 1931.

Baxter, James Phinney. *The Pioneers of New France in New England.* Albany: J. Munsell's Sons, 1894.

Bédard, Marc-Antoine. Les Protestants en Nouvelle-France. Québec : Société historique de Québéc, 1978.

Belmessous, Seliha. "Assimilation and Racialism in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century French Colonial Policy." *American Historical Review* 110:2 (2005), 322-49.

Bonomi, Patricia U. *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society and Politics in Colonial America.* New York: Oxford, 1986.

Bosher, J. F. *The Canada Merchants, 1713 –1763.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Bourne, Edward E. *History of Wells and Kennebunk.* Portland: B. Thurston and Co., 1875.

Brasseaux, Carl A. *The Founding of New Acadia: The Beginnings of Acadian Life in Louisiana, 1765–1803*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.

Breen, Louise A. *Transgressing the Bounds: Subversive Enterprise Among the Puritan Elite, 1630 – 1692.* New York: Oxford, 2001.

Brumm, Ursula. "The Virgin Mary among American Puritans: A Difficult Relation." *Amerikastudien* 2002 47(4): 449–468.

Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe.* New York: Harper, 1978.

Burrage, Henry S. *The Beginnings of Colonial Maine, 1602-1658.* Portland: State of Maine, 1914.

Bushman, Richard. *From Puritan to Yankee: Character and the Social Order in Connecticut, 1690–1765.* Cambridge: Harvard, 1967.

Butler, Jon. *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1990.

_____. "Historiographical Heresy: Catholicism as a Model for American Religious History." In Thomas Kselman, ed., *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion.* Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame Press, 1991.

Calvert, Mary R. *Black Robe on the Kennebec.* Monmouth, ME: Monmouth Press, 1991.

Canup, John. *Out of the Wilderness: The Emergence of an American Identity in Colonial New England.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan U. Press, 1990.

Carroll, Peter N. *Puritanism and the Wilderness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier, 1629–1700.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Chaplin, Leola Bowling. *The Life and Work of Nathaniel Deering, (1791-1881) with the Text of Two of His Plays, Carabasset and The Clairvoyants*. Orono, ME: University of Maine Press, 1934.

Clark, Charles E. *The Eastern Frontier: The Settlement of Northern New England, 1610–1763.* New York: Knopf, 1970.

Clark, Emily, and Virginia Meacham Gould. "The Face of Afro-Catholicism in New Orleans, 1727–1852." *William and Mary Quarterly* 59 (2): 409-448.

Choquette, Leslie. *Frenchmen into Peasants: Modernity and Tradition in the Peopling of French Canada.* Cambridge: Harvard, 1997.

Cogliano, Francis D. *No King, No Popery: Anti-Catholicism in Revolutionary New England.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.

Coleman, Emma Lewis. *New England Captives Carried to Canada Between 1677 and 1760 During the French and Indian Wars.* 2 vols. Portland, ME: The Southworth Press, 1925; reprint, Bowie, MD: Heritage Classics, 1989.

Colley, Linda. *Captives: The Story of Britain's Pursuit of Empire and How its Soldiers and Civilians Were Held Captive by the Dream of Global Supremacy, 1600-1850.* New York: Pantheon, 2002.

Cott, Nancy F. "Divorce and the Changing Status of Women in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd ser 33.4 (1976): 586-614.

Crawford, Mary Caroline. *The Romance of Old New England Churches.* Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1903.

Cronon, William, and George Miles and Jay Gitlin, eds. *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past.* New York: W. W. Norton, 1993.

Daniels, Christine and Kennedy, Michael V., eds. *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500 – 1820.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Dawson, Hugh. "Père Sébastien Racle in History and Fiction: The Background of Hawthorne's 'Bell' Sketches." *Essex Historical Institute Collections* 124 (3) 1988, 204 – 212.

Dechêne, Louise. *Habitants and Merchants in Seventeenth Century Montreal.* Trans. Liana Vardi. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1992.

Demos, John. *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony.* New York: Oxford, 1970.

_____. *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America.* New York: Knopf, 1994.

De Paoli, Neill. "Life on the Edge: Community and Trade on the Anglo-American Periphery, Pemaquid, Maine, 1610–1689. Ph.D. diss: University of New Hampshire, 2001.

Dictionary of Canadian Biography. 13 vols. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966-.

Dinan, Susan E., and Debra Meyers, eds. *Women and Religion in Old and New Worlds.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

Drake, Samuel Adams. *The Border Wars of New England.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.

Dunn, Mary Maples. "Saints and Sinners: Congregational and Quaker Women in the Early Colonial Period." *American Quarterly* 30:5 (1978), 582-601.

Eccles, William J. *The Canadian Frontier: 1534–1760.* Revised. New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1983.

Evennett, H. Outram. *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation.* Ed. John Bossy. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Faulkner, Alaric, and Gretchen F. Faulkner. *The French at Pentagoët: 1635-1674: An Archaeological Portrait of the Acadian Frontier.* Augusta, ME: Maine Preservation Commission, 1987.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America.* New York: Oxford, 1989.

Folsom, George. *History of Saco and Biddeford.* Saco, ME: Alex G. Putnam, 1830.

Foster, William H. III. "Agathe St. Père and Her Captive New England Weavers." *French Colonial History* Vol. 1 (2002): 129–41.

_____. *The Captor's Narrative: Catholic Women and Their Puritan Men on the Early American Frontier.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Fournier, Marcel. *De la Nouvelle-Angleterre à la Nouvelle France : L'histoire des captifs anglo-américains au Canada entre 1675 et 1760.* Montréal : Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française, 1992.

_____. *Les Européens au Canada des Origins à 1765 (hors France).* Montréal: Les Éditions du Fleuve, 1989.

Franchot, Jenny. *Roads to Rome: The Antebellum Protestant Encounter with Catholicism.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Garrity, John A., and Mark C. Carnes, general eds. *American National Biography*. 24 vols. New York: Oxford, 1999.

Gildrie, Richard P. *The Profane, the Civil, and the Godly: The Reformation of Manners in Orthodox New England, 1679–1749.* University Park: Penn State Press, 1994.

Gray, Linda Breuer. "Narratives and Identities in the Saint Lawrence Valley, 1667–1720." Ph.D. diss: McGill University, 1999.

Greer, Allan. *Peasant, Lord, and Merchant: Rural Society in Three Quebec Parishes, 1740–1840.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

_____. *The People of New France.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

_____, and Jody Bilinkoff, eds. *Colonial Saints: Discovering the Holy in the Americas.* New York: Routledge, 2003.

Greven, Philip. *The Protestant Temperament: Patterns of Child-Rearing, Religious Experience, and the Self in Early America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Griffiths, Nicholas, and Fernando Cervantes, eds. *Spiritual Encounters: Interactions Between Christianity and Native Religions in Colonial America.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1999.

Gura, Philip F. *A Glimpse of Sion's Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England, 1620-1660*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1984.

Haefeli, Evan. "Ransoming New England Captives in New France." *French Colonial History* Vol. 1 (2002): 113–27.

_____, and Kevin Sweeney. *Captors and Captives: The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

Hall, David. *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment: Popular Religious Belief in Early New England.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E. *The Practice of Piety: Puritan Devotional Disciplines in Seventeenth-Century New England.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Hanson, Charles P. *Necessary Virtue: The Pragmatic Origins of Religious Liberty in New England.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1998.

Harris, R. Cole et al. *Historical Atlas of Canada.* Vol. 1 From the Beginning to 1800. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Jaenen, Cornelius. *The Role of the Church in New France.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1976.

Jetté, René. *Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles du Québec des Origines à 1730.* Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1983.

Kidd, Thomas S. *The Protestant Interest: New England After Puritanism.* New Haven: Yale: 2004.

Kolodny, Annette. *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1984.

Kulikoff, Allan. *From British Peasants to Colonial American Farmers.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2000.

Lapomarda, Vincent A. *The Jesuit Heritage in New England.* Worcester: College of the Holy Cross, 1977.

Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity.* New York: Vintage, 1998.

Levy, Barry. *Quakers and the American Family: British Settlement in the Delaware.* New York: Oxford, 1988.

Little, Ann M. "The Life of Mother Marie-Joseph de l'Enfant Jesus, or, How a Little English Girl from Wells Became a Big French Politician." *Maine History.* 40:4 (Winter 2001-2002), 279-308.

Lucey, William Leo. *The Catholic Church in Maine.* Francestown, NH: Marshall Jones, 1957.

Magnuson, Roger. *Education in New France.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992.

Marlowe, George Francis. *Churches of Old New England: Their Architecture and Their Architects, Their Pastors and Their People.* New York: Macmillan, 1947.

McDannell, Colleen. *Material Christianity: Religion and Popular Culture in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Moogk, Peter. *Building a House in New France: An Account of the Perplexities of Client and Craftsmen in Early Canada.* Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry and Whiteside 1977.

_____. *La Nouvelle France: The Making of French Canada - A Cultural History.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2000.

_____. "Writing the Cultural History of Pre-1760 European Colonists." *French Colonial History* 4 (2003), 1–14.

Moore, James T. *Indian and Jesuit: A Seventeenth Century Encounter.* Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1982.

Morgan, Edmund S. *The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England.* New York: Harper & Rowe, 1966.

_____. *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea.* Ithaca: Cornell, 1963.

Morin, Marie. *Histoire Véritable et Simple: Les Annales de L'Hôtel Dieu de Montréal, 1659-1725.* Éditions critique par Ghislaine Legendre. Montréal : Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1979.

Morris, Gerald E., ed. *The Maine Bicentennial Atlas: An Historical Survey.* Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1976.

Morrison, Kenneth M. *The Embattled Northeast: The Elusive Ideal of Alliance in Abenaki-Euroamerican Relations.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

_____. "Sebastien Rale vs. New England: A Case Study of Frontier Conflict." Master's thesis: University of Maine at Orono, 1970.

Namais, June. *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Nash, Alice N. "The Abiding Frontier: Family, Gender, and Religion in Wabanaki History, 1600-1763." Ph.D. diss.: Columbia University, 1997.

_____. "Two Stories of New England Captives: Grizel and Christine Otis of Dover, New Hampshire." In *New England/New France, 1600-1850.* Edited by Peter Benes. Boston: Annual Proceedings of the Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife, vol 14. Boston: Boston University, 1992.

Norton, Mary Beth. *Founding Mothers and Fathers: Gendered Power and the Forming of American Society.* New York: Knopf, 1996.

_____. "George Burroughs and the Girls from Casco: The Maine Roots of Salem Witchcraft." *Maine History* 40:4 (Winter 2001-2002), 259-277.

_____. *In the Devil's Snare: The Salem Witchcraft Crisis of 1692.* New York: Knopf, 2002.

Noyes, Sybil et al. *Genealogical Dictionary of Maine and New Hampshire.* Portland, ME: n.p., 1928-35; reprint Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1972.

O'Malley, John W. *The First Jesuits.* Cambridge: Harvard, 1993.

Pacquet, Gilles, and Jean-Pierre Wallot. "Nouvelle-France/Québec/Canada : A World of Limited Identities." In Nicolas Canny and Anthony Pagden, eds., *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500–1800.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Parkman, Francis. *Count Frontenac and New France Under Louis XIV*. In *France and England in North America.* Vol. II. New York: Library of America, 1983.

_____. *A Half-Century of Conflict.* In *France and England in North America.* Vol. II. New York: Library of America, 1983.

_____. *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Rapley, Elizabeth. *The Dévotes: Women and Church in Seventeenth-Century France.* Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1990.

Ray, Mary Augustina. *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Rebora, Carrie and Paul Straiti. *John Singleton Copley in America.* New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1996.

Reid, John G. *Acadia, Maine and New Scotland: Marginal Colonies in the Seventeenth Century.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

_____. *Maine, Charles II and Massachusetts: Governmental Relationships in Early Northern New England.* Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1977.

Richter, Daniel. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Saint-Pierre, Majolaine. *Saint-Castin: Baron français, chef Amérindien: 1652-1707.* Québec : Les éditions du Septentrion, 1999.

Saunders, A.C. *Jersey in the Seventeenth Century.* Jersey: J.T. Bigwood, 1931.

Sayre, Gordon M. *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Scalberg, Daniel Allen. "The French-Amerindian Religious Encounter in Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth-Century New France." *French Colonial History* Vol. 1 (2002): 101–112.

_____. "Religious Life in New France under the Laval and Saint-Vallier Bishoprics: 1659–1727." Ph.D. diss.: University of Oregon, 1990.

Scribner, Robert W. " 'The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the 'Disenchantment of the World'" *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* vol. 23 (3), Winter 1993, 475-494.

Seed, Patricia. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640.* London: Cambridge, 1995.

Sibley, John Langdon, and Clifford K. Shipton. *Sibley's Harvard Graduates.* 16 vols. Cambridge: Harvard, 1933-.

Silverman, Kenneth. *The Life and Times of Cotton Mather.* New York: Harper & Row, 1984.

Simons, D. Brenton, and Peter Benes. *The Art of Family: Genealogical Artifacts in New England.* Boston: New England Historic Genealogical Society, 2002.

Storer, Malcolm. *Annals of the Storer Family.* New York: n.p., 1924.

Stout, Harry S. *The New England Soul: Preaching and Religious Culture in Colonial New England.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Tanguay, Cyprien. *Dictionnaire Généalogique des Familles Canadiennes.* Montréal: Eusébe Senécal & Fils, 1871.

Taylor, Alan. "Centers and Peripheries: Locating Maine's History." *Maine History* 39(1), 2000: 2-16.

_____. *Liberty Men and Great Proprietors: The Revolutionary Settlement on the Maine Frontier, 1760–1820.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Taylor, Aline. *The French Baron of Pentagouet: Baron St. Castin and the Struggle for Empire in Early New England.* Camden, ME: Picton Press, 1998.

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. *The Age of Homespun: Objects and Stories in the Creation of an American Myth.* New York: Knopf, 2001.

_____. *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650–1750.* New York: Alfred Knopf, 1982.

Vaughan, Alden T. and Daniel K. Richter. "Crossing the Cultural Divide: Indians and New Englanders, 1605-1763." *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 90.1 (1980): 23-99.

Vickers, Daniel. *Farmers and Fisherman: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630-1850.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1994.

Wall, Helena M. *Fierce Communion: Family and Community in Early America*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1990.

Walsh, James P. "Holy Time and Sacred Space in Puritan New England." *American Quarterly* vol. 23 (1) Spring 1980, 79-95.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and the Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Willis, William. *The History of Portland.* 2 vols. Portland: Day, Fraser & Co., 1831.