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ABSTRACT

This dissertation focuses on the discursive creation and consolidation of Anglo-Colonial and Anglo-American identities from the early modern period through the early nineteenth century. In formulating my argument, I turn to various texts including early modern English accounts of the Islamic East, Barbary captivity narratives written by early modern English and early American subjects, as well as Indian captivity narratives penned by English colonists in North America. In particular, I examine the role of Ottoman/Muslim and English encounters and experiences in relation to Anglo-Atlantic and Anglo-American identity formation. In my examination of these encounters, I complicate the notion of binary opposition as suggested by Edward Said’s theory of Orientalism. Instead, I propose a triangular model in which figures of Islam assume the role of catalyzers and encourage Western subjects to reconsider and reconfigure their identity against their own countrymen. For instance, some early modern Englishmen began reconsidering and reconfiguring their Englishness after gaining a new sense of class-consciousness in their encounters with Ottoman Muslims. In a similar fashion, English colonists in North America embraced a settler-colonial identity in the New World that challenged old English social constructions and promoted skill over noble blood. This new identity was not necessarily forged by pitting the English self against the Native American other but by reconsidering Englishness in the New World setting—and eventually replacing old English values by New English ones—after encounters with Native Americans. In the early national period, American encounters with North African Muslims similarly contributed to the consolidation of an American identity as the new nation gradually separated itself from the mother nation. In Barbary captivity narratives
written in this period, American captives often engage in an identity-formation that relies on a national pride vis-à-vis European captives rather than Muslim captors. Drawing on these examples of Anglo-Colonial and Anglo-American identity formation in the age of transatlantic expansion and colonization, I delineate in this project an alternative to the model of identity construction via binary opposition. This triangular model does not entirely override binaries, but it does better encapsulate the Anglo-Atlantic experience in the colonial and early national periods by considering the complexities of cultural relations in the transatlantic contact zone.
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Introduction

In this project, I trace the discursive creation and consolidation of Anglo-colonial identity across a wide time period by turning to Barbary and Indian captivity as well as early modern travel narratives. Specifically, I examine the role of Ottoman/Muslim and English encounters and experiences in relation to Anglo-Atlantic and Anglo-American identity formation. Chronologically, my project starts with the late sixteenth century—when England began developing an interest in westward colonial expansion—and ends in the early nineteenth century when a more or less distinctive American identity—one that is not necessarily defined in relation to a strict social hierarchy but to skill and labor—was forged by the inhabitants of England’s former colonies. I am particularly interested in teasing out the ways in which this Anglo-American identity came into being. While this task has been undertaken many scholars, my approach differs from that of established scholarship on Anglo-Colonial (and later Anglo-American) identity-formation as I am interested in the influence of Ottoman and North African Muslims on the emergence of this identity.¹ The trajectory I am tracing in this project is significant because scholars often do not connect the Ottoman Empire to the Anglo-Atlantic Empire but the Ottoman Empire does have bearing on the development of the Anglo-Atlantic world and the U.S.² The broad temporal reach of this project enables this connection, although it means

¹ Two scholars whose work on Anglo-colonial modes of identity influenced mine are Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse. In their foundational study, Imaginary Puritan (1994), they explore the ways in which an Anglo-American identity came into being in a fashion that is similar to the triangular model I propose in my project. They focus on Indian captivity narratives’ transformative role on the other side of the Atlantic over the social life of the English by encouraging a new form of Englishness that does not gain its strength from aristocracy. In this project, I extend their model to include the early

² I should note that there is an increasing interest among scholars in exploring how encounters with North African Muslims in the early national period contributed to
that very diverse texts are considered as are diverse periods and geographies, but the aim is to draw some new connections that have not been drawn before.

In order to give a clear historical narrative of the emergence and consolidation of this Anglo-Atlantic and Anglo-American identity, I dedicate each chapter to a particular geography and time period. The first chapter starts in the English center and traces early modern English travelers and Barbary captives to the Ottoman Empire/North Africa and back to England. One of the central arguments I make in this chapter is that encounters of Englishmen with Ottoman and North African Muslims shifted ideas of Englishness, and this new idea of Englishness was effective and/or instrumental in developing Anglo-Colonial modes of identity. A key part of this new Englishness was that it was not defined by class but by nationality and was thus inclusive of Englishmen in the lower as well as upper classes. Despite its relatively inclusive nature, though, this New Englishness was deeply racialized as a result of the increased interactions during the America’s nation-building project. Scholars like Robert Battistini and Robert Allison among others attend to the ways in which Barbary captivity in the early national period taught Americans the importance of being a nation after the former colonies of England lost the mother nation’s protection on the high seas after the declaration of independence. Malini Johar Schueller, Jacob Rama Berman, and Timothy Marr, in a similar fashion, direct our attention to the utilization of the discourse of American Orientalism in the early national period to discuss issues of nation building such as race, gender, and slavery. Yet these scholars do not necessarily trace the trajectory I am tracing here—from the pre-colonial to the early national periods—but mostly focus on post-revolutionary America’s experience with North African Muslims. See Robert Allison’s *The Crescent Obscured: The United States and the Muslim World 1776-1815* (1995), Malini Johar Schueller’s *US Orientalisms* (2001), Timothy Marr’s, *The Cultural Roots of American Islamicism* (2006), Robert Battistini’s “Glimpses of the Other before Orientalism: The Muslim World in Early American Periodicals, 1785-1800” (2010), and Jacob Rama Berman’s *American Arabesque: Arabs and Islam in the Nineteenth-Century Imagery* (2012).

3 Scholars Richard Helgerson, Mary Fuller, and Alison Games make a similar argument with regards to England’s colonial endeavors’ role in the unification of the gentry and the middle-class. I will turn to these scholars and their respective arguments later in this introduction.
colonial period and afterwards with non-Europeans—particularly Native Americans and Africans. The new focus on nationhood brings about the question of who represents and is included within the nation—a question that becomes particularly concerning in the cases of early modern Barbary captives, who are denied membership in the nation for being over-exposed to the Muslim culture during their captivities in North Africa. Throughout the chapter, I give an account of how early modern travel and Barbary captivity narratives show the utility and attractiveness of a new social mobility found in the English encounter with Ottoman and North African Muslims; however, these accounts ultimately indicate the extent to which this social mobility is not accepted in England.

If social mobility is not accepted in England, it does have far more utility in colonial settings, as my discussion of John Smith and subsequent settler-colonists such as Mary Rowlandson and John Williams works to demonstrate in the second chapter. I shift my geographical focus to North America in this chapter and turn to Indian captivity narratives written in the seventeenth century to discuss how settler colonial Anglo-American identity countenanced class mobility in new ways. I essentially argue in this chapter that Smith’s vision of a successful colony, which is partly shaped by his experience in Eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire, emphasizes the value of skill and labor over noble blood and plays a paradigmatic role in the construction of England’s North American colonies in a fashion that avoids the rigid class structure of England. Mary Rowlandson’s narrative, I further argue, spotlights her female skill of childbearing as an indispensable marker of a new settler-colonial identity that is predominantly concerned with populating the New World with white Anglo-Christian progeny.
The central geographical focus of the third chapter remains North America as I trace the gradual transformation of Anglo-colonial identity into a distinctive American identity by focusing on Barbary captivity narratives written from the seventeenth through the early nineteenth centuries. I propose that American Barbary captivity narratives demonstrate the extent to which Anglo-Colonial identity is shaped by and comfortable with North African figures/encounters, in contrast with a traditional English hierarchical social model. I argue that Barbary captivity enabled the colonists to begin imagining themselves as a community separate from England as early as the late seventeenth century. I demonstrate how narratives about this captivity played a unifying role in the New English community as opposed to their role in England, where they further perpetuated the alienation of ex-captives from their natal communities.

This project is by no means alone in its attempt to scrutinize English and American—or Anglo-American—relations with the Islamic East in the colonial and/or the early national periods. There have been numerous studies that attend to early modern English encounters with the Ottoman Empire and a number of scholars turn to American Barbary captivity narratives to discuss the genre’s role in the process of American nation-building in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Most of these scholars, however, position their arguments in relation to Edward Said and the notion of binary

---

oppositions that are central to his theory of Orientalism. In his seminal study, Said underlines that “[t]he European encounter with the Orient, and specifically with Islam,…turned Islam into the very epitome of an outsider against which the whole of European civilization from the Middle Ages on was founded” (70). Said suggests with this formulation that since the Middle Ages, encounters with the Muslim world have been a defining factor in the formation of European identity. In other words, European subjects attained a better sense of self by pitting their culture and practices against Muslim practices. Said’s formulation situates the notion of binary opposition at the heart of the debate on the Christian West-Muslim East relationship and scholarship since his groundbreaking study understandably has been either relying on or challenging this notion.

Neither relying on nor completely dismissing binary oppositions, I propose in this project, specifically in chapter one, a triangular model to explain the formation of a new English identity in the early modern period within a transatlantic context. After I trace in the first chapter the emergence of this new English identity in the context of England’s relationship with the Islamic East with a focus on early modern travel and Barbary captivity narratives, I demonstrate in the second and third chapters the role of this relationship in the development of Anglo-Colonial modes of identity from the seventeenth and through the nineteenth centuries. This historical narrative I give ultimately works towards demonstrating how the binaries that Said and many subsequent scholars rely on do not hold when we place the Ottoman Empire next to the Anglo-Atlantic Empire. Instead, this narrative makes visible the ways in which mercantilism in
the east and settler colonialism in the west served to shape a new Anglo-Colonial and later Anglo-American identity.  

By offering a triangular model in this project, I suggest that to the early modern Englishman (and occasionally the Englishwoman) his encounter with the non-English did not necessarily translate into a binary opposition. Instead, his experience often compelled him, due to a newfound class-consciousness and/or an enforced social alienation, to reevaluate his own position back at home vis-à-vis fellow Englishmen. In other words, his interactions with Ottoman/North African Muslims armed the itinerant Englishman with a new kind of self-consciousness yielding to the perception of fellow Englishmen as “Other” which in turn influenced his perception of himself as English. This triangular model shifts our focus from the self-other binary which degrades the Ottoman/North African Muslims whom Englishmen encountered in the early modern period to the position of “Others” who were merely auxiliary tools in the formation of an Anglo-Colonial identity.  

In the model of triangulation, instead, the English traveler/captive questions his position in his natal culture thanks to his encounters with non-English subjects. His experience with Muslims (and later Native Americans) does not necessarily take the form of pitting the self against the other but takes place in a context where the non-English “Other” catalyzes his reconsideration of his own Englishness.

---

5 Alison Games makes a similar point in her study, The Web of Empire (2008), and argues about the role of mercantilism in the earlier stages of British imperialism. She underlines that the English embraced the idea of adapting to non-English cultures in order to be able to carry on successful mercantile activity in the early modern period before England became a colonial power.

6 Cf. the arguments made by Joe Snader, Daniel Vitkus, Nabil Matar, and Gerald MacLean on how encounters with the Islamic East enabled early modern Englishmen to develop a discourse to justify their westward colonial endeavors. I give an overview of the arguments presented by these scholars later in this introduction.
Stephen Greenblatt, in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, describes early modern English identity-formation as a process that “is achieved in relation to something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile…[a] threatening Other” (9). This “threatening Other” is the Spanish according to Michael Duffy, the continental European according to A. J. Hoenselaars, the Jew according to James Shapiro, the Irish according to Michael Neill, and the Muslim according to Nabil Matar, Jonathan Burton, and Daniel Vitkus among others. To use Michael Neill’s formulation, these scholars contend that “England is always discovered elsewhere, defined by the encounter with the Other” (14). Some scholars, on the other hand, employ a more revisionist approach and propose instead an examination of the role of “correspondence and likeness” on the emergence of new forms of Englishness. In one of the most recent of these studies, Marjorie Rubright “directs attention to the ways in which desirable and disquieting similarities to one’s neighbors shaped” (19) the definitions of English identity as well. I intend to contribute to this debate by slightly tweaking the wording of Neill’s formulation and suggesting that “Englishness is always discovered elsewhere.” In doing so, I propose that while this

---


8 See Emily Bartels’s *Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello* (2008), Lloyd Edward Kermode’s *Aliens and Englishness in Elizabethan Drama* (2009), Andrew Murphy’s *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us: Ireland, Colonialism, and Renaissance Literature* (1999), and Marjorie Rubright’s *Doppelgänger Dilemmas: Anglo-Dutch Relations in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (2014).
Englishness is discovered elsewhere, it is not exclusively “defined by the encounter with the Other” as Neill and others argue. Instead, I suggest that this Englishness is discovered outside the borders of England, in the land of the Muslim Other for the purposes of this study, yet defined not necessarily against the Muslim Other but vis-à-vis fellow Englishmen.

The new Englishness that is constructed outside the national borders, I suggest, prioritizes skill over noble blood and social mobility over a deep-rooted loyalty to a rigid English class structure. In establishing and expanding on this point, I rely on two seemingly unrelated but essentially overlapping notions: class consciousness and social alienation. As I have mentioned earlier, I first discuss the ways in which encounters with Ottomans implement a sense of class-consciousness and aspiration for social mobility in the minds of early modern travelers. I later turn to ex-Barbary captives and the social alienation they experience after their captivity and enslavement in North Africa. I eventually demonstrate how these two notions overlap by discussing the gradual transformation of class-consciousness into a social alienation that paves the way for racially determined Anglo-colonial and Anglo-American identities.

By focusing on an emergent class-consciousness in the context of early modern English encounters with the Islamic East, I propose an alternative to the postulation embraced by many scholars that early modern English encounters with the Ottoman Empire and North African nations contributed to the formation of a proto-imperialist/colonialist/Orientalist discourse. For example, Daniel Vitkus describes the early modern English “colonial” discourse as “merely a premature articulation of a third-rank power” (3) that can be described as proto-imperialist while Joe Snader argues for the
early modern proto-Orientalist discourse’s role in the justification of Western colonial expansion. According to Snader, the proto-Orientalist accounts penned by early modern Englishmen depicted the Muslim East as a geography ruled by passionate, despotic, and irrational sovereigns and in doing so “suggest[ed] that the autonomous Western subject possessed a natural aptitude for knowing and ruling lands seemingly racked by political injustice, ineptitude, and extravagance” (132). Ivo Kamps and Jyotsna Singh, on the other hand, opt for the term “colonizing imagination” to describe the early modern literary treatment of the Islamic East. While they acknowledge the “dangers of yoking disparate journeys and encounters within an ideological straitjacket of colonial intent,” they at the same time accentuate “the emerging imperial designs underpinning the new mercantile economy” (2). According to them, early modern English travelers to the East—the Levant, India, and Africa to be more specific—utilized rhetorical structures that worked towards defining the cultural other through binaries that would in the subsequent century be a staple of the colonial discourse (3). Gerald MacLean, in a similar fashion, describes early modern Englishmen as possessors of “imperial envy”—“a dominant discursive formation” (MacLean Looking 20) that manifested itself in early modern writings about the East. With this coinage, MacLean underlines that early modern England’s envy in the face of Ottoman imperial power as “a weak and relatively insignificant nation seeking to compete with the Spanish for the wealth of the New World” (21) was instrumental in “shap[ing] the English into imperial Britons” (20) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This discursive formation—initially characterized by a sense of inferiority—gave way to an “emergent imperiousness” once England’s colonial endeavors began to bear fruit on the west side of the Atlantic (21).
These scholars ultimately identify a nascent imperialist discourse that early modern Englishmen assumed to justify their westward colonial endeavors—a discourse that was paradoxically invented vis-à-vis the Ottoman Empire against whom the English were feeling politically, economically, and culturally inferior. Early modern Englishmen, they acknowledge, might not have had a full-blown colonialist or imperialist identity, yet they began to forge one in their encounters with Ottoman and North African Muslims in the early seventeenth century. I propose an alternative to this viewpoint and argue against describing early modern travel and captivity narratives as the embodiments of a nascent imperialist discourse. The two notions I have mentioned above—class consciousness and social alienation—play an especially crucial role in helping me establish my point.

One of my central arguments in this project is that early modern English encounters with the Ottoman Empire contributed to the emergence of a class-consciousness, which translates in this case into an aspiration for social mobility. While scholars tend to focus on English travelers’ anxiety in the face of Ottoman imperial power and this anxiety’s contribution to a bourgeoning imperialist discourse, I shift my focus to an emerging middle-class anxiety that surfaces when the English traveler realizes that the social mobility offered to him by the Muslim Other is not achievable back in England. As my reading of Thomas Dallam’s diary in the first chapter illustrates, the

---

English traveler leaves the Ottoman Empire with a new sense of self-esteem that makes him reconsider his Englishness defined by a strict social stratification back at home.

Scholars Mary Fuller, Richard Helgerson, and Alison Games among others attend to the notion of class as part of their attempts to portray the social and historical context of England’s emerging interest in westward colonial expansion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Fuller directs our attention to the role of early modern narratives in the propagation of English colonialism by uniting Englishmen regardless of their rank under the common goal of creating a “collective memory” of the English nation that would eventually reimagine England as a colonial power.\(^1\) More than individual narratives, Fuller and Helgerson emphasize, it was the collation of those accounts by compilers like Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas that contributed to the refashioning of English identity with respect to the colonial context. For instance, Hakluyt, thanks to his compilation of English exploration narratives, is remembered as the writer of “England’s great prose epic” that contributed to the forging of a merchant-colonizer English identity (Fuller Remembering 24). In this identity is merged, Helgerson underlines, the two separate classes of the English social system: the gentry and merchants.\(^1\) Games, on the other hand, accentuates that English colonialism started not as a purely national project but one that also depended heavily on private investors. These investors were more motivated by the prospect of economic gain than nationalistic sentiment. Yet at the same time, they were aware that their prosperity depended on the

\(^1\) For Mary Fuller’s discussion of “collective memory,” see the introduction to Remembering the Early Modern Voyage (2008).

\(^1\) See Helgerson’s Forms of Nationhood (1994), pp. 171-183. Helgerson’s point is especially noteworthy given the fact that in early modern England, merchants, regardless of their income, were firmly considered below landed gentlemen in the social hierarchy (Wrightson 30).
prestige of the English nation on the colonial stage (Games 8). Both Games and Helgerson contend that the English colonial project brought together Englishmen from various strata. In order to maintain the strength and the prestige of the English nation overseas, which in turn would maintain the economic stability of individual investors as well as the merchants and colonists venturing to the New World, all Englishmen with a personal interest in this project had to work together regardless of their social rank. In that sense, they suggest, simultaneously with the development of its colonial ventures, England entered a time period of significant social change—a change that, according to Helgerson, involved shifting away from “the centralizing forces of the monarchic state” towards a unity characterized by “a national cultural formation” (299).

According to Helgerson, the Englishmen of this period were assuming a new kind of national identity whose “primary source” was the land as a result of their increasing awareness of England’s position in the world thanks to advancements in the science of cartography (139). Moreover, “[t]he discovery of a new world with new opportunities and new demands inevitably threatened the old hierarchy of power” (153). This new national consciousness in turn contributed to the emergence of “some other interest or cultural formation—the nobility, the law, the land, the economy, the common people, the church—rival[ing] the monarch as the fundamental source of national identity” (10). This search for alternative identity markers by no means suggests the decline of monarchical authority in early modern England but it certainly indicates the beginning of a new self-consciousness that would shape Anglo-Colonial modes of identity throughout the
seventeenth century. Yet, Helgerson’s seminal account of the emergence of new forms of Englishness in the age of discovery and expansion fails to consider the contribution of early modern Englishmen’s experiences in the Islamic East to the construction of new forms of Englishness with respect to class. In this study, I revise Helgerson’s thesis regarding how English colonial interests loosened England’s strict social hierarchical model and gave way to possibilities for social mobility to consider the ways in which encounters with the Islamic East contributed to this process.

A fitting example would be by T. O. Lloyd when he points out how, by as early as the 1630s, English colonists in the New World had begun to handle the matters pertaining to their colonies without consulting the royal government (3). While Lloyd underlines that there was no conscious intention to challenge the monarchical authority, this example, I believe, shows a sense of autonomy and thus is indicative of Anglo-Colonial identity’s gradual estrangement from loyalty to the crown as its first and foremost marker. See T. O. Lloyd’s *The British Empire 1558-1995* (1996).

A discussion of the early modern English social model and its highly stratified nature raises the question of whether we can assume the existence of social classes in early modern England in the sense that we consider the notion of class today. Therefore, I should note that my argument in the following chapters only takes up on the unanimously acknowledged understanding that early modern English society was highly stratified. In my reference to some of the early modern travelers as middle-class Englishmen, I only intend to direct attention to their social position below the gentry and to the difficulty they encounter in their attempts to pursue their desire for social mobility. For more on English social system and its hierarchical nature, see, Peter Laslett’s *The World We Have Lost* (1965), Keith Wrightson’s *English Society* (1982), Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson’s edited collection *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (1985), and Jonathan Barry and Christopher Brooks’s edited collection *The Middling Sort of People* (1994).

Many scholars underline that, contrary to what we have come to believe, early modern English society did provide opportunities for upward mobility. However, these opportunities were very rare and required aspiring Englishmen to be in possession of enough wealth to live without manual labor, to buy a coat of arms, and to receive higher education (Laslett 33-34). Considering this, I base my argument in the upcoming pages on the fact that the prospect of climbing the social ladder was significantly minuscule for the majority of early modern Englishmen of middling sorts. On the other hand, that social mobility did exist as an opportunity in early modern English society actually works in favor of my argument as the two middle-class Englishmen I discuss in this project, John Smith and Thomas Dallam, never stop considering a return to England and utilize their newfound self-esteem and class-consciousness to seek upward mobility.
Not all Englishmen were able to profit similarly from their experience in the Islamic East upon their return to England and therefore each went through a different process of identity-construction. While John Smith and Thomas Dallam returned to their native country with a new sense of Englishness that challenged the hierarchical norms existing there, Barbary captives went through a slightly different kind of identity-formation due to their experience of captivity in North Africa. To delineate this experience, I turn to two early modern Barbary captives in this project and argue against Nabil Matar’s contention that “[c]aptivity accounts were written to assert English identity and authorize national commitment” and therefore “reveal a deep-seated sense of Anglo-Christian self-righteousness” (Matar *Piracy* 37). Instead, I propose, these narratives reveal the degree of social alienation ex-Barbary captives experienced during and, ironically, after their captivity. Under the dehumanizing conditions of captivity and slavery, Barbary captives could not experience the necessary sense of superiority to assert a “deep-seated sense of Anglo-Christian self-righteousness” as Matar suggests. Furthermore, even after their return from captivity, ex-captives could not feel “English” enough to engage in a binary opposition against their Muslim captors. This was mainly because their compatriots did not perceive these ex-captives as adequately English after they had been exposed to the Muslim culture for a dangerously long period of time. Having been denied membership to English social life, these ex-captives often felt disconnected from their natal communities. This disconnection made it difficult for captive-turned-narrators to assert a strong and genuine sense of Englishness and, therefore, pushed them to find new forms of Englishness to identify with. I challenge the assumption that ex-Barbary captives somehow managed to hold on to their English
identities despite the dehumanizing treatment they underwent during captivity and the social dislocation they continued to experience even after their return to England. Instead, I read the narratives of ex-captives as their means of resisting the social alienation and writing themselves into being together with a new model of Englishness.

In proposing and supporting my argument, I am influenced by Orlando Patterson's theory of natal alienation and social death experienced by African slaves. Patterson compares natal alienation to *secular excommunication*: “Alienated from all ‘rights’ or claims of birth, [the slave] ceases to belong in his own right to any legitimate social order.” The slave becomes a “genealogical isolate” as he is “denied all claims on, and obligations to, his parents and living blood relations but, by extension, all such claims and obligations on his more remote ancestors and on his descendants” the result of which is the slave’s “social death” (5). Since Patterson’s theory has emerged in the context of African slavery, an institution whose practices were not identical to those of Anglo-Christian slavery in North Africa, I appropriate his terms “natal alienation” and “social death” to discuss the trials of early modern Englishmen during and after their captivity and enslavement in North Africa. I deem these two concepts as particularly helpful because I believe they remind us that early modern Englishmen went through a related, if not as intense and sustained, dehumanizing treatment under captivity and slavery as their African counterparts even though there are large differences between the two forms of slavery—Atlantic and North African—that have to do with scale, economics, and race. My main motivation in appropriating these two terms is to highlight that despite the fact that England was striving to become a colonial power in the New World at the time of
their captivity, Barbary captives experienced forms of dehumanization that had significant effects on the shape of their English identity.

What distinguished English captives from the majority of their African counterparts, among other things, was the fact that some of them were able to return to their native countries and publish their accounts of captivity and enslavement in their own languages. Recent scholarship on Barbary captivity narratives, I believe, fails to consider ex-Barbary captives as human beings who were oppressed under the dehumanizing institution of slavery and insists on reading their accounts as embodiments of a proto-imperialist discourse that requires possessing a strong English identity after years of captivity and enslavement among the non-English Other—North African Muslims to be more specific. By appropriating Patterson’s theory, I would like to bring to our attention the fact that these Englishmen were very possibly enforced to give up parts of their natal identities as slaves. Therefore, considering their narratives as strong assertions of their Englishness might not result in the most accurate analyses of these narratives. Instead, I argue that these ex-captives, many of whom returned to England after spending decades of their lives experiencing a degree of natal alienation, experienced a “social alienation” when they were denied the opportunity of reintegration to their natal society by their own compatriots. With an analysis of John Smith’s *The True Travels* in the second chapter, I demonstrate how social alienation plays a crucial role in the development of Anglo-Colonial modes of identity that would gradually

---

15 I should note that there were a few African slaves who managed to return to their native countries and there were also a few who composed manuscripts in their native languages. Two such African slaves are Ayuba Suleiman Diallo (Job ben Solomon) and Ben Ali. For more on these African Slaves, see Ronald Judy’s *(Dis)forming the American Canon: African-Arabic Slave Narratives and the Vernacular* (1993).
become New English and later Anglo-American. Furthermore, when I turn to Indian captivity narratives I argue that ex-Indian captives do not experience a similar alienation due to the differing social characteristics of the New English community from the English community in the imperial center. The ease of Indian captives' reintegration into their New English community, in turn, suggests the gradual alienation of peripheral New Englanders from the imperial center and consequently from their English past.

While I do not suggest that New Englanders immediately alienated themselves from the imperial center, I believe we can see the signals of cultural alienation as early as the seventeenth century by attending to Indian captivity narratives. When John Smith tries to establish a mindset that prioritizes skill over noble blood in England’s first successful colony, he sows the seeds of this alienation by envisioning the first English colony as an inclusive construction. When I turn to Indian captivity narratives in the second chapter after my discussion of Smith, I contrast the peripheral New English community’s welcoming attitudes towards captives with the central English community’s rejection of returning Barbary captives. I scrutinize Mary Rowlandson’s account of her three-month captivity among Native Americans and argue that she places her female skill of childbearing at the heart of her narrative as a means of securing membership in her Puritan community despite showing signs of cultural contamination. Rowlandson and other Indian captives, I underline, can achieve something that early modern Barbary captives could not: receiving readmission to the “English” community. The main reason for this difference, I argue, is that the New English community inherently assumes a settler-colonial shape and thus is conscious of the necessity of adapting to the new environment of the New World and of reproducing itself there.
I describe the New English community as inclusive primarily in terms of class difference. I do not mean to ignore that while this community was more inclusive in terms of class, it was increasingly less inclusive in terms of race. With this characterization of the New English community as inclusive, though, I am focusing on New English attitudes towards returning captives as contrasted with those of the imperial center. This contrast becomes the strongest when I turn in the third chapter to American Barbary captivity narratives written in the colonial and early national periods. By reading two seventeenth-century Barbary captivity narratives in light of Cotton Mather’s sermon that was delivered on the occasion of the redemption of 300 English slaves from Barbary captivity, I demonstrate how Barbary captivity plays a unifying role in the New English community as opposed to its role in England, where it estranges ex-captives from their natal communities. I further argue that Barbary captivity enabled the colonists to begin imagining themselves as a community separate from England. By demonstrating the differences between the two communities when it comes to granting membership to their “citizens,” I bring my argument to a full circle and show how the Anglo-Colonial modes of identity formed in the face of Ottoman and North African Muslims play a paradigmatic role in the emergence of a relatively inclusive New English community, which gradually transformed into the United States of America within a century.

Hence, this dissertation positions itself against Said’s assertion that “[t]he European encounter with the Orient, and specifically with Islam,…turned Islam into the very epitome of an outsider against which the whole of European civilization from the Middle Ages on was founded” (70) while at the same time acknowledging that “binary oppositions have an important rudimentary function in the dialectical process” (Vitkus 2).
Following Vitkus’s lead, I identify essential binaries—such as English self-Ottoman Other or English captive-North American/North African captor—“in the preliminary phase of interpretation” (2). However, instead of telling a story of Anglo-American identity-construction based on these binaries, I attend to their auxiliary role in the emergence of a triangular model of identity-formation for Englishmen in the colonial and for Anglo-Americans in the early national period. One leg of this triangular model always remains the non-English Other in the form of either Ottoman Turks, North African masters, or Native American captors. However, these others do not necessarily serve as entities against which English, Anglo-colonial, and Anglo-American identities are constructed. Rather, they function as catalyzers that help the white Christian subject question his or her position within the community s/he is a part of. For instance, some early modern Englishmen began reconsidering and reconfiguring their Englishness after gaining a new sense of class-consciousness thanks to their encounters with Ottoman Muslims. In a similar fashion, English colonists in North America embraced a settler-colonial identity in the New World that challenged old English social constructions and promoted skill over noble blood. This new identity was not necessarily forged by pitting the English self against the Native American other but by reconsidering Englishness in the New World setting—and eventually replacing old English values by New English ones—after encountering with Native Americans. Drawing on these examples of Anglo-American identity-formation in the age of transatlantic expansion and colonization, I delineate in this project an alternative model of identity-construction to binary opposition. This triangular model does not entirely override binaries, and yet better encapsulates the
Anglo-American experience in the colonial and early national periods by considering the complexities of cultural relations in the transatlantic contact zone.
Chapter 1

Captive Travelers, Travelling Captives: Early Modern English Encounters with the Muslim Other and the Reconfiguration of English Identity

ALONSO: Good boatswain, have care. Where's the master? Play the men.
Boatswain: I pray now, keep below.
ANTONIO: Where is the master, boatswain?
Boatswain: Do you not hear him? You mar our labour: keep your cabins: you do assist the storm.
GONZALO: Nay, good, be patient.
Boatswain: When the sea is. Hence! What cares these roarers for the name of king? To cabin: silence! trouble us not.
GONZALO: Good, yet remember whom thou hast aboard.
Boatswain: None that I more love than myself. You are a counsellor; if you can command these elements to silence, and work the peace of the present, we will not hand a rope more; use your authority: if you cannot, give thanks you have lived so long, and make yourself ready in your cabin for the mischance of the hour, if it so hap. Cheerly, good hearts! Out of our way, I say.

William Shakespeare, The Tempest (Act 1 Scene 1)

Shakespeare’s 1611 play, The Tempest, opens with a prophetic nod to the devaluation of noble blood in the face of skill over the course of European westward colonial expansion. Amidst a strong storm during their journey from North Africa to Italy, the royal passengers Alonso, Antonia, and Gonzalo are forced to face the reality that their noble blood is of no significance at a moment when only the skill of the ship’s captain and his crew will save the lives of the passengers—noble and commoner alike. In suggesting such a reading of its opening scene, I rely on the commonplace critical readings of the play as one that is essentially about European colonial endeavors in the
While the exact geography of Prospero’s island is the subject of much speculation, the colonial setting of the play has been widely accepted by scholars. The opening scene of The Tempest is germane to this chapter because of the remarkable similarity between the experiences of the subjects of this chapter—namely early modern itinerant Englishmen—and those of Shakespeare’s characters with regard to the change in their perception of their social position in an increasingly transatlantic world. As the first chapter of a project that aims at tracing the evolution of early modern English men and women into Anglo-colonials and later Anglo-Americans, this chapter turns to narratives written by seventeenth-century English travelers and captives and scrutinizes their encounters with the Islamic East with a focus on shifting class-consciousness. Thanks to the encounters with Ottoman and North African Muslims in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, ideas of Englishness, I propose, started going through a major transformation. This transformation culminated in new Anglo-colonial modes of identity,

---

16 For a detailed overview, analysis, and critique of The Tempest’s colonialist interpretations by the new historicists, see Ben Ross Schneider, Jr, “Are We Being Historical Yet?” Colonial Interpretations of Shakespeare’s Tempest” (1995).

17 For instance, in The Jamestown Project, Karen Ordahl Kupperman likens Prospero’s island in The Tempest to John Smith’s Virginia: “[T]he truly noble engaged in unaccustomed hard labor to prove their virtue, as Ferdinand stacked and carried wood to prove his worthiness to marry Miranda. And, as in Jamestown, some among the rank and file demonstrated their unworthiness by their fecklessness—even in trying to realize their greedy plans” (249-50). Also, see Charles Frey’s “The Tempest and the New World” (1979) for a discussion of the geography of Prospero’s island.

18 In an article that criticizes the colonialist interpretations of The Tempest for “privileging…America as the primary context of colonialism for the play,” Barbara Fuchs directs attention to “the very real presence of the Ottoman threat in the Mediterranean in the early seventeenth century and…the violent English colonial adventures in Ireland, which paved the way for plantation in Virginia” (46). See Barbara Fuchs’s “Conquering Islands: Contextualizing The Tempest” (1997).
which privileged national belonging above class and thus were characterized as more inclusive than the Englishness that flourished in the metropole.

The arguments I make in this chapter are based on the notion that early modern English society had an inherently stratified social structure. While scholars still debate whether we can identify early modern English society as one with a strict class system in the sense that we define class today, there is nevertheless consensus among historians that the English social system was an intrinsically hierarchical construction which allowed some room for social mobility to those who had the financial resources to secure a spot in the English court. In his seminal work on English social history, Peter Laslett summarizes what being an Englishman of middling sorts meant in the early modern period: “If you were not a gentleman, if you were not ordinarily called ‘Master’ by the commoner folk, or ‘Your Worship’; if you, like nearly all the rest, had a Christian and a surname and nothing more; then you counted for little in the world outside your own household, and for almost nothing outside your small village community and its neighbourhood” (Laslett 27-28). While some of these middle-class Englishmen were qualified to vote in elections, their opinions did not matter much on issues concerning the population unless they could inherit wealth or gain education. Under circumstances that made it almost impossible for Englishmen of middling sorts to have their voices heard with regard to issues concerning the nation, parochial affiliations and local loyalties inevitably were more instrumental in the configuration of one’s sense of belonging and identity (Wrightson 48). For example, a middle-class Englishman from Lancashire would more easily identify as a Lancastrian than an Englishman given a lack of experience with the matters concerning the world outside his town or county.
Considering the highly stratified nature of English society and the scarcity of resources for middle-class Englishmen to experience the England existing outside their local borders, encounters of some of these Englishmen with the world beyond national borders inevitably culminated in new modes of Englishness. In this chapter, I attend to early modern English encounters with the Islamic East—particularly the Ottoman Empire and North Africa—while taking into consideration the social history of England in relation to these accounts. Such an approach enables me to offer a reading that differs from existing scholarship on England’s relationship with the Islamic East. Under the influence of Edward Said and his theory of Orientalism, scholarship on European encounters with the Muslim world has long attended to the ways in which Europeans came to define their identity against the Muslim Other, which eventually culminated in a discourse that perceived the Muslim east as inherently inferior to the Christian west. In his seminal study, *Orientalism*, Said underlines that “[t]he European encounter with the Orient, and specifically with Islam,…turned Islam into the very epitome of an outsider against which the whole of European civilization from the Middle Ages on was founded” (70). Although Said’s groundbreaking theory has been contested by subsequent critics, the binary opposition his formulation depends on—between the European self and the Muslim other—never ceased to be at the center of studies of Europe’s relationship with the Islamic East. Many of these studies reconsider Said’s formulation and argue for the slow yet steady emergence of a colonialist and/or Orientalist discourse in the early modern period that gains its strength from a binary construction of English identity vis-à-vis the Muslim Other. Joe Snader, for instance, contends that “the English captivity tradition tended to handle a variety of locations and cultures with the aggressive rhetoric
that Edward Said has called ‘Orientalism’...[and] portrayed North Africa, the Middle East, or southern Asia through a standard set of rhetorical strategies and cultural stereotypes that grew from centuries of religious strife and expanded with Europe’s early modern military ascendancy” (3). Ivo Kamps and Jyotsna Singh, on the other hand, propose that early modern narratives carry the traces of what they call “colonizing imagination” their authors “frequently fall[ing] back on defining the cultural other they encounter in terms of binaries that later consolidate and justify full-blown colonialism” (2-3). In a similar fashion, Nabil Matar argues that to the English in the early modern period, “[t]he Muslim was all that an Englishman and Christian was not: he was the Other with whom there could only be holy war” (Matar Turks 13). My analysis of this encounter differs from those that have binary oppositions at their center. By directing attention to a middle-class consciousness that began to emerge in these increasingly cosmopolitan Englishmen’s minds, I shift the focus from an English identity construction that solely relies on Anglo-Christian self vs. Muslim Other binary to a triangular identity formation in which the traveling middle-class Englishman gains a class-consciousness that positions him against fellow Englishmen. The Muslim figure in this triangulation assumes the role of a catalyzer that helps the English traveler aspire to social mobility by making him realize the limitations his background entails in England.

The diary of one such middle-class Englishman, who traveled to the Ottoman Empire in the very beginning of the seventeenth century, is replete with moments that reveal its author’s increasing class-consciousness upon realizing the opportunities for social mobility beyond the national borders of England. Thomas Dallam was an organ maker whose fortune took a turn for the better when he was commissioned in 1599 by
Queen Elizabeth to deliver a special, yet belated, accession gift to the Ottoman Sultan, Mehmed III. This gift was a clockwork organ specially designed and built by Dallam himself and carefully selected as a gift to the Sultan after the Queen was impressed by Dallam’s performance at Whitehall. Dallam’s mission in this visit to Istanbul would become crucial for Anglo-Ottoman relations in the seventeenth century as it was designed to strengthen the commercial and political relationship between the Ottoman Empire and England. The clockwork organ he was to deliver to the “Grand Turk” was described as a “great and curious present…which will scandalize other nations” (qtd. in MacLean 2) indicating the gift’s larger significance for England’s aspiration to become a player on the global stage and the Ottoman Empire’s strategic position in helping England achieve this goal. Queen Elizabeth was particularly anxious about the possibility of an alliance between England’s Catholic enemies and the Ottoman Empire. The success of the Spanish in their colonial endeavors was a major reason to be apprehensive of the prospect of Ottoman-Spanish alliance that would make the Spanish even more powerful in the Mediterranean and a greater threat to England’s autonomy in Europe. With the Netherlands already encompassed in the Spanish Empire, the prospect of being taken over by the Spanish appeared to the English more real than ever.20

The Levant Company at the time was still in the inception stage, first trading privileges to England having been granted in 1580 by Sultan Murad III. The success of the company was crucial to creating a strong English presence in the Mediterranean as it

---

19 For an excellent source on Dallam’s voyage to the Ottoman Empire and the historical context of events, see Gerald MacLean’s *The Rise of the Oriental Travel* (2004), pp. 3-47.
20 For a more detailed discussion of the Spanish threat against England in the early modern period, see Marjorie Rubright’s *Doppelgänger Dilemmas*, pp. 10-11 and Karen Ordahl Kupperman’s *The Jamestown Project*, pp. 20-21.
was the only way English merchants could carry on their trade in Ottoman ports.\textsuperscript{21} For the company to remain active and successful a second charter had to be issued when the first one expired in 1588. In 1592, the company gained a stronger presence in the Mediterranean with a new charter and renewed trading privileges. In this diplomatic context, it was deemed necessary that Queen Elizabeth send an appropriate present to the Ottoman Sultan; without a present the Sultan would not officially recognize Henry Lello, the agent of the Levant Company, as the English ambassador. Dallam’s burden was heavy in that context: in order for Lello to be recognized as the ambassador, Dallam had to be successful. In other words, the moment Dallam put his foot on Ottoman soil he found himself in a topsy-turvy world where, on a micro scale, an English gentleman’s and, on a macro scale, the whole English nation’s future was in the hands of a middle-class artisan. Although Gerald MacLean describes Dallam as oblivious to the significance of his mission (MacLean 33), it is hard to assume that he was not aware of the implications of delivering a special gift to the Ottoman Sultan. As Dallam’s diary indicates, from the first moment he meets with Lello, Dallam refuses to be talked down to by the soon-to-be ambassador, giving the first sign of his rejection of a hierarchical positioning between the two Englishmen beyond English national borders.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore,

\textsuperscript{21} For a detailed historical background of the Levant Company, see Kenneth Andrew’s \textit{Trade, Plunder, and Settlement}, Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{22} The section in Dallam’s diary in which he depicts his encounter with Lello and two other English gentlemen is extremely telling as it reveals how Dallam confronts with these Englishmen conscious of his social position below them and therefore prefers not to make note of his impudent response:

\begin{quote}
When our Imbassader, Mr. Wylyam Aldridge, and other jentlmen, se in what case it was in, theye weare all amayzed, and sayde that it was not worthe ii d. My answereare unto our Imbassader and to Mr. Aldridge, at this time I will omit; but when Mr. Aldridge harde what I sayede, he tould me that yf I did make it perfitt he would give me, of his owne purss, 15li., so aboute my worke I wente. (58)
\end{quote}
the two Englishmen soon find themselves competing for the attention and the affection of the Ottoman Sultan. Providing minute details of this competition, Dallam’s diary provides a full account of the triangular model I propose.

Dallam’s diary, which was published 300 years after it was written, reflects the anxieties of an Englishman in the face of Ottoman Muslims. Together with the above-mentioned pursuit of the Sultan’s attention and affection, which I would like to call Dallam’s “desire to be desired,” we can find repeated references in Dallam’s journal to his apprehension of being held captive by the Ottoman Sultan. In other words, his diary reveals Dallam’s conflicting feelings in the face of the Muslim Other—while he presumably enjoys the special treatment he receives in the Ottoman court, he cannot help but be possessed by the fear of falling captive to Turks, a threat that was not unfamiliar to early modern Englishmen. Yet, Dallam’s conflict does not end there. Further analysis of his implied fear of captivity reveals that rather than feel genuinely threatened, Dallam in fact engages in a ‘fantasy of captivity,’ which paradoxically gives him a boost of self-confidence and the aspiration to climb the social ladder back in England. By attending to Dallam’s diary we can see how fantasy of captivity enables a free Englishman to reevaluate his identity and to reconfigure his Englishness.

---

23 Here I should take a moment and acknowledge that I do not intend to dismiss the notion that the English traveler felt a degree of anxiety in his encounters with the Muslim Other, which resulted in a variation of Christian self-Muslim Other binary. While I believe that relying solely on a binary model would only result in a single story of Orientalism and/or colonialism, I do not argue that the English traveler was never engaged in a self-other binary when he encountered the Muslims of the Ottoman Empire or North Africa. As Daniel Vitkus aptly puts, “binary oppositions have an important rudimentary function in the dialectical process” and it is important to identify these binaries for an accurate interpretation “in any basic cultural analysis” (2). What I suggest here is a closer attention to this self-other binary’s auxiliary role in the reconfiguration of an English identity that was defined in relation to fellow Englishmen with a new sense of class-consciousness in highly stratified English social structure.
From the moment Dallam sets foot on the Ottoman soil, he is surrounded by affectionate Turks and Jews who shower him not just with attention but also with hugs and kisses. When the ship that is bringing Dallam to Istanbul, named the Hector, anchors by Rhodes to receive a supply of victuals, more than 500 Turks and Jews come aboard enthused to observe “[the] pride of Queen Elizabeth’s fleet” (MacLean 3). During the days the Hector remains anchored, it receives many curious visitors including the deputy of the governor. To entertain this enthusiastic crowd, Dallam plays the virginals he has brought with him for a fascinated audience. Amazed and entertained, some of the men among his audience hug and kiss Dallam and “wyshe that [he] would dwell with them” (35). This is the first of many instances when Dallam receives compelling requests for him to spend the rest of his life among Turks. From the laymen who are mesmerized by the sound of his virginals to the Ottoman Sultan who is fascinated by his organ, the Turks Dallam encounters throughout his travels desire him for one reason: his talent. His talent as a musician and organ maker almost makes him a celebrity in this foreign land among the people who are complete strangers to him. In England, his talent was not as fascinating as it is in Turkey; although he was chosen by the Queen to deliver an organ to the Turkish Sultan as a special gift, he was still one of the many organ makers in England even if the most talented one. Much like the sailors in the opening scene of Shakespeare’s The Tempest, Dallam comes to the realization outside the national borders of his country that his skill is more valuable than he is given credit for in England. In that sense, he does

24 Here I use the word “Turk” to describe the Muslims Dallam encountered in the Ottoman soil only to follow his lead and avoid wordiness. For early modern Englishmen, “Turk” was the generic word that was used to describe Muslims of the Ottoman Empire regardless of their ethnic background. While I acknowledge that this is a problematic usage ignoring the diversity within the Ottoman Empire, I choose to follow each author’s lead while discussing his narrative.
not pit himself against the Muslims he encounters and engage in a binary construction of English identity but begins perceiving his distinctive qualities as an English craftsman whose skill is highlighted once he is in a strange setting among non-English people.

To his surprise, Dallam is treated like a celebrity in Istanbul. To Lello’s dismay, Dallam instantaneously becomes a figure of great attention even though his success is crucial for the fate of the aspiring ambassador’s career. He is admitted to the Sultan’s palace sans the necessary ceremonies the ambassadors have to undergo; he finds himself in a proximity to the Sultan that is unimaginable to Lello; and he enjoys the Sultan’s company for two hours while Lello has to wait outside the palace for admittance. Dallam notes his unusual yet exciting experience in the seraglio without skipping a single detail since he is completely aware of the exceptionality of this experience having received a lecture from Lello on what to expect during his presentation of the clockwork organ to the Sultan. The day before the gifting ceremony, Lello invites Dallam to his chamber and gives a “friendly” speech to warn him, among other things, against having high expectations with regard to receiving a reward from the Sultan for his performance. In a monologue that will prove completely inaccurate the next day, Lello informs Dallam that “[i]t was never knowne that upon the receaving of any presente he gave any rewarde unto any Christian, and tharfore yow muste louke for nothinge at his handes” (65). Lello, not even imagining that the Sultan would officially admit an organ maker to his presence, then describes the ceremony he himself will go through to present the letters of the Queen to the Sultan:

  We cale it kisinge of the Grand Sinyor's hande; bute when I com to his gates I shalbe taken of my horse and seartcht, and lede betwyxte tow men holdinge my
handes downe close to my sides, and so lede into the presence of the Grand Sinyor, and I muste kiss his kne or his hanginge sleve. Havininge deliverede my letteres unto the Coppagawe, I shalbe presently ledd awaye, goinge backwardes as longe as I can se him, and in payne of my heade I muste not turne my backe upon him, and therefore yow muste not louke to have a sighte of him. (65)

MacLean attributes the condescending tone of Lello’s speech essentially to his resentment of the fact that his future depends on a middle-class craftsman’s success. This resentment inevitably results in a rivalry between the two Englishmen that MacLean characterizes as “personal” (39). While Lello’s experience might be more personal as an English gentleman whose upper-class position is more or less static, I believe Dallam experiences something more complex than a personal rivalry as a middle-class Englishman who has just opened his eyes to the prospect of social mobility thanks to his experience in the Ottoman court.

Lello’s repetitive warnings to Dallam against any attempt to see the Sultan are noteworthy given Dallam’s actual experience in the Ottoman court the next day. While Lello cannot even think of turning his back to the Sultan, Dallam finds himself not just playing the organ with his back turned but in such proximity to the Sultan that he “touche[s] his Kne with [his] britchis, which no man, in paine of deathe, myghte dow, savinge only the Coppagaw” (70).25 Fascinated by the instrument and Dallam’s performance, the Sultan gives Dallam forty-five pieces of gold as a sign of his appreciation of his talent. In addition to giving the lie to Lello’s earlier advice on not to expect any reward from the Sultan, this reward perpetuates the competition between the

---

25 Coppagew (Kapici in Turkish) was the title given to the gatekeeper in the Ottoman palace.
two Englishmen as, according to MacLean, “there was considerable rivalry among Englishmen over gifts received from the Ottomans” (8). This rivalry certainly suggests Englishmen’s sense of inferiority vis-à-vis the Ottomans, yet the rivalry between Dallam and Lello proves extremely intricate upon further investigation. According to MacLean, Dallam’s detailed account of how Lello’s stern advice proves completely inaccurate works to illustrate Dallam’s extreme pride in “his own performance[s]...victory for the craftsman over his ‘lord’” as well as Lello’s resentment of “not only Dallam’s skilled confidence, but also the fact of his own reliance on the craftsman’s success” (38-39). In other words, the two Englishmen find out that English class dynamics do not hold in the Ottoman court as strongly as they do in England. For Lello, this might have resulted in resentment, but for Dallam, in a renewed sense of self-esteem that depends on his skill not his social standing.

Dallam’s performance for the Sultan was spectacular as proven by the generous gift he received, yet Dallam notes in his journal the hesitation and apprehension he has experienced during the ceremony. At one point, Sultan sits so close to him that Dallam believes “he had bene drawinge his sorde to cut of [his] heade” (71). Contrary to Dallam’s expectations that were shaped by Lello’s “friendly” speech the previous day, the Sultan shows great hospitality to Dallam and Dallam notes all the details of his hospitable reception at the Ottoman court. In these details, we can see the traces of the rivalry between the ambassador and Dallam. Dallam’s careful depiction of his highly personal encounter with the Sultan certainly implies a comparison with Lello’s description of his own reception at the palace, which only involves kissing the knee or the sleeve of the Sultan and presenting the Queen’s letters only to leave backwards in order
not to offend and infuriate the Sultan with any sign of disrespect. Dallam craftily juxtaposes his own experience in the Ottoman court with that of the ambassador in a manner that highlights how his talent has earned him a great privilege that no Englishman can think of.

In the land of the Muslim Other, Dallam achieves a position he cannot even imagine attaining in England. The treatment he receives from the Ottoman Sultan symbolically places him at a higher rank than the ambassador. This favorable treatment essentially encourages Dallam to engage in a tri-partite identity formation in which he contrasts his position in the eye of the Sultan with that of Lello, who was stood up at the gate of the court for two hours before being called in. Dallam reports that, “[b]eing gotten oute of the surralia, I made all the spede I could to that gate where the imbassador wente in, for he and all his Company stode all these tow houres expecktinge the Grand Sinyors cominge to another place whear he should deliver his imbassege and Letteres” (71). Note how Dallam makes “all the spede [he] could” to reach the ambassador and his company before they are admitted to the Sultan’s presence after waiting “all these tow houres.” Given that the ambassador is the official representative of the Queen of England, Dallam is undoubtedly proud of his fascinating performance that puts him above all the ranks that exist back home, including the Queen herself. Coming to the realization that his middle-class skill matters more than the Queen’s letters inevitably results in a new sense of class-consciousness for Dallam. Paradoxically, though, the Sultan’s special treatment also culminates in a “fantasy of captivity” characterized by the amalgamation of fear and admiration in the face of the Ottoman allure.
After relating his exceptional encounter with the Sultan during the gifting ceremony, Dallam turns to the details of the conversation he had with the ambassador later the same day. Lello’s reaction to Dallam’s intimate contact with the Sultan deserves close attention. Dallam notes that the ambassador, upon hearing of Dallam’s personal encounter with the Sultan, “sat still a good whyle, and said nothinge untill one asked him what he did stodie” (72). Dallam underlines this seemingly minor detail, implying that the ambassador had a hard time accepting the fact that the Sultan preferred the company of an organ maker to that of the official representative of the Queen of England. We learn later that the ambassador had his own explanation as to why he looked thoughtful for a while. It turns out that “he never had any thoughte of [Dallam’s] cominge into the Grand Sinyors presence” and “if he had but mistrusted it never so litle, he would have bestowed 30 or 40l. in apparell for [him]” (72-73). Lello’s reflection here is significant as it reveals how deep-rooted notions of English social hierarchy prove vulnerable in the Ottoman court. In a way, Lello’s reflection suggests that the powerful Ottoman figure is not only a military or diplomatic peril but also a threat to the established social norms of the English society. Keith Wrightson outlines the established norms that define the limits between social classes in early modern England as follows:

Hierarchical distinctions of status were reflected in styles of address. Rank and power were recognized in dress, in the conventions of comportment which governed face-to-face contacts between superiors and inferiors, in the order in which seats were taken in church, in the arrangement of places at table and in the ordering of public processions. (25)
The Ottoman Sultan’s reception and treatment of Dallam turn the English social hierarchy upside down, which, to Lello, means that everything that defines his sense of Englishness as a gentleman becomes invalid in the Ottoman court. In the topsy-turvy world of the Ottoman court, a middle-class Englishman without appropriate clothing is received before the ambassador. For Dallam, however, this treatment does not translate into a similar disappointment. If there is one similarity between the experiences of the two Englishmen, it is that they are forced to reconsider the notions of what make them English. Unlike Lello, Dallam profits in this topsy-turvy world; in his newfound privileged position he ceases to be a middle-class Englishmen whose opinions are of no significance anymore. Arguably, he feels more English as a member of his nation whose talent contributes to the establishment of favorable diplomatic relations with the Ottoman Empire. In short, while one man’s sense of Englishness is challenged, the other’s is heightened in the Ottoman court. Paradigmatically, Dallam’s new English identity is not defined against the Muslim other but is rather catalyzed by the Ottoman Sultan’s appreciation of Dallam’s talent and shaped in contrast to Lello’s sense of Englishness.

As we can infer from the self-reflections documented in his journal, Dallam enjoys the Sultan’s attention particularly because he is aware that this attention is the key to achieving social mobility when he returns to England. On the other hand, though, he is acutely aware of the fact that the Sultan’s desire carries with itself a substantial danger—the danger of captivity. For Dallam, this danger manifests itself in two different forms: the threat of being forced to stay in Istanbul for the rest of his life and more significantly the threat of “desiring” to stay in Istanbul for the rest of his life. Dallam never explicitly mentions the slightest desire to spend the remaining days of his life serving the Ottoman
Sultan but the mesmerizing attention he has received from the Sultan undoubtedly makes him consider the possibility. First, I would like to turn to the notion of captivity with which Dallam is so intensely occupied. The most obvious—and the only noted—reason of Dallam’s obsession with the notion of captivity is the Sultan’s persistent propositions that he stay in Istanbul. These propositions include an offer to marry him with “ether tow of his Concubines or els tow virgins of the beste [he] Could Chuse [him] selfe, in Cittie or contrie” and a promise to provide him “all the contentt that [he] could desier” (73). Creating an effect that utterly contradicts the intention of the Sultan—which is to make Dallam feel comfortable and content—this proposal disturbs Dallam and makes him feel like a captive during the time he spends in Istanbul. There certainly was not any way that Dallam would fall captive in the Ottoman Empire in the sense that hundreds of Englishmen were held captive in North Africa at the time; however, there were many reasons for him to feel he might. Captivity did not just mean being enslaved by North African pirates; it had a different meaning for early modern Englishmen who experienced Ottoman grandiosity and who felt compelled to question their social position back in England. We can even argue that to Dallam, returning to England probably looked like, at least for a moment, a voluntary imprisonment on that small island when compared to the life that was promised to him in the Ottoman court unless he managed to take advantage of his experience and secure himself a place among the gentry. His narrative, for this reason, can be read as the reflections of an Englishman who is extremely self-conscious about his own social status back at home.

To better understand Dallam’s dilemma as a free Englishman who resists captivation by the Ottoman allure, we should turn to his depiction of English “renegades”
(or Muslim converts) he encountered throughout his travels. One of these renegades is Dallam’s interpreter who accompanied him during the initial parts of his return trip to England. In his analysis of Dallam’s portrayal of his interpreter, MacLean attends to Dallam’s habit of only naming Englishmen in his journal and leaving unnamed the individuals whose authority he does not respect. MacLean underlines that Dallam does not leave his interpreter in Istanbul unnamed but feels so much affinity with him that he names him two times in his narrative (11). Never mentioning his Turkish name, Dallam refers to this interpreter as “our Turke” several times in his diary. The first time we learn the English name of this renegade is when he prevents an attack that four Turkish bandits were planning against Dallam and his fellow travelers. After describing how their interpreter saved their lives, Dallam dutifully mentions his name and origins: “This man…was an Inglishe man, borne in Chorlaye in Lancashier; his name Finche. He was also in religion a perfit Turke, but he was our trustie frende” (84). Dallam’s description of Finche proves more significant when juxtaposed with his earlier account of renegades in Algiers:

Thar be a greate number of Turks that be but Renied [renegade] cristians [sic] of all nations.²⁶ Som, but moste are Spanyardes, Italians, and other Ilands adjoyninge, who, when they be taken, ar compelled so to doo, or els to live in moche more slaverie and myserie. But, in prosis of time, these Renied cristians do become most berberus and villanus, taking pleasur in all sinfull actions ; but that which is worste of all they take moste delite in, and that is, Theye proule aboute

Here Dallam plainly echoes the common perception among early modern Englishmen of renegades that embodies the Anglo-Christian anxiety over the prospect of conversion to Islam. Repeatedly mentioned in many travel and captivity narratives, the “villainous and cruel renegade” was a familiar figure for early modern readers. What makes this description idiosyncratic is its author’s completely different perspective on another renegade in the upcoming pages. Dallam does not fail to mention in this description that these Christians were compelled to convert to Islam as they would end up in miserable slavery otherwise. Although he is naturally antagonistic towards renegades, who not only convert to Islam but also become pirates and “betraye” Christians, he also wants to grant them justice by mentioning the forceful conversion they had to go through. Therefore, we know that Dallam believes his interpreter has only turned Turk to avoid misery in slavery. Unlike the renegades in Algiers, though, Dallam’s interpreter did not choose to turn pirate on Christians but assumed a position in which he could help fellow Englishmen. In fact, he proves that he is true to his roots by saving Dallam and his fellow travelers and earns the titles of “our Turke” and ‘trustie frende.” Dallam’s account of his interpreter, therefore, serves as a symbolic gesture of very high sentimental value. By writing his English name twice, Dallam recompenses his interpreter for saving his life. Although he was “in religon a perfit Turke … he was [their] trustie frende” (84) since “his righte name was Finche, borne at Chorlaye in Longcashier” (89, emphasis added). Despite his conversion, Finch deserves to be remembered as an Englishman from
Lancashire, not as an unnamed renegade like Dallam’s other interpreter in the Ottoman palace, who left him behind unassisted while they were chased by the attendants of the Sultan “with their semetaries drawne” (79).  

But why does Dallam care so much about Finch that he writes his name and place of birth two times in his diary? Is it because he merely “liked him well enough to name him not once but twice” as MacLean argues? MacLean’s reading of the significance of naming for Dallam is compelling, but I would like to argue that Finch means more to Dallam than an amicable and loyal fellow Englishman from Lancashire does. With this brief yet revealing depiction of Finch, Dallam complicates our reading of the descriptions of renegades in early modern travel and captivity narratives as well as the meaning of English national identity in the face of captivity and conversion. Although Dallam does not fail to repeat the hearsay in his description of renegades in Algiers, in his portrayal of Finch he reveals that he has a more nuanced understanding of conversion than one that leads to labeling a renegade as villainous, barbarous, and more importantly, un-English. As evidenced by his description of Finch, Dallam believes that one can still be an Englishman despite being a “perfit Turke.” In that sense, Dallam’s perception of Finch suggests that he does not necessarily equate Englishness with Christianity and sees no problem in describing an English renegade as “our Turke,” suggesting a vision for a more  

---

27 A similar analysis of Dallam’s renegade interpreter is offered by Karen Ordahl Kupperman, who believes that Finch’s “friendship for Dallam indicates that he retained a sense of common English heritage despite having cast his lot with the Ottoman Muslims.” Finch’s case demonstrates, according to Kupperman, that “[n]ationality was most likely not a category by which such people would have described themselves” (Kupperman *The Jamestown* 71-72). In that sense, Dallam’s gesture presumably does not mean much to Finch, who, despite showing loyalty to his roots, might not necessarily feel English in the same way as Dallam. This discrepancy between Finch and Dallam’s senses of “Englishness” becomes more significant in my discussion of Barbary captives and the social alienation they experience after returning to England.
inclusive nation. Indeed, an inclusive model would not just benefit Finch but Dallam himself, who certainly comes to question his position within the English nation after his encounters with Ottoman Muslims.

The pirates in Algiers might have lost their Christian identities, but Finch unquestionably did not. Why does Finch require attention despite being mentioned briefly in Dallam’s diary? I would like to argue that Dallam projects himself onto Finch, either consciously or unconsciously. It is a happy coincidence that Finch is not just a random fellow Englishman but also from Lancashire, Dallam’s home county. Having faced requests from various individuals, ranging from laymen to the Ottoman Sultan, to stay in Istanbul for the rest of his life, Dallam has learned during his travels what one refuses when he refuses to turn Turk. Although he was just a visitor to the Ottoman court, he often times felt like a captive as a result of the compelling requests of Turks to stay in Istanbul and even the experience of a parody-abduction by the adgemoglangs in the seraglio.28 While never a real captive, the allure of the opportunities he was presented made him feel like one. He had to resist being a captive to the allure of conversion, of giving up his Englishness, yet this resistance required him to create a new kind of English identity that would hold out in the face of the Ottoman allure and this was only possible through a fantasy of class mobility in England.

28 Adgemoglangs were Christian-born Ottoman subjects, who were taken from their families by the Ottoman government and raised under Islamic education. These young men were then given various positions within the Ottoman army. This Ottoman practice of taking Christian-born boys and raising them as Muslims to be employed in various state positions was called the Devshirme System. For a more detailed explanation of this Ottoman practice, see Alexander Mikaberidze’s Conflict and Conquest in the Islamic World: A Historical Encyclopedia, Volume 1 (2011), p. 273.
Dallam experiences the Ottoman allure so strongly that it almost makes him paranoid; he comes to believe that even Lello is involved in a conspiracy against him. On the day Dallam is preparing to leave Istanbul for England on the same ship he arrived on, the Sultan sends an order that “yf the workman that sett up the presente in the surralia would not be perswaded to stay be hind the shipe, the ship muste staye untill he had removed the presente unto another place” (76). Considering the financial consequences in the case of the ship’s delayed departure, Lello demands that Dallam stay in Istanbul to finish his work and let the ship leave without him. Dallam’s hysterical reaction to the ambassador’s demand is noteworthy as it reveals how much he desires to return to England at that very moment: “[I]n my furie I tould my lorde that that was now com to pass which I ever feared, and that was that he in the end would betray me, and turne me over into the Turkes hands, whear I should Live a slavish Life, and never companie againe with Christians, with many other suche-like words” (76). Dallam’s panic in the face of elongating his visit by only a few weeks should not go without notice and should be read in light of information we obtain from the earlier pages of his diary.

Earlier, Dallam makes note of a three-day tour of the seraglio that was given “to no other end but to show [him] the Grand Sinyors privie Chamberes, his gould and silver, his chairs of estate” (74). Undoubtedly, the purpose of this tour was to show Dallam what he was about to miss by refusing to serve the Sultan and choosing instead to return to England. He had already been offered two concubines of his choice from the Sultan’s harem and this tour was meant to prove that this offer was not specious as it gave him a chance to see the Sultan’s concubines with his own eyes—an opportunity no Englishman
could have had before, and after, Dallam.\textsuperscript{29} Having found the opportunity to gaze at the Sultan’s concubines with the knowledge that two of them were promised to him, Dallam admits that he had trouble removing his eyes from them: “I stood so longe loukinge upon them that he which had showed me all this kindnes began to be verrie angrie with me. He made a wrye mouthe, and stamped with his foute to make me give over looking; the which I was verrie lothe to dow, for that sighte did please me wondrous well” (75). More significantly, Dallam impersonates the Ottoman Sultan during his tour as he is given the permission to “sitt downe in one of [his chairs of estate], and than to draw that sord out of the sheathe with the which the Grand Sinyor doth croune his kinge” (74). One wonders what crossed Dallam’s mind in that moment, knowing that his ship was to leave Istanbul for England the very next day. Although this tour did not persuade Dallam to stay, it certainly made Dallam’s dilemma more acute by reminding him of the various temptations surrounding him in the form of concubines, fine food, and the opportunity to be in the Sultan’s close circle.

Dallam’s moment of hysteria and accusation comes right after the description of his unforgettable experience in the Ottoman harem. Read side by side, these two scenes suggest how Dallam could only find salvation in the prospect of upward mobility back in England as a means to resist the Turkish allure presented to him in the form of innumerable opportunities in the Ottoman court. Thanks to his experience in the Ottoman court.

\textsuperscript{29} When contrasting early modern English attitudes towards Native Americans and Muslims, Nabil Matar underlines that Englishmen did not perceive these two non-English “others” as equals. Despite their unfavorable depictions in early modern English texts, Muslims were not perceived as “colonial targets.” There was not, for instance, “a painting of an Englishman gazing at a feminine, possessible, naked Islam, as in Jan van der Straet’s depiction of Amerigo Vespucci gazing at ‘America’” (Matar \textit{Turks} 12). In that sense, we can imagine how privileged Dallam must have felt when given an opportunity no Englishmen had ever been given.
capital, Dallam finds himself in a perfect position to understand his renegade interpreter Finch and sees in him the future that awaits him if he fails to defy the Turkish allure. The allure of Islam was substantial, as he personally experienced it, and the English traveler/captive constantly needed to be reminded of his real roots to defy it. But what if his real roots could not offer him the satisfaction that a future in the Ottoman court could grant? He comes to understand how Finch feels like, how hard it must have been for Finch to refuse this allure. In England, there was uncertainty for Englishmen like Finch, who had to continue their lives under the stigma of captivity. Dallam might have managed to profit from his success after his return—after all his was only a fantasy and never a real captivity—but for many like Finch, as I will discuss later, erasing their history of Barbary captivity was not a possibility. For renegades like Finch, returning to England meant leaving a comfortable life behind and facing many accusations as well as adversities in their native country. Therefore, Finch was more than just a renegade interpreter to Dallam and deserved to be remembered as an Englishman “borne at Chorlaye in Longcashier.” If the renegade was forced to leave his natal identity behind, Dallam had enough empathy to forge one for him as well while he was fashioning one for himself to use Stephen Greenblatt’s terminology.

As evidenced by his paranoid and hysterical reaction to Lello’s demand from him to stay behind, Dallam felt uneasy with the idea of spending more time in the Ottoman

---

30 In the second half of this chapter, I turn to two Englishmen—Joseph Pitts and Thomas Pellow—who could not find contentment back in England after they were blemished by the stigma of captivity. Their stories show a stark contrast to that of Finch, who manages to find prosperity by staying in the Ottoman Empire instead of returning to England.

31 In his seminal work, Renaissance Self-Fashioning, Greenblatt argues that early modern Englishmen were actively involved in a process of identity (re)construction. This process, he underlines, took place in the face of “something perceived as alien, strange, or hostile” (Greenblatt 9).
court than he had planned. We should turn to Dallam’s very first impression of the seraglio to better understand this apprehension. Dallam gives a description of the place where he will set his organ up earlier in his diary. This is the first time Dallam has set foot in the seraglio and thus is his first depiction of a part of it besides the gardens:

Cominge into the house whear I was appoynted to sett up the presente or instramente; it semed to be rether a churche than a dwellinge house; to say the truthe, it was no dwellinge house, but a house of pleasur, and lyke wyse a house of slaughter; for in that house was bulte one little house, verrie curius bothe within and witheout; for carvinge, gildinge, good Collors and vernishe, I have not sene the lyke. In this little house, that emperor that rained when I was thare, had nyntene brotheres put to deathe in it, and it was bulte for no other use but for the stranglinge of everie emperors [sic] bretherin. (62-63)

It is noteworthy that Dallam describes the place both as a house of pleasure and a house of slaughter reminding himself that all the pleasure he might indulge in here would come with dire consequences. Dallam immediately finds his identity in jeopardy as the temptations around him are countless. He observes the gardens that are the best kept in the world, he dines in the seraglio for a month, a privilege “no Christian ever did…that wente awaye a Christian,” and more importantly he faces “many perswations to have [him] staye with the Grand Sinyor, and sarve him” (64). All this attention compels Dallam to remind himself that in the Ottoman seraglio pleasure comes with risks. On top of all the temptations, Dallam is informed by his Ottoman companions, in the form of a tacit threat, that they had no memory of a Christian who has dined in the seraglio for such a long time as Dallam did and “wente awaye a Christian.” Dallam is the only Christian
who has dined in the seraglio and left it a Christian, but to remain so, he will have to resist all the temptations the Ottoman court enclosed.

The temptations the Ottoman court offered Dallam were grand as implied by his confession after his voyeuristic experience in the seraglio where he had hard time keeping his eyes off of the concubines playing ball in the harem since “that sighte did please [him] wondrous well” (75). Despite the sensual and materialistic promises of the court, Dallam seems to have struggled the most with his desire to be desired by the Muslim Other, especially by the Sultan. In his diary, Dallam alludes eight times to the compelling requests he received from Turkish men to stay and spend the rest of his life with them. The first one of these requests is the one I have mentioned earlier when no less than 500 Turks and Jews come aboard the Hector in Rhodes and hear Dallam playing his virginals. Seven of these requests are made by the adgemoglans in the Ottoman palace reflecting not just their own affection for Dallam but also the Sultan’s desire to keep him in the seraglio. He often receives hugs and kisses from Turkish men in demonstration of this affection. His talent proves so mesmerizing that the notoriously irritable Sultan is not even bothered when Dallam’s breeches touch his knee while playing the organ.

Despite his initial attempts to portray the Sultan as a tyrannical ruler who is responsible for the greatest fratricide in Ottoman history, Dallam later cannot hide his satisfaction upon receiving respect and affection from him. He even regrets missing the opportunity of the Sultan’s company on a Sunday when he does not go to the seraglio on the Christian Sabbath. Dallam admits that not going to the seraglio to work on his organ “did louse me somthinge, for that daye the Grand Sinyor had appointed to com and sitt by me to se how I put my worke together.” When informed that Dallam did not come to
work that day, the Sultan “thoughte that I had kepe my selfe awaye of purpose, and therefore he would not com any more” (80). Dallam’s observation of Sabbath, which curiously is forced upon him by the ambassador, “costs” him the company of the Sultan, who respects him so much that he decides to give Dallam space believing that he avoids him on purpose. The tyrannical Sultan, who could kill his nineteen brothers without blinking an eye, transforms himself into a sensitive gentleman out of respect for an English organ maker. Just as Dallam’s talent earns him respect in the seraglio, the Sultan’s affection and admiration for Dallam earn him a final appearance in Dallam’s diary as a sensitive and respectful monarch—quite a contrast to his initial depiction as a fratricide only twenty pages earlier.

Clearly, Dallam’s experience in the Ottoman court as a respected and desired Englishman was quite different from that of the enslaved Englishmen in North Africa—his fantasized captivity did not entail physical abuse—but nonetheless it yielded a careful reevaluation and reconfiguration of his English identity which, I argue, resulted in an aspiration for social mobility. Fortunately for Dallam, in his quest for an identity to hold on to in the face of the allure of the Ottoman, he was able to receive the much-needed assistance of a group of English gentlemen whose acquaintance ensured Dallam upward mobility in English class structure. After being compelled by the Sultan to stay in Istanbul for a few more weeks to carry the organ to another place, Dallam finishes his job in the seraglio and is free to leave for England. His departure being delayed for a month, he receives the news on the 12th of November that “thar was good Company reddie to com for Inglande, suche as in 2 or 3 years I could not have had the lik, if I had stayed behinde them” (81). Dallam finds even better company thanks to this delay than he would
have found had he left on Hector a month ago. As we learn later, Thomas Glover, who later became the successor to Henry Lello as the English ambassador to Istanbul, was among these potential fellow travelers increasing Dallam’s desire to leave Istanbul with this particular group. Dallam’s emphasis on the quality of the company reveals his aspiration towards assuming a new English identity by climbing the social ladder. Having dined in the seraglio for the duration of a month and received persistent appeals from the Sultan to settle in the Ottoman court, Dallam starts perceiving himself as entitled to upward mobility. Equipped with a heightened self-esteem, he could not stay behind this group, which, in addition to Glover, included other diplomats and gentlemen. In mentioning this good company, Dallam includes another small yet significant detail, that “they weare all desierus to have [his] company” (81) as well. Dallam’s desire to be desired appears here again, and this time the desire is directed towards fellow Englishmen. As suggested by his account, Dallam regards himself qualified enough to be an object of desire among the members of English aristocracy thanks to his experience as a highly respected musician in the Ottoman court. In that sense, the Ottoman Sultan’s affection turns out to be the determiner of Dallam’s value. Ironically, only through fantasizing captivity, a notion that in essence commodifies human beings by assigning them an economic value, could Dallam reconfigure his English identity.

I would like to briefly return to the section of Dallam’s journal in which he records the news of Glover and his company’s departure plans. In this short section Dallam notes that if he stays behind this group it will be impossible for him to find a

---

32 The other two Englishmen were Paul Pindar, “who would be knighted in 1622 and follow Glover as ambassador,” as well as Humphrey Conisby, “gentleman-treasurer to Queen Elizabeth” (MacLean 11).
similarly good company to travel with in the next two to three years. Here, Dallam implies that he requires an upper-class company to depart from Istanbul. In other words, if he is to turn down the opportunity to be a member of the Ottoman elite, it has to be done in order to gain admittance to the English elite. He finds this requirement so imperative that despite the high fever he is suffering from at the time he receives the news of this group’s planned departure, he refuses Lello’s suggestion that he should wait until he recovers. Dallam’s response to Lello is noteworthy: “I desiered my lord to give me leve, for I had rether die by the way in doinge my good will to goo hom than staye to die thare, wheare I was perswaded I could not live if I did staye behind them” (81). On the surface, Dallam underlines here that dying on the way to home is much preferable to staying in Istanbul, but in what follows he reveals how important it is to him to travel with this company of gentlemen. He believes that he cannot live if he does not leave Istanbul with this clique. Not until he received the news of this elite group’s travel plans was Dallam actively making plans to leave Istanbul. In other words, had he not received this news he would have stayed in Istanbul until after he recovered his health. In that sense, Dallam’s ostensibly chauvinistic gesture of crying out his preference to die on the way to England over staying in Istanbul proves to be more self-centered than patriotic. If anything, this gesture illustrates Dallam’s awareness of the necessity to find himself a spot in this clique. Weighing the opportunities he could attain if he arrives England as a friend of these diplomats and gentlemen, Dallam realizes that missing this opportunity, even for health reasons, would prove imprudent. As Dallam admits, staying behind would mean losing his life—but not in the literal sense. By not taking advantage of this once-in-a-lifetime chance, Dallam would risk going back to England as an ordinary organ maker
and lose all the privileges the Ottoman court has offered him. In other words, he would lose the new social position he has found in the Ottoman court if he did not act pragmatically and profit from the chance of befriending these men of the English gentry.

Dallam’s quest for a reconfigured English identity that will hold out against the threat of the Ottoman allure demonstrates how captivity—fantasized or genuine—prompted early modern Englishmen to reevaluate their identities defined by their positions within their country’s social system. Thanks to Dallam’s reflections, we can observe how the English subject might not necessarily be looking to perpetuate his Anglo-Christian identity through a strict binary opposition with the Muslim other but rather seeking an opportunity to maneuver within his nation’s class system. The fantasy of captivity enables Dallam to construct an upwardly mobile subject position and in similar fashion it enables William Biddulph, a Protestant clergyman commissioned as a chaplain to Aleppo, to reevaluate his position and identity as a member of the English clergy as I discuss below. When we turn to “real” Barbary captives, we observe that their experience of captivity also prompts them to question what it means to be a free Englishman and thereby places them in the center of a debate over who is included in the English nation. In all the cases I analyze in this chapter, fantasized or real captivity results in a reconfigured Englishness that often comes with class-consciousness rather than perpetuate a fixed sense of national belonging.

I now turn to William Biddulph, the chaplain to the English embassy in Aleppo in the beginning of the seventeenth century, to discuss how his encounters with the non-English, particularly the Muslim, other contributed to the English churchman’s
increasingly critical perception of his national belonging. My analysis of Biddulph’s letters demonstrates that Biddulph, like many other English travelers and captives, ostensibly asserts a strong Anglo-Christian identity in the face of non-English subjects, yet he simultaneously questions his sense of national belonging after spending a long time outside England among various non-English others. In his comparison of Biddulph and Dallam as two contemporary Englishmen, MacLean accentuates that “their shared national origin clearly did not prepare them to view the world in the same way…[but] provided them with a richly mixed and varied common culture, not a uniform set of opinions” (112). While Dallam’s and Biddulph’s subjective responses to the non-English they encountered throughout their travels showed significant differences shaped by the degree of the prejudice they possessed, they nonetheless shared a similar experience—one in which living outside England triggered an examination of their belonging within the English nation. Dallam’s diary reflects the distraught sentiments of a middle-class Englishman who returns from the Ottoman Empire with a newfound class-consciousness and Biddulph’s narrative is reflective of the anxiety of the English clergy—an anxiety that is further amplified when Biddulph finds his Anglo-Protestant identity tested not only against non-English and non-Protestant others but also fellow Englishmen. MacLean underlines that Biddulph’s readers would find in his letters “a carefully plotted sense of the increasing dangers from exposure to false beliefs and wicked practices the further from England one travelled” (53). Ironically, though, Biddulph cannot escape from the danger he so adamantly warns his readers against and occasionally finds himself favoring non-English practices.

33 For background information on Biddulph, his travels, and the historical context of events, see Gerald MacLean’s The Rise of the Oriental Travel (2004), Part II, pp. 51-114.
Biddulph was commissioned by the Church of England as a chaplain to the English expatriates in Aleppo and spent eight years in the Levant between 1600 and 1608. During his tenure as a chaplain, he took an active role in provoking the animosity between Henry Lello, the English ambassador to Istanbul who owed his career to Dallam’s success in the Ottoman court, and his successor Thomas Glover, whom Dallam made sure to befriend before returning to England. Meddling with the personal affairs of these two diplomats certainly did not earn Biddulph a favorable reputation among the English living in the Ottoman Empire. However, the possibility of English expatriates’ extending him a warm greeting was already slim if the reception of his predecessors was any indicator. According to MacLean, the chaplains appointed to the Ottoman Empire “were quickly making themselves unpopular with the community of expatriates, who had grown accustomed to behaving without interference from godly ministers” (67). English expatriates’ discontent with the prospect of being policed by the Church of England reveals the variety of attitudes among the English with regard to losing their English values outside the English Isles. To illustrate the discrepancy in attitudes among the English we need not turn to anyone else but Biddulph as his narrative contrasts anxiety of a self-righteous Anglo-Protestant clergy facing the threat of acculturation with the willingness of English expatriates to take a break from their Englishness. Throughout his narrative, Biddulph relentlessly creates an image of the Muslim Other as heathenish, ignorant, and barbarous all of which would become staple characteristics of the Muslim Other in the Orientalist discourse of the subsequent century. Yet, for Biddulph his account serves more as a strategic juxtaposition of his reception as a clergyman by these “ignorant” people with his treatment by Protestant Christians in and out of England than
asserting an English identity that is defined against the Muslim Other. If Dallam is using his visit to the Ottoman Empire as an opportunity to climb the social ladder, Biddulph’s experience with the Muslim Other culminates in him questioning the belonging of clergy in the nation.

In his narrative published one year after his return to England, Biddulph’s interests chiefly lie in preaching his English readership the necessity of submitting to power—be it political, patriarchal, or most importantly religious power. The preface to *The Travels Of Certayne Englishmen* (1609) is a clear articulation of Biddulph’s agenda and it is therefore not surprising that the very first sentence of the book reads, “Good Reader read the Preface, or else reade nothing.” The preface, which is claimed to have been written by a Theophilus Lavender, requires attention for a couple of reasons. First of all, Biddulph strives to establish his own authority by associating himself with the great figures of history that are known to have traveled to distant corners of the world to expand their knowledge such as “Pythagoras [who] travelled into Egypt to heare the Memphiticall Poets,” Plato, who “went into Italy to Architas of Tarentum, that he might learne somewhat of that Philosopher,” and Apollonius, who “passed and journeied to the furthest parts of India to the Philosophers there.” All these great men, Lavender reminds us, “travelled to get wisdome and learning.” After readers are reminded that many great philosophers traveled to faraway countries, which unsurprisingly include the ones Biddulph has also visited, they find out that the letters contained in the book were

---

34 According to MacLean, Biddulph found it necessary to assume the persona of Theophilus Lavender in the preface to distance himself from the content of his narrative that would potentially offend living Englishmen and expose him to accusations of “frivolous impiety” and “scandalmongering.” Thanks to this assumed persona, though, he could claim that his letters were published without his consent. (52)
published against Biddulph’s will by Lavender, who by chance obtained these letters after the death of their original addressee, Bezaliell Biddulph.

From the very beginning, Biddulph makes sure that he is included among the ancient traveling philosophers, who only traveled to gain wisdom. The preface creates an honorable and wise image for Biddulph, who a couple of pages later uses this image to promote submission to authority. According to Lavender, readers of Biddulph’s letters, regardless of their background, “may see how God hath blessed our Countrie above others, and be stirred up to thankefulnesse.” Subjects of the English monarch “may learne to love, honour, and obey their good and gratious King, when they shall reade of the tyrannous governement of other Countries” whereas “wives may learne to love their husbands, when they shal read in what slavery women live in other Contries.”35 It is important that English subjects respect the power of their King and women their husbands, but Biddulph is more concerned with the respect clergy should receive:

Heereby hearers may learne to love and reverence their Pastors, and to thank God for the inestimable benefit of the preaching of the word amongst them; when they shall reade in what blindnesse and palpable ignorance other nations live, not knowing the right hand from the left in matters that concerne the kingdome of Heaven, and yet reverence and honour their blind guids and superstitious Church-men like Angels, and provide for their maintenance roially.

Coming right after the section on the necessity of submitting to the just King of England, this paragraph on the importance of revering the clergy is curiously longer then the former. Biddulph not only notes the reverence the ignorant people of other countries

35 Interestingly, Biddulph praises Muslim marriage practices later in his narrative to which I will turn later in this chapter.
show their pastors but also strategically finishes the paragraph with the information that they “provide for their maintenance royally.” Two more times in his letters Biddulph mentions that Turks and Christians in the Ottoman Empire treat their clergy as if they are angels while emphasizing that in England the churchmen “are the least of all regarded” (63). He later adds that Englishmen, though more knowledgeable than these people, “come far behind them in … providing for” “the Preachers of the truth” (65).

Twice in his narrative Biddulph underlines that, despite having been away from England and his English friends for a long time, he is “still the same man, and of the same minde” (31, 44). Biddulph’s emphasis is by no means particular to him. In almost all early modern travel and captivity narratives we can see at least one reference to the strength of the narrator’s English identity that purportedly is not even slightly shaken after being exposed to non-English and non-Protestant culture for a dangerously long time. In Biddulph’s case, however, this emphasis becomes increasingly ironic when read in light of English expatriates’ indifference to holding on to Anglo-Christian values once they are removed from England. Attention to this crucial detail transforms Biddulph’s narrative into a paradigmatic text that prompts us to reconsider our reading of early modern travel narratives to the Islamic East merely as English articulations of the Christian self vs. Muslim other binary opposition. Early modern travelers and ex-captives, upon their return to England, often asserted in their narratives that their travels to the Islamic East only helped them feel more attached to their Anglo-Christian roots by giving the opportunity to contrast Muslim culture and practices with those of English—in other words, to engage in a binary opposition of the Christian Self against the Muslim Other. Biddulph’s experience in the Levant, on the other hand, proves that English
expatriates were more open to the idea of acculturation than the English travelers and ex-captives who eventually returned to the English center. Arguably, expatriates’ lack of concern over reintegration into the English center characterized their welcoming attitude towards acculturation. This difference between the attitudes of English travelers/captives and expatriates suggests that the construction of an English identity simply through binary opposition might not have been the only outcome of Englishmen’s encounters with the non-English Other.

Biddulph’s narrative not only reveals the desire of many Englishmen to accultivate to foreign culture, but also depicts, by highlighting the tension between Biddulph and English expatriates, how the English chaplain was forced to question his identity as a member of the English clergy vis-à-vis fellow Englishmen rather than the Muslim Other. In this identity formation, the non-English—particularly the Muslim—other acts as a catalyst rather than the one and only entity against which Biddulph’s Anglo-Protestant identity is constructed. The passage below illustrates the tripartite identity formation Biddulph engages in:

I my selfe haue had great experience héereof both in the place of my abode at Aleppo, and in my iourney towards Jerusalem, and in other places. In Aleppo as I haue walked in the streéets, both Turkes, and Moores, and other Nations, would very reuerently salute me after the manner of their Country…Yea in all my ten yéeres trauels, I neuer receiued, neither was offered wrong by any Nation but mine owne Countrimen, and by them chiefly whom it chiefly concerned to protect me from wrongs: yet haue I found them most forward to offer me wrong only for doing my duty, and following the order of our Church of England: knowing that I
had none of the Reuerend Fathers of our Church to defend me. So would it be in England, if we had not the Reuerend Fathers in God the Lord Bishops of our Church to protect vs. (62)

I find this passage particularly illuminating as it is a clear articulation of Biddulph’s sentiments in the face of his fellow Englishmen’s rejection of his—and the Church of England’s—authority. More importantly, Biddulph gradually moves his focus from his reception in Aleppo and Jerusalem to the perception of the clergy back in England. By shifting from first person singular (“I had none of the Reuerend Fathers of our Church to defend me”) to first person plural later in the paragraph (“So would it be in England, if we had not the Reuerend Fathers in God the Lord Bishops of our Church to protect vs”), he reveals how his experience with fellow Englishmen outside England creates what we can define as a class consciousness that proves instrumental in his questioning of the clergy’s belonging in the English nation. In a sense, Biddulph has an epiphany thanks to his travels to the Islamic East, which is made possible by the treatment he receives from Turks and Moors—very much like Thomas Dallam whose English national consciousness emerges thanks to the favorable treatment he receives from Ottomans throughout his travels. In other words, their encounters with the Muslim Other enable these two Englishmen to question their individual positions within the English nation rather than to embrace a generic English national identity that merely encapsulates Anglo-Christian pride in the face of the Muslim Other.

Biddulph’s narrative contains another triangular model that has Anglo-Protestant anxiety in its basis. The favorable treatment Biddulph receives from Muslims that is not extended to him in his native country ultimately works towards illuminating Protestant
anxiety in the face of Catholicism. Biddulph’s reflection clearly demonstrates how the Protestant churchman feels more threatened by Catholics than by Muslims among whom he spent many years:

The Turkes honour their Muftie (which is their chiefe Ruler in Ecclesiasticall matters, next vnder the Grand Signior) as an Angell: The Nostranes, Greekes, Armenians, Chelfalines, and Christians of all other Nations, performe double honour vnto them: only in England, where there is a more learned Ministry (I speake by experience) than in any Nation in the world, they are least of all regarded: Which maketh our Aduersaries, the Papists, say, (as I haue heard some of them speake in my hearing, many thousand miles from England) that if we our selues were perswaded of the truth of our Religion, we would reuerence our Churchmen as they do, and not scorne them and contemne them as we doe. (62-63)

While asserting a strong Anglo-Protestant righteousness in the face of the followers of a religion that he believes to be the antithesis of Christianity, namely Islam, is easy for the English chaplain, the same is not true vis-à-vis the Catholics, followers of a religion that reigns over a geography adjacent to England and that historically has played a larger role in the emergence and consolidation of an Anglo-Protestant identity.36 As Biddulph suggests in this paragraph, there is something Englishmen can learn from the Turks despite the fact that they live in “blindnesse and palpable ignorance…not knowing the

right hand from the left in matters that concern the kingdom of Heaven.” Catholics, however, only remind Biddulph the possibility that the relatively new religion might still have not been sincerely embraced by his fellow Englishmen which in turn challenges the Protestant clergyman’s sense of belonging in the nation.

While Biddulph contrasts his Anglo-Christian self-righteousness against English expatriates’ indifference to the prospect of acculturation, or cultural contamination, he simultaneously and paradoxically fantasizes the spread of Muslim influence over fellow Englishmen—both abroad and at home. Clearly, Biddulph sees no harm in desiring the English to be more like the people of “[a]ll other Nations, both Heathen and Christian, [who] goe before vs heerein, in reuerencing and prouiding for their Churchmen” as well as Turks and Moors, who “would very reuerently salute [him] after the manner of their Country” (62). In so desiring, Biddulph, a chaplain who was commissioned to ensure the steadfastness of his compatriots’ Englishness, paradoxically suggests that being “more” English is partly possible by being more like Turks and Moors. Intriguingly, this is not the only instance where Biddulph believes the English can actually benefit from imitating Muslim practices. After giving an account of how Muslim wives demonstrate their respect for their husbands by standing up the moment their husbands walk in to a room and kissing their hands, Biddulph immediately fantasizes the transportation of such practices over to England: “If the like order were in England, women would be more dutifull and faithfull to their husbands than many of them are” (55-56). Although some travelers might view such practices as despotic and oppressive, to Biddulph they are
worth adopting.\footnote{In \textit{Women and Islam in Early Modern English Literature} (2008), Bernadette Andrea underlines that Biddulph’s sentiments epitomize a paradox “constitutive of orientalist patriarchal discourse” (Andrea 80) as he first pities Muslim women for being “virtual slaves” (Andrea 80) only to fantasize later that were English wives to adopt Turkish manners, they “would be more dutiful and faithful to their husbands than many of them are” (Biddulph 95).} In that sense, while Biddulph’s narrative might initially seem to be a perfect example of identity construction in the face of the Muslim other through binary opposition, a closer examination reveals the many instances of triangular identity construction Biddulph engages in throughout his travels in the Levant.

In the title of this chapter I refer to Thomas Dallam and William Biddulph, as “captive travelers.” I consider these two Englishmen as captives despite the fact that they never face a real threat of captivity to direct attention to their captivation by certain Turkish and Muslim practices—a captivation that culminates in questioning their belonging in the English nation. In Dallam’s case, a fantasy of captivity is perpetuated by repeated proposals that he leaves his life in England behind and settle in the Ottoman court to serve the Sultan. Biddulph, on the other hand, never receives such offers, yet he experiences the threat of captivity, albeit in a different sense. The threat Biddulph faces throughout his travels in the Levant is similarly posed by the Ottoman allure. While in Dallam’s case the allure stems from the Sultan’s admiration of his talent, in Biddulph’s case the allure presents itself in the form of reverence he receives from Muslims as a Protestant clergy—a reverence that is denied to him both by the English in the center and the English expatriates in the Levant. In that sense, Biddulph’s reveals the sentiments of an English clergyman whose encounters with the Other force him to reconsider his position in his own country and who is acutely aware of the danger of the Turkish allure as evidenced by his two-time emphasis on being “still the same man, and of the same
minde” despite his nine-year residence in the Levant (31, 44). Reflecting a similar sentiment, Dallam cries out his preference to “die by the way in doinge [his] good will to goo hom” rather than stay in Istanbul when he is told he should consider postponing his return trip to England as he is too sick to endure a long journey. Despite their contrasting experiences in the Ottoman Empire shaped by their different social backgrounds, both Englishmen return home with a reconfigured sense of Englishness—Dallam as an aspiring gentleman, who has come to believe that his skill can compensate for his lack of noble blood in climbing the social ladder, and Biddulph as a Protestant clergy, who begins to question his belonging in the English nation when realizing that the non-English other shows him more respect than his English compatriots do.

***

In the second part of this chapter I will turn to early modern Englishmen, who, unlike the travelers I discuss in the first part, experienced Barbary captivity not just intellectually and spiritually but also physically. The trials these captive Englishmen endured in Barbary will not be my main focus, though. Instead, I will attend to the treatment ex-Barbary captives received once they returned to England. Ex-captives’ reception by fellow Englishmen showed a stark difference when compared to the reception of a “captive traveler” like Thomas Dallam. While Dallam could profit from his fantasized captivity by achieving social mobility, real Barbary captives found themselves stigmatized by their experience of captivity.38 However, despite the discrepancy between their experiences, notions of captivity enabled both “captive travelers” and Barbary captives to reconsider and reconfigure their Englishness. Inevitably, some Englishmen

38 MacLean notes that Dallam was commissioned to construct the organ in King’s College due to his success in Istanbul (227 n. 8).
were luckier than the others, but in the end they all found themselves questioning their
sense of belonging in the nation, or as I will discuss in my analysis of two Barbary
captivity narratives, they all experienced a degree of social alienation due to their
encounters in the Islamic East.

My use of the notion “social alienation” is an appropriation of Orlando
Patterson’s coinages “natal alienation” and “social death,” two terms he has formulated to
discuss the experiences of African slaves as individuals forcefully removed from their
native countries and placed in the strange settings of the American plantation. In my
discussion in this chapter of English ex-captives returning from North Africa, I propose
an appropriation of these two terms and use the phrase “social alienation” to direct
attention to the fact that English slaves in Barbary were not spared from experiencing the
alienating effects of slavery that took its toll on their Englishness because their native
country was striving to become an imperial power. According to Patterson, the African
slave’s natal alienation starts with the separation from his native country, his family as
well as his friends and continues with his placement in a completely strange setting where
he is no longer treated as a human being and consequently becomes a socially dead being.
Within this dehumanizing institution, a few African slaves chose to take a literary route
to resist social death and claim subjectivity by gaining literacy in English and publishing
narratives. These narratives gave the details of not just their slavery days but also their
pre-slavery lives highlighting their belonging to a community in which they could engage
in social relations just like any other free subject. 39 Thanks to these narratives, these

39 A paradigmatic example of such a slave narrative is that of Olaudah Equiano. While
Equiano claims in his narrative that he considers himself a European (19), he often
nostalgically reflects on his pre-slavery life and admits that he “still looks back with
slaves were able to make their pre-slavery lives known to their readers and to some extent resist the efforts of their masters to deprive them of their humanity and subjectivity.

The relationship between literacy and subjectivity has long been a focus of attention in the field of African-American studies and it has become an axiom that “[t]he slave narrative represents the attempts of blacks to write themselves into being” (Davis and Gates xxii). Yet, Charles Davis and Henry Louis Gates complicate this notion at the same time by asking how an African slave can claim subjectivity by mastering a Western language: “What a curious idea: through the mastery of formal Western languages, the presupposition went, a black person could become a human being by an act of self-creation through the mastery of language” (xxii). Their deliberation is significant on many different levels. Most importantly, they bring to our attention the paradox this notion creates, that an African slave can write himself into existence by gaining mastery over a formal Western language—a language in which, as Gates argues in another study, “blackness is a sign of absence” (Gates Signifying Monkey 169). While I will not expand on the issue of literacy and African slavery here, I believe it is important to observe how the relationship between literacy (as well as language) and existence becomes equally significant in the context of Anglo-Christian captivity and slavery. In fact, when we turn to English captives and their resistance to social alienation in their own countries by writing their narratives in their own languages the paradox becomes even greater.

Barbary captivity narratives enable us to observe ex-slaves’ experience with and resistance to social alienation upon return to their own countries. By producing first-person written accounts of their captivity, enslavement, and eventual homecoming,

pleasure on the first scenes of [his] life, though that pleasure has been for the most part mingled with sorrow” (32).
Barbary captives give us ample opportunity to observe how their reception back in their country by their compatriots actually contributed to their alienation from their natal bonds as they could not feel a sense of belonging to the nation. The Barbary captivity narratives I attend to in this section all reveal their authors’ attempts to reclaim membership in the nation by utilizing their experience of captivity, yet, at the same time, these accounts demonstrate the degree of disorientation and alienation their authors experience. While trying to write themselves into existence in their narratives, these ex-captives in fact reveal that they are having hard time feeling English again. In other words, while these narratives are meant to write their authors into existence as Englishmen, they paradoxically reveal the degree of social alienation they experience in their own natal communities. Curiously, scholars of early modern Barbary captivity tend to ignore the function of these narratives as their authors’ attempts to write themselves into existence in favor of readings that describe these narratives as early modern assertions of a strong English identity that is becoming increasingly colonial and/or imperial. In one of the most recent studies of the captivity narrative genre, Joe Snader argues for defining the discourse of early modern accounts of Islamic East, which “often came from the pens of captives or ambassadors working to secure the release of captives,” as proto-Orientalist (132). He contends that early modern narratives, by depicting Islamic East as a land that harbors “excessively passionate, ineffectual, and despotic” peoples, “created a justification and even an imperative for Western colonial expansion” (132). Nabil Matar, in a similar fashion, argues that “[c]aptivity accounts were written to assert English identity and authorize national commitment” and “reveal a deep-seated sense of Anglo-Christian self-righteousness” (“Introduction” 37). Such readings demonstrate the critics’
resistance to the idea of dehumanized and socially alienated Anglo-Christian captives/slaves. Attending to Barbary captives’ attempts to “write themselves into being” through their narratives helps us not only overcome this problem but also to observe the ways ex-captives reconfigured their identities after their return to England from North Africa.

Upon their return from a strange land and from among people speaking a strange language, British ex-captives had to write themselves into existence in their natal languages after they were exposed to a foreign culture and language for a dangerously long period of time. The risk of contamination was high for most of these ex-captives as they were enslaved while they were still young. In fact, Joseph Pitts and Thomas Pellow admit in their narratives—published in 1704 and in 1739 respectively—that they had converted to Islam, albeit due to the pressure they received from their masters, thus contributing to the skepticism of their readers over the genuineness of their asserted Anglo-Christianity. Ideally, their narratives served as vehicles through which they could create personas showcasing a strong sense of Englishness. The paradox here is that while the ex-captives’ ability to write their narratives made the creation of this persona possible, their mastery over the mysterious and foreign language of the Muslim Other undoubtedly helped them gain a broader audience than the captives who could not demonstrate a similar linguistic knowledge had.⁴⁰ These authors could actually profit from early modern English anxiety in the face of the Muslim Other by satisfying their readers’ curiosity about foreign Muslim practices. Just as Dallam managed to avoid the danger of turning Turk with his talent that was foreign to his Ottoman audience, ex-

⁴⁰ The most paradigmatic example is Joseph Pitts’s narrative which saw more editions than any early modern Barbary captivity narrative.
captives like Joseph Pitts and Thomas Pellow tried to subvert the accusation of contamination by suggesting that their readers could only learn about the customs and language of the Muslim Other thanks to their feigned conversion. In publishing their narratives of captivity in Barbary, these captive-turned-authors had to achieve many things at once. They had to satisfy the curiosity of their English readers; they had to prove that the information given in their narratives was accurate; and they had to make their readers believe that they were not contaminated by any means despite having been forced to assimilate into foreign culture during their long stays. Only the successful accomplishment of these three tasks could help the ex-captive avoid social alienation in their natal country. In other words, as ex-captives who were already dehumanized under the institution Barbary slavery, these Englishmen had to overcome social alienation upon returning to their native countries. Having spent dangerously long time in close proximity to Muslim culture, they faced the reality that their compatriots were unwilling to consider them English anymore. There was only one way for these ex-captives to prove that they were able to maintain their Anglo-Christian identities: publishing narratives in which they assert a strong connection to their natal bonds. Ironically though, these narratives end up revealing ex-captives’ social alienation rather than helping them assert a strong Anglo-Christian identity.

As discussed by scholars such as Daniel Vitkus and Jonathan Burton, the danger of turning Turk, or converting to Islam, was a very real one for early modern Britons.41 Burton summarizes early modern British anxiety in the face of the Muslim Other as “to turn to the Turks without ‘turning Turk’” (18): in other words, to maintain a successful

---

diplomatic and commercial relationship with the Islamic East while at the same time
avoiding religious conversion. This anxiety was not unfounded as many English captives
were reported to have converted to Islam willingly in the early modern period. Burton
argues that the result of this anxiety was “a divided rhetoric, apparent in church liturgy,
guild records, travelers’ narratives, diplomatic correspondences, histories, ballads,
pageants, poems, and plays” (18). For example, while diplomatic correspondence
between England and the Ottoman Empire suggested that the English perceived the
Ottomans as allies, early modern travel and captivity narratives often depicted Turks as
the antithesis of Christianity. By pointing to this divided rhetoric, Burton turns our
attention to the “complexity of response[s]” (18) to the Muslim Other. Relying on
Burton’s terminology but utilizing it in a slightly different fashion, I argue that Barbary
captivity narratives embodied a “divided rhetoric”—one that helped the ex-captive create
a persona, or a virtual identity, which proclaimed a strong sense of Englishness but at the
same time one that revealed the degree of social alienation the ex-captive went through
not only due to the dehumanizing treatment he endured under Barbary captivity but also
due to the unwelcoming treatment he received from fellow Englishmen upon return from
captivity in North Africa.

As previously mentioned, Nabil Matar claims that “[c]aptivity accounts were
written to assert English identity and authorize national commitment” and “[t]hey reveal
a deep-seated sense of Anglo-Christian self-righteousness” (Matar Piracy 37). While I
partly agree with the first portion of Matar’s argument, I do not believe that ex-captives
had a strong enough commitment to their Englishness to “reveal a deep-seated sense of
Anglo-Christian self-righteousness.” On the other hand, I only partly agree with Matar’s
argument that the ex-captives asserted English identity in their narratives because I believe ex-captives were extremely self-conscious about the personas they were creating in their accounts. In other words, the English identity they assert in their narratives often, upon closer examination, turns out to be a façade meant to cover the confusion and disappointment of the ex-captive. Furthermore, Matar’s argument ignores another function of Barbary captivity narratives, which, as Linda Colley underlines, was to help these former captives make sense of what they had gone through as captives and slaves. In her foundational work on captivity, Colley highlights that “[t]ranslating any experience of trauma into one’s own words is cathartic” (84) and writing was meant to help ex-captives regain the sense of identity that was lost to them for many years during their enslavement. By penning their experiences, ex-captives could be at the center of their narratives and control their own tales. As individuals whose authority over their own lives was suppressed by their captors, they attempted to reincarnate themselves as socially alive through their narratives.

Colley’s suggestion of reading Barbary captivity narratives as cathartic prompts us to consider the psychological burden ex-captives were carrying upon their return to England and their struggles to gain admittance back to their own countries. Most of these ex-captives were not granted the treatment they had expected to receive upon setting foot on English soil. Many even admit in their narratives that their lot was much better in Barbary. Thomas Pellow had become a high-rank soldier in the Moroccan army, while William Okeley had established his own business in Algiers. Maybe the most fortunate of all, Joseph Pitts was treated like a son by his rich third owner, who had promised to make him an heir to his large fortune. In a statement that would win Thomas Dallam’s deepest
sympathy, Pitts admits in the preface to *A Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mohametans* (1704) that he “was in a much fairer Way for Honour and Preferment in Algier, than [he] could ever expect to have been in England” (xvii, italics original). William Okeley, in *Ebenezer: or, a Small Monument of Great Mercy* (1675), confesses that he wavered before coming to a final decision regarding his escape believing that “Liberty is a good word; but a Man cannot buy a Meals meat with a word: And Slavery is a hard word, but it breaks no mans [sic] back” (46). And Pellow, in *The History of the Long Captivity and Adventures of Thomas Pellow* (1739), describes his “poor Reception on his Arrival at London” when all he was offered upon his visit to the Navy Office to request introduction to the king “was the very extraordinary Favour of a Hammock on board of a Man of War” (385). Colley offers a compelling reading of Pellow’s reception at the Navy Office and argues that Pellow was regarded as an embarrassment to his nation “who might at least have the decency now to get himself killed fighting for the country he had so impertinently (if involuntarily) abandoned” (97). We should ask, then, how the ex-captive could have a strong sense of English identity when his Englishness was clearly questioned by fellow countrymen. How genuine would the English identity asserted in ex-captive’s narrative would prove? It would be more fruitful, therefore, to shift the focus from the degree of Englishness that is asserted in these narratives to how their experience as captives and slaves in North Africa helped these ex-captives reconfigure their Englishness.

After years of captivity and slavery, the ex-captive had to re-adapt to his own culture; he had to make sense of what had happened to him during his captivity and figure out what his future would look like now that he was back in England. Captivity did
not just deprive the ex-captive of his freedom but turned it into a stigma that would be attached to him for the rest of his life. Pellow’s 1739 narrative gives us an account of an ex-captive who experiences the stigma of captivity very deeply as he finds himself largely disappointed in the very first moment of breathing the English air. The passage below is crucial to understanding Pellow’s state of mind in the face of the disappointing reception extended to him by fellow countryman:

Here it is impossible for me (or at least for anybody but myself) to describe the excessive joy I felt during all the Time of our rowing to the shore, tho’ all may suppose it (after my so long and grievous Servitude amongst the Barbarians) to be more than ordinary; and now are we come to the landing Place at the Water Port, where offering to land, I was denied by the Centinels, telling me that till they had Orders for my so doing, they would not suffer any Moor to land: Moor! said I, you are very much mistaken in that, for I am as good a Christian (though I am dressed in the Moorish Garb) as any of you all; therefore, pray (said I) suffer me once more to set my Foot on Christian land: Indeed (said they) we cannot, if you was our Brother. (376)

As illustrated in this scene, Pellow’s twenty-three years of captivity and slavery resulted in a form of social alienation in the sense that the ex-captive had become physically indistinguishable from his Muslim captors. This form of alienation is undoubtedly unlike the one experienced by African slaves, who were denied any physical, spiritual, or social connection to their native communities by their European masters. In the case of Pellow, who manages to return to his native country, the social alienation is enforced by his compatriots who do not allow him to step foot on the English soil. His futile insistence on
being as Christian as any of the Englishmen who are not letting him disembark from the ship is possibly also directed towards the readers of his narrative. Pellow learns the hard way that he is no longer a member of the family; even if he were a brother to those Englishmen, he did not hold a chance to be admitted back to his home—he had been away for too long and there was no evidence of his absence being involuntary.

Rejected by his own countrymen, the distraught and lonely Pellow became further alienated from his English community and could only find relief in the familiarity of the Moroccan ambassador’s house in London where he visited “several Times, and was always by him and his People kindly received” (387). Pellow’s disorientation surfaces here again when he cannot hide how pleased he was to get a chance to see the ambassador again but is extremely self-conscious in depicting his correspondence with him. When the ambassador warmly asks Pellow to stay and enjoy himself in his house, Pellow claims that he “did not care much to accept” this offer yet “neither did [he], after a blunt Manner, refuse it, answering him with a low Bow” (386). However, on the very next page Pellow becomes oblivious to his commitment to appear indifferent to the ambassador’s invitation and admits to having paid several other visits to his house during his time in London. Further demonstrating his social alienation, Pellow cannot find a site of familiarity in his hometown similar to the one he finds in Moroccan ambassador’s residence. He is disappointed to find that he cannot recognize his own father and mother nor they him (388). Aware of his un-English looks, Pellow seems to be trying hard to make peace with the idea that he does not look like the rest of his people any more: “[H]ad [my parents and I] happened to meet at any other Place, without being on either Side pre-advised, (whereby there might be an Expectation, or natural Instinct interposing)
we should no Doubt have passed each other, unless my great Beard might have induc’d them to enquire further after me” (388). Referring sarcastically to his beard, still fashioned in a way a Muslim man would wear it even weeks after his return to England, Pellow underlines that he does not have any intention of leaving behind some of his Muslim habits even if it means remaining unrecognized by his own family.

Pellow clearly experiences an identity crisis, which is perpetuated by his disappointing reception in Gibraltar and by the rejection he receives in the Navy Office where he requests to meet with the King. Making his identity crisis even more evident, his isolation is only remedied by the Moroccan ambassador. This crisis has many layers and is perpetuated by not only the ex-captive’s struggle to adapt to his natal society but also by his natal society’s rejection of him. With their narratives written after they had returned to their countries, early modern English captives give us a rare opportunity to observe captivity and slavery’s effect on the captive/slave who eventually found freedom and a chance to return to his natal country. Their narratives enable us to observe the experience of social alienation and whether the ex-slave can or cannot fight against this social alienation upon return to his native country. However, when we insist on reading these narratives exclusively within the framework of an English national identity construction and empire making we lose this opportunity.

Beginning at the moment of their captivity, English captives, just like many other slaves, lost all the authority over their lives, their bodies, and their languages. Ex-captives made sure to emphasize in their narratives that captivity and slavery deprived them of
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42 In the case of the Barbary captives I discuss in this chapter, I believe the words “captive” and “slave” can be used interchangeably. I understand that this might not be the case for all Barbary captives yet I believe this interchangeability allows me to better juxtapose the cases of African slaves and British captives.
their humanity by describing the slave market and the examination of the slaves “like beasts” by possible buyers. Captives became spectacles first, dehumanized as they disembarked from ships naked and chained. Then came the slave market where they were sold like beasts after their teeth, limbs, and even private parts were examined. Slavery turned a human being into an object in the eyes of the slaveholders and white Christian slaves were no exceptions to this. A paradox emerged, however, when ex-captives tried to regain their subjectivity—to write themselves into existence by detailing for their English readers the dehumanizing treatments they had received from their Muslim captors and masters. Through graphic descriptions of the process of dehumanization they had gone through, ex-captives hoped to resurrect themselves like a phoenix rising from its own ashes. As accounts of dehumanized slaves, their narratives naturally reflected their resentment for their Muslim captors and masters. For this reason, the binary oppositions we would like to rely on in our discussion of east-west relations fail in this context. The only binary that seems to matter to the English subject in the context of captivity and slavery is subject vs. object. Despite the favorable treatment they received from their Muslim masters, and unlike many other fellow captives who chose to settle in North Africa, the captives I focus on in this chapter wanted to leave Barbary and return to England because they refused to be a part of this binary throughout their lives. They wanted to be subjects, human beings rather than objects. However, they learned the hard way that merely returning to their native countries did not grant them the subject position they greatly desired.

Ex-captives’ status as objects did not end once the horror of the slave market was distant. Upon returning to their homeland, they were now made spectacles for their
fellow Englishmen. In public ceremonies, redeemed captives would parade with their Moorish clothes still on visualizing the horrendous effects of slavery to the curious public (Colley 79). Although they were now free from the chains of Barbary captivity, they were still seen as the embodiments of the horrors of slavery. Saved from one kind of servitude, they became servants to their governments that bought them their liberties together with the help and donations of sympathetic English citizens. Captivity was a stigma; the humiliation it brought never left the ones who were so unlucky to experience it. Having experienced captivity, an Englishman could never become truly a free man, even in his own country. In 1702, during a Thanksgiving Service, William Sherlock reminded ex-captives that private Christians and the government “redeemed you, that you might serve them, not as slaves, but as free-born subjects” (qtd. in Colley 79). Sherlock’s statement clearly demonstrates how slavery and freedom were not the exact opposite of each other for British captives—freedom did not automatically start where slavery ended. These Britons, who were stigmatized by their captivities, actively sought redemption from this stigma in order to be free subjects again. Their narratives, for this reason, can be read as their attempts to write themselves into existence. If we overlook the ex-captives’ attempts to write themselves into being in favor of solely focusing on the binary opposition of Anglo-Christian self vs. the Muslim Other we would only perceive these narratives as contributions to a discourse that would transform into the Orientalist discourse in the next century—a discourse Joe Snader defines as proto-Orientalism.43

One paradigmatic example of an ex-captive who attempts to write himself into existence by publishing the narrative of his Barbary captivity is Joseph Pitts. Pitts was

43 See Snader’s Caught Between Worlds for his discussion of the proto-Orientalist discourse.
fifteen years old when he was taken captive by Algerian corsairs in 1678. He spent fifteen years in Barbary until his escape in 1693 and converted to Islam as a result of, according to his narrative, his owners’ brutal beatings. Pitts’s narrative is framed as more of an ethnographic account than a Barbary captivity narrative and keeps his personal experience as a captive as marginal to the narrative as possible. Pitts chooses to give an account of his forced conversion only in the ninth chapter having written eight chapters that give detailed descriptions, among many other things, “of the Preparation the Turks make before they go to their Mosques. The Manner of their Worship there, and the Number of their Prayers” as well as of “[the] Mahometans [sic] Pilgrimage to Mecca…[and] [t]he Manner of their Devotion there.” The chapters are strategically ordered to emphasize that only Pitts’s conversion enables his readers to gain insight into the life and religion of the Muslim Other. His narrative consists of ten chapters and curiously Pitts’s conversion is only detailed right before the last chapter, which is a lengthy account of his escape. The first eight chapters include, in the order they appear, accounts of Pitts’s being taken captive by the Algerian pirates, of the behaviors of Algerian pirates at sea, of the Turks’ eating habits, of their social life, of their marriages, funerals, and education, of their devotions, of their pilgrimage to Mecca, of their return from pilgrimage, of Pitts’s forced conversion, and finally of his escape. The full titles of the chapters reveal that Pitts tries to make his narrative as much about Algerians and Muslims as possible and avoids being at the center of his text.

Pitts’s approach to writing this narrative as more of an ethnographic text than a personal narrative apparently proved successful since his narrative remained popular for a long time as the only source written in the English language that meticulously describes
the details of Muslim rituals including the pilgrimage to Mecca. It enjoyed four editions during Pitts’s lifetime, the second of which was printed without his permission. Different versions of the text were published even after the author’s death, the latest of which is Paul Auchterlonie’s critical edition that came out in 2012. As shown by the various editions of his narrative, Pitts had achieved success in his attempts to write himself into existence as an ex-captive, which was not the case for many of the Englishmen upon their escape or redemption from Barbary. Pitts’s case is even more curious as he undertakes this attempt as an Englishman who had converted to Islam—albeit involuntarily. His conversion, without doubt, enabled Pitts to gain admittance into the most intimate circles among Muslims. He admits that he visited the mosque everyday to perform the daily prayers as expected from a Muslim man.

He does not forget to add, though, that he often would go to Mosque without doing the required washing of body parts before the prayer, which, he underscores, “none of the thorough pac’d Mahometans would do” (150). As I argued above, Pitts had to achieve many things at once in his narrative and this often resulted in contradiction on his part. To assume the power of an eyewitness that was required during the time for the author of an account to be credible, he had to claim that he had been to the mosque and performed the prayer with the Muslim Other. In fact, the details he gives in his narrative prove that he had been a part of the Muslim congregation and observed the rituals in fine detail. He gives many details in his account

---

44 For a detailed publishing history of Pitt’s narrative see Paul Auchterlonie’s *Encountering: Joseph Pitts: An English Slave in 17th-century Algiers and Mecca* (2012).
45 Pitts mentions in his narrative that women are not allowed to enter the mosque and even gives details such as “there is no performing of Salah [ritual prayer]” when women are having their menstrual cycles (54).
46 For a detailed discussion of “eye-witnessing” and credibility, see Julia Schleck’s *Telling True Tales of Islamic Lands: Forms of Mediation in English Travel Writing, 1575-1630* (2011).
that no other English traveler or captive had ever mentioned before such as when the imam [prayer leader] recites the Qur’an audibly and when inaudibly during the ritual prayers depending on the time of the day (42). Only someone who frequented the mosque and actively engaged in prayers could know these details; on the other side, admitting to have been a party to Muslim rituals carried the danger of being branded un-English. This was clearly a source of anxiety for Pitts who faced the dilemma of whether to present himself as source of authentic information as an inauthentic Englishman or as an authentic Englishman yet an unreliable source of information—both of which were risky options for an ex-captive who was trying to establish himself in a new life in England and who needed both money and a good reputation to achieve this goal.

Pitts’s narrative is a paradigmatic text that gives us plenty of opportunity to observe how ex-Barbary captives often find their future depending on the question of who is included in the nation. While an ex-captive like Pellow learns the hard way that he is no longer considered a member of the nation when he is denied freedom on English soil, another like Pitts manages to profit from his exposure to foreign manners. Pitts’s narrative is particularly illuminating in its use of his knowledge in Arabic. Here it would be helpful to turn to Benedict Anderson’s discussion of sacred languages in his seminal work *Imagined Communities*. Anderson emphasizes that classical religious communities like the Islamic Ummah, “were imaginable largely through the medium of a sacred language and written script” (12-13). In that sense, an Englishman like Pitts would be considered a sincere member of the Muslim community by his captors once he mastered the language of the sacred text. On the other hand, considering the inherently different characteristics of Arabic from English, claiming mastery over Islam’s sacred language
meant in England that Pitts would be considered more Muslim/North African than English by his fellow countrymen. In his narrative, Pitts manages to subvert this seemingly unfavorable condition but it requires an immense effort on his part.

Pitts’s dilemma surfaces many times in his narrative, and the most striking instance can be seen when we compare the first and third editions of his narrative to see how he chooses to transcribe and translate an Arabic sentence that is the Islamic statement of faith. Before analyzing his transcription and translation of this fundamental Islamic creed, I first would like to turn to the preface of the third edition of *A Faithful Account* that was printed in 1731, twenty-seven years after the publication of the first edition. One small paragraph proves to be very significant for revealing Pitts’s dilemma in printing his narrative as an ex-captive who remained in Barbary for fifteen years as a convert:

One Thing I will desire of the *learned Reader*, which is, that if the *Arabick* Words in any Place be not rightly written, he will please to take notice, that I aim’d at the vulgar Sound of the Words, and writ as near as I could to their way of speaking. And moreover, I can’t pretend to a Perfection in the *Arabick* Language; which was the Occasion of that Mistake in *Page 41. of the first Edition*, where the *Arabick* was not truly englished [sic]; but I have since procured a *just Translation* of it. If I happen in any place to be mistaken in point of Time, it is not willfully done; and therefore I hope the *Reader* will overlook it. (vii, italics original)

I should first note that the paragraph addresses the “learned Reader” who in this case would be one who had linguistic background in Arabic and who had book knowledge about Islam and Muslims. Considering the abundance of travel as well captivity
narratives and the interest among Britons in the peoples of the East, we know that there was much information, partly accurate and partly inaccurate, distributed among the English readership. As implied in the preface, Pitts was allegedly criticized for a mistake he made in the first edition of his narrative translating a certain Arabic phrase. He found it necessary not just to fix his translation but to make a note in the preface to announce that he had addressed the problem. Considering the length of the text and the abundance of texts during the time that are filled with inaccurate transcriptions and translations of Arabic words and phrases, one wonders why “learned readers” specifically chose Pitts to criticize for such a small mistake. In fact a comparison of the two editions reveals that there is not so much difference between the two versions as to require a mention in the preface.

In his description of the fourth prayer of the day, or the “Acsham Nomas,” Pitts gives the details of a voluntary ritual, which is “a short Form of Singing with the Emaum [prayer leader], who reads a Sentence, and then he and they [the congregation] sing.” In the first edition of his narrative, Pitts transcribes and translates the repeated sentence thus: 

“‘Alla hum salle, wa salem: alla, se yee de na wa Moulaw na, Mohammet wa awela, awela, se ye de na Mohammet!’ i.e. All Praise, and Blessing, and Thanksgiving, be to God and to our Master Mohammet!’ In the third edition, after mentioning in the preface that he had “procured a just Translation” of the same sentence, Pitts includes a new transcription and translation: “‘Allahum solle, wasalem alla Seyedena, wa moulauna

---


Mohammed, wa alla Aula Seyedena Mohammed,’ i.e. Our God, be favourable to, and let Peace be upon our Lord (Master) and Teacher, Mahomet, and upon the Family of our Lord (Master) Mahomet.” While both transliterations are not precise (their precision most probably did not matter to the majority of his readers), Pitts provides a more accurate translation in the third edition by mentioning the Prophet’s family in the sentence, which is definitely a correction to the translation in the first edition but not such a crucial one—at least to his English readers—to deserve a spot in the preface. The insignificance of the mistake makes one wonder whether the alleged criticism had ever taken place. It seems probable that Pitts was just looking for an opportunity to underline that he could not remember Arabic any more and therefore he had to “procure” a translation to achieve authenticity. With this note he sought to prove that he was now a true Englishman without any trace left of his previous life as a convert captive. To perpetuate this image and to avoid any potential criticisms in the future for possible mistakes, he does not forget to add that he “can’t pretend to a Perfection in the Arabick Language.”

There is another phrase that Pitts transcribes differently in the first and third editions of his narrative. This phrase is not just a short supplication that is merely a “voluntary devotion” (41 first edition) but one of the fundamental creeds of Islam, so much so that one can turn Turk, according to Pitts, by “only holding up the Fore-finger of the Right-hand and pronouncing the Words before mentioned” even if converting “by Compulsion” (196 third edition). This sentence is written in four different places in both editions. The first time Pitts mentions it is when he is describing the abdest, the required ablution before one performs the prayer, the second time is when he is informing his readers that this sentence is “the great and fundamental Article of the Mahometan Faith,
which chiefly makes them Mussulmans” (49 first edition); he then repeats the same information in the section where he is describing the “six Credenda” [creed or “aqidah”] of Islam and finally he writes it again in the chapter in which he is giving the details of his forced conversion. Notably, in the third edition we see a revised version of this sentence in all of the four instances. In the first edition of his narrative Pitts transcribes these words as “La illahi illallah Mohammet Resul-allah” (139)—an accurate transcription that does not alter the meaning of the sentence in Arabic, which is in Pitts’s translation, “There is but one God, and Mahomet his Prophet, or the Messenger of God: Or this, there is no God (i.e. true God) but God and Mahomet is the Messenger of God.” In the third edition, Pitts decides to “revise” his transcription and rewrites the sentence as “La Allah ellallah, Mohammed Resul Allah” by significantly changing the meaning and obliterating the entire purpose of the sentence. In this new version, the first part of the sentence means “there is no Allah” which effectively makes the reciter of the sentence a heretic according to the Islamic law therefore a faithful Christian in the case of Pitts. In light of Pitts’s note in the preface addressing a criticism he had received for a mistranslated supplication, the changes he made in the third edition to the most fundamental article of Islam cannot be read as a mere editorial correction. It becomes clear that Pitts was aware of the close scrutiny of the “learned Readers” of his narrative and knew that in some cases he was expected to make mistakes to avoid being perceived as too assimilated into Islam. In other words, as much as he had to emphasize that “[w]hat I speak I know to be true; nor have I recited Things meerly upon Hearsay” (viii third edition) he at the same time had to show his willingness to deviate from the truth in
order to avoid the social alienation that many ex-captives faced when they returned to England.

I find Pitts’s situation paradigmatic not only because it reflects the struggles of ex-captives to avoid the social alienation but also because it provides us with a medium to explore the notion of “seeing-man” articulated by Mary Louise Pratt in her 1992 study, *Imperial Eyes*. My conflation of these two seemingly unrelated notions—slave’s social death and the imperial agent’s gaze—might at first sound like a stretch, but I believe this conflation will enable me to explain the premise of this chapter—that the notion of captivity contests and complicates our understanding of how early modern Britons’ encounters with the Muslim Other shaped the ways they reconfigured their identities. Pratt uses the phrase “seeing-man” to describe “the European male subject…whose imperial eyes passively look out and possess” (7). By using this term—which Pratt has coined to define the imperial agents of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries—in the context of Barbary captivity narratives, I aim to point out the oxymoron that emerges when we see ex-captives as contributors to a proto-Orientalist discourse—as slave imperial agents, in other words. Such a reading grants the authors of these narratives the role of a “seeing-man.” I have to admit, on the other hand, that we cannot ignore that ex-captives had to assume this role in their narratives in order to appeal to more readers so that they could financially profit from their narratives.\(^49\) This correlation between the ex-captives’ motivation to sell more editions of their narratives without portraying an image of a spiritually contaminated person is what I would like to underscore. Part of what this

\(^{49}\) The fact that Pitts’s narrative was one of the most popular of Barbary captivities for a long time is a sufficient enough proof of the reading public’s interest in reading the observations of an ex-captive.
chapter tries to do is to challenge the idea that early modern Britons were employing an exclusively proto-Orientalist and proto-imperialist discourse in their depictions of the Muslim Other. Instead, I propose that we need to consider the struggle of early modern ex-captives to resist social alienation and to write themselves into existence without assuming that they somehow managed to hold on to their English identities despite the dehumanizing treatment they had received during captivity and the social alienation they experienced after their return to England. Ex-captives could only resist social alienation by writing their observations, in other words, by presenting themselves as “seeing-men.” Just as Dallam came to realize his agency thanks to the Ottoman Sultan’s appreciation of his mysterious and foreign talent, ex-captives could only gain a sense of agency once their knowledge of the mysterious and the foreign received the attention of English readers.

English captives often assumed the persona of a seeing-man in their accounts as the case of Joseph Pitts demonstrates. This persona, however, was by no means meant to assert a strong sense of Englishness but to assist the ex-captive in decentralizing his own captivity experience by putting Muslim culture under scrutiny. While we cannot ignore that in the subsequent century the information provided in these narratives became useful for the emergence of an Orientalist discourse that depicted the Islamic East as a land of tyranny, sensuality, and despotism, the authors of these narratives were more concerned with seeking membership in the English nation than in contributing to a national discourse. All the English subjects I scrutinize in this chapter, travelers and captives alike, return to England with a renewed sense of self and a different understanding of belonging in the nation from the one they had before leaving. One common consequence
of their experience in the Islamic East was the inevitable questioning of their Englishness either as a result of an emerging class-consciousness or as a result of social alienation entailed by slavery. While the narratives of all these English travelers and captives suggest a renewed sense of Englishness, they all end without letting their readers know about these Englishmen’s lives after their return from the Ottoman Empire or North Africa. In that sense, this chapter functions as a compilation of case studies that investigate the emergence of new forms of Englishness in the early modern period. In the next chapter, I explore how these new forms of Englishness become useful in the Anglo-colonial world and reflect on how these early modern Englishmen’s narratives give us hints about their eastern experiences’ contribution to the emergence of Anglo-colonial modes of identity.
Chapter 2

From Colony to Settlement: Indian Captivity Narratives and Settler-Colonist Investment in the Reproductive Female Body in Colonial America

Here nature and liberty afford us that freely which in England we want, or it costs us dearly.

John Smith, *Description of New England* (1616)

I have situated this chapter on Indian captivity narratives right at the intersection of my discussion of early modern English travelers/Barbary captives and early American Barbary captives. This placement is strategic as it brings to attention the oft-ignored notion that “[d]uring the early modern era, the Christians of Spain, Portugal, England, and other nations were establishing their first permanent colonies in the New World while simultaneously facing the threat at home of being colonized by the Ottoman Turks” (Vitkus 6-7). For the most part, the Ottomans did not engage in a systematic colonization of the lands they conquered during the early modern period demonstrating that imperialism does not exclusively translate into colonialism.\(^5\) Regardless, the threat of Turkish invasion was dangerously real for Western European nations, who were at the time engaging in their own Westward expansion as aspiring colonizers. With this history in mind, this chapter will explore the influence of early modern Britons’ twofold ethos—aspiring colonizers and potential victims of imperial conquest—on British accounts of the Native American Other. Karen Ordahl Kupperman directs attention to the significance of

\(^5\) In *Jamestown Project*, Karen Ordahl Kupperman describes the Ottoman imperial model as flexible and tolerant: “[T]he Ottoman rulers adopted an official policy of flexibility, even tolerance, in order to govern their diverse population. Administrators of conquered territories took account of local practice…Judaism and Christianity were particularly tolerated in recognition of their joint genesis with Islam in Abrahamic faith” (22).
this twofold ethos when she underlines that European colonial project in the early modern period cannot be thought separately from the Ottoman threat of conquest of Western European nations. In the face of the possibility of an Ottoman domination of Christendom, early modern thinkers believed that “[r]iches from abroad, especially from America, could right the balance and restore the unity of Christian Europe under the pope.” A richer and stronger Europe could consequently “resist the expansive Ottoman Empire” (Kupperman 15). With this motivation, the Catholic powers were the first to venture into the New World and their success inevitably alarmed the English, who began to realize their inferiority more acutely than ever in the face of two imperial powers—namely the Spanish and the Ottomans.

The Ottoman influence on England’s westward colonial expansion might seem indirect at first, but a close examination proves the contrary—English encounters with the Islamic East in fact played a crucial role in transforming early modern English colonialism from a project that relied on temporary colonial outposts to one that envisioned permanent settlement in North America. As Kupperman points out, the English were initially motivated by the goal of gaining access to the riches of the New World, which “they were convinced…would be one key to making their nation powerful enough to stand up to Spain” (42). In that regard, settlement in the New World was not a priority for English investors. They were mainly interested in finding “a rich commodity

---

51 In “Conquering Islands,” Barbara Fuchs makes a similar argument when she underlines that “the very real presence of the Ottoman threat in the Mediterranean in the early seventeenth century…paved the way for” English colonial endeavors in the New World (46).

that colonists could extract or, even better, gain in trade with the Americans, or a passage through to the rich eastern trades” (Kupperman 212). In other words, the first successful English colony in the New World, “from which would grow a powerful nation where all the world’s people would mingle,” was not initially imagined as a settler-colony by the upper-class Englishmen investing in it (Kupperman 1). Englishmen of middling sorts, however, had other plans: “Active young men saw the newly opened world as a theater for their own advancement” (Kupperman 44). Conveniently for these young men, it soon became evident that hierarchical arrangements that “would most closely resemble the English society…did not survive the transatlantic passage well” (Kupperman 6). While this was certainly an inconvenience for the governors and the royally appointed Virginia Company, in retrospect, the failure of Old World hierarchy in the New World turned out to be the first and foremost reason why the Virginia Colony, despite its tumultuous and messy beginnings, survived to be the first successful settler-colony of the British Empire in the New World.

In its transformation from a temporary colonial outpost to a settler-colony, the Virginia colony was indebted to a particular middle-class Englishman, who is the perfect embodiment of the twofold British ethos—colonizer and colonized—mentioned above. This man is none other than John Smith—a member, and later the leader for a brief time, of “the first permanent settlement in [North America] that would become the United States” (Kupperman 1) who, before his colonial ventures, was enslaved by Ottoman Turks while commanding a Christian army in Eastern Europe. According to Leo Lemay, Smith “first fully formed an American Dream” by realizing before others that “America provided the opportunity for an individual’s standing in society to be determined by hard
work and achievement rather than social position” (5). In other words, he was an early modern example of the self-made man and his autobiography, *The True Travels*, “is the first American success story” (5). Smith’s autobiography, which he published just one year before his death, is also a paradigmatic text that narrates its author’s “adventures” in Eastern Europe, where he participated in wars against the Ottoman Turks and rose to fame by beheading three Turkish challengers thanks to which he was endowed by the Prince of Transylvania with a coat of arms adorned with the images of three Turks’ heads. However, curiously enough, *The True Travels* has never received the kind of attention it deserves from scholars of English colonization of the New World despite the fact that its author is universally considered as one of the symbolic figures of English colonialism in the early modern period. Jim Egan, one of the few scholars who attends to *True Travels*, offers the text’s lack of “an easily recognizable formal or stylistic coherence” as one explanation for scholars’ negligence. More significantly, though, he believes that *The True Travels* is largely ignored “because it deals with America only as an afterthought” (Egan “The East” 104).

Smith’s autobiography brings together the accounts of its author’s travels, fights, and captivity in a diverse geography to the east of England and it turns to the New World only in its last few pages. The eclectic nature of the text, as Egan aptly puts it, has resulted in scholars’ dismissal of it as un-American and thus not necessarily contributive to our understanding of the English colonization of the Americas. However, as Egan underlines, Smith’s autobiography is invaluable precisely because it shows how “English colonization of American space depends on a particular understanding of spaces to England’s East” (104). Most significantly, Egan adds, by reflecting in his text on “The
bad Life, Qualities and Conditions of Pirates” (Smith True Travels 411) in Barbary and the opportunities the New World offers these Englishmen, “Smith suggests that American space provides a way of reclaiming English peoples who might have been lost to Eastern ways” (Egan105). After delineating the deplorable conditions of the pirates on Barbary coasts, Smith calls out to those renegade Englishmen:

Those Titles of Seamen and Soldiers, have been most worthily honoured and esteemed, but now regarded for the most part, but as the scum of the World; regain therefore your wonted Reputations and endeavour rather to Adventure to those fair Plantations of our English Nation; which however in the beginning were scorned contemned, yet now you see how many Rich and Gallant People come from thence, who went thither as Poor as any Soldier or Sailer [sic], and gets more in one Year, than you by Piracy in seven. (412)

Smith’s appeal to the English seamen-turned-pirates demonstrates that he believes English colonies in the New World have the potential to become a sanctuary for English renegades as Egan points out. This appeal, however, reveals much more than Smith’s faith in the New World as a space to reclaim Englishmen “lost to Eastern ways.” To begin with, it should not go unnoticed that The True Travels is Smith’s autobiography and that Smith chooses to close his autobiography with an appeal to English renegades in Barbary. Paradigmatically, Smith finds it appropriate to end his autobiography by reminding himself and his readers that he has found fame and prosperity after captivity and enslavement among the Ottomans. With this reminder, Smith suggests that his Ottoman captivity might have had a similar, though not identical, effect on his English identity to that of those renegades. He might not have converted to Islam and pirated on
English and Christian ships, but his English identity went through an inevitable reconfiguration as a result of his experience in Eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire. As I discuss in chapter one, this reconfiguration owed more to the Englishman’s increasing class-consciousness emerged in the context of the Ottoman allure.

To those like Smith, who sought social mobility but were determined to resist the Ottoman allure, English “Plantations” in North America presented the optimum medium. Smith warns his intended audience, namely the renegades lost to Eastern ways, that these plantations were scorned in the beginning by the English. However, there is every reason to hope that these plantations offer endless opportunities to the renegades who would like to regain their “wonted Reputations.” Smith’s proposal is significant not only because it “suggests American space provides a way of reclaiming English peoples who might have been lost to Eastern ways” as Egan notes, but also because it insinuates that there is little to no opportunity in England offered to those Englishmen who have either lost or reconfigured their English identities. Only by bypassing the English center and seeking a future in the colonies could ex-captives find prosperity and only by pursuing it in the English colonies could Smith fulfill his dream of social mobility.

Considering the role of his success against the Turks in Smith’s transformation from a yeoman farmer’s son to the governor of the Virginia colony, Lemay’s description of Smith’s autobiography as “the first American success story” works to highlight the triangulation of identities I propose in this project among the non-English other, the

---

53 In seventeenth-century English lexicon, the term “plantation” refers to “[a] settlement in a conquered or dominated country; a colony” (OED), which differs from the meaning the word takes on in the American South. In the context of the American South, it means “[a]n estate or large farm, esp. in a former British colony, on which crops such as cotton, sugar, and tobacco are grown (formerly with the aid of slave labour)” (OED).
English traveler/captive, and the Englishmen in the center. Smith himself admits the crucial role his experience in Eastern Europe and the Ottoman Empire had in preparing him for the challenges he faced in the New World in his *Advertisements for the Unexperienced Planters of New England, or Anywhere* (1631): “The Warres in Europe, Asia, and Affrica, taught me how to subdue the wilde Salvages in Virginia and New-England, in America” (9). While this statement initially suggests that Smith only gained practical benefits—like physical strength, war stratagem, or most importantly, a coat of arms—from his participation in wars on the Eastern side of the Atlantic, I believe we should also take into consideration his Eastern adventures’ effect on the development of Smith’s colonial ethos which comes hand in hand with his quest for a socially mobile subject position. In other words, Smith’s adventures in Eastern Europe helped him redefine his Englishness. This new Englishness he assumed as a colonial agent of England in the New World relied heavily on the lack of hierarchical stratification that constituted the backbone of the central English society Smith left behind when he ventured into the North American space.

*The True Travels* delineates its author’s rise to the position of captain of a Christian army in Eastern Europe from obscurity in England only to be “sold for slaves, like beasts” in the Ottoman slave markets in Eastern Europe, specifically, in Axopolis (Smith *True Travels* 387). Smith, who had been enjoying his newfound fame and position away from his native England, suddenly found himself enslaved and dehumanized by Turks; yet he was not one to easily give up. Among many stories of escape from captivity in Muslim lands, including North Africa/Barbary and Ottoman Europe, Smith’s deserves particular attention. Through the story of his escape, which involves “beat[ing] out [his
master’s] Brains with his Threshing Bat,” Smith manages to reclaim the masculine subjectivity that was lost to him under slavery. But there is more to it than that. In the middle of his late master’s vast estate, Smith can find no other option but wearing his master’s clothes as an attempt to remain disguised until he reaches a Christian land. Although Smith’s story of escape is not as elaborate as that of some Barbary captives—such as William Okeley and his friends who built a canvas boat and went through many adversities in order to escape—the implications of Smith’s donning Turkish clothes is hard to ignore. Considering that the Turks were potential invaders of Europe at the time, Smith’s wearing of Turkish clothes to escape slavery gains a symbolic meaning. He does not only escape his current enslavement but also assumes the ethos of the invading Turk, which would transform into the ethos of the colonizing British in a few years when he becomes a member of the first English settlement in Virginia.

When we begin to assess Smith’s transatlantic experiences—both eastward and westward—from the perspective I suggest above, it becomes clear that he exploits opportunities existing outside of England to redefine his Englishness. While he holds on to his Anglo-Christian identity throughout his encounters with non-English others, he at the same time reconfigures that identity in a way that is only possible outside the rigid class structure of English society. In one of the most comprehensive examinations of Smith’s True Travels, Mary Fuller questions Smith’s possible motivations to fight against the Ottoman Empire even though it was not the enemy of the English at the time. She contends that “[t]his distant, military context was one place where Smith could actually do things that at home were the prerogative of highly placed courtiers…and could by doing them win rapid advancement in rank, wealth, and status” (93-94). Outside this
military context, Fuller adds, his romantic involvement with his Turkish mistress highlights “the possibility…that a woman of high birth would fall in love with him and seek him in marriage” (94). Smith’s autobiography, in that sense, represents its author’s aspirations to upward mobility while suggesting that this mobility, which was not possible for the low-rank Smith in England, could only turn from dream into reality thanks to his encounters with the Muslim Other and his success as a colonialist in the New World.

*The True Travels* was one of the least popular of Smith’s publications at the time of its publication. According to Fuller, this was due to Smith’s excessive self-promotion in the text. Smith’s earlier publication *Generall Historie* (1624), despite also being an account of self-promotion, was a “national narrative” that supported England’s colonial endeavors; *The True Travels*, however, was “far more closely focused on Smith, without the counterweight of larger, shared concerns” (70). If John Smith is one of the first names that comes to mind when we think of the English colonization of North America, his identity construction in the form of self-promotion suggests that not all colonial Englishmen possessed a selfless interest in England’s success as a colonial power in the New World. In other words, personal ambitions of early colonists often superseded national interests during the first years of New World colonization and Smith was the prototypical example of this reality. Having been born into an obscure family, Smith strove to gain admittance into elite circles early in his life but faced disappointment. After spending some time in isolation and “desirous to see more of the world, and trie his fortune against the Turkes” (Smith *True Travels* 374) he left England and embarked on an eastward journey. While this journey is significant in and of itself, what makes it
paradigmatic for my project is Smith’s return to England—or his lack thereof. When he returned to England from Eastern Europe in 1604 with his brand new coat of arms adorned with three Turks’ heads, Smith believed he was carrying a sign of ennoblement that would secure him the friendship of worthy Englishmen. Although “[t]he English nobility sneered at his hard-earned title” (Hindley), the timing of his return in 1604 presented him with the opportunity to fulfill his dream of social mobility. In 1606, only two years after his return, this opportunity came in the form of the Virginia Company of London. Thanks to his “connections, skills, and willingness to invest his own money,” all of which he owed to his experience in Eastern Europe and Turkey, Smith was able to “secure a spot in the expedition and an appointment to the colony's governing council” (Hindley). In other words, Smith’s eastern adventures not only provided him with connections, skills, and money but also with the consciousness that the opportunity for social mobility did exist outside of England. This consciousness eventually led him to reconfigure his English identity into one that rejected the hierarchical arrangements of the central English community that were determined by noble blood and instead embraced Protestant work ethic as a determiner of one’s social positioning in the peripheral English community flourishing in the North American space.

In the previous chapter, I discussed how the disappointing reception of ex-Barbary captives influenced the ways in which those Englishmen reconfigured their identities. Ex-captives found themselves in an identity crisis that was a result of the dehumanizing treatment they received in captivity and was perpetuated when they realized they were not perceived as true Englishmen anymore by their own countrymen. As an attempt to write themselves into existence, some of those ex-captives published
their narratives after their return to England. Had John Smith published an account of his Ottoman captivity right after he returned to England instead of waiting almost three decades, it would have been one of the earliest accounts of captivity in the Islamic East written by an Englishman. Yet, he chose to publish this chapter of his life after his return to England from New World as a successful colonizer and only one year before his death in 1631. Smith did not attempt to write himself into existence after his return from captivity in the Islamic East like many other early modern ex-captives because he did not have to. He did not return to England in the sense that many captives returned expecting readmission to his natal society. The timing of Smith’s return from slavery in the Islamic East enabled him to avoid the arduous task of reintegrating himself into his natal society. Smith left the English center with an amplified class-consciousness when presented with the opportunity to venture into North America. He soon found out that this new colonial space could be home to a new peripheral English community—one that could nurture his aspiration for social mobility.

If Smith is remembered today as one of the most noteworthy pioneers of English colonization of North America, it is paradoxically because of his active and conscious reconfiguration of his English identity. Mary Fuller underlines that Smith “wanted to be somebody, to be a hero—but not just any somebody, not a Turkish admiral or an Indian king, but an English worthy” (96). On his way to becoming an English worthy, Smith fashioned an English identity profiting from his overseas ethos—such as “conquistador, lover, convert, or pirate”—without losing his original English identity. In fact, Fuller
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54 One of the earliest accounts of English captivity in the Islamic East is Strange and wonderfull things. Happened to Richard Hasleton, borne at Braintree in Essex, in his ten yeares travailes in many forraine countries, which was printed in 1595.
further argues, Smith managed to do more than preserve his English identity by way of reconfiguring it thanks to his transatlantic endeavors—he emerged as a figure who contributed to the “national narrative” of British empire-making. However, despite his contribution to the national narrative of the British Empire, Smith, I believe, did not consider himself a member of English metropolitan society nor did he want to be “an English worthy” as defined by the Old English hierarchical social model. We should look for no further proof than his constant transatlantic adventures for his lack of desire to be settled in the metropole. He was content with the idea of being in the periphery as long as he could have his dream of social fluidity fulfilled. His dream was fulfilled when he became the governor of Virginia and saved the colony from an imminent ruin by introducing a policy that significantly challenged the deeply rooted class structure the council was trying to transfer from England to Jamestown: “[H]e that will not worke shall not eate” (Smith *Genreall Historie* 174). Fellow colonizers’ discontent with Smith’s vision of a populist government that embraces Protestant work ethic is hardly surprising. Despite the brief lifespan of his experiment, though, Smith managed to prove that there was the possibility of a more fluid class structure outside of the British Isles. In that sense, we can argue that Smith was the first to challenge the English aristocratic norms in the New World and this was possible due to his earlier experiences that enabled him to reconfigure his English identity and emerge as a self-made man.

In a fashion that implies Smith’s being comfortable with the idea of adapting to Turkish ways, marrying a Muslim woman and establishing himself in a life outside his native country, Smith never comments in *The True Travels* on his Turkish mistress’ intention to marry him after he learns “the language, and what it was to be a Turke” (31).
This authorial move in a way reveals Smith’s contentment with the prospect of settling in any other geography than England as long as he could find social mobility. In that respect, he shows a stark difference from the early modern captives I discuss in the first chapter, whose only desire was to return to England despite their relatively comfortable conditions in Barbary. While he did not share the mindset of the Barbary captives mentioned earlier, Smith resembled the English organ maker, Thomas Dallam, in terms of his aspirations, yet he did not have the same talent and social background as Dallam to secure himself a place among the English elite. There is one more representative of English colonization whose experience is in many ways comparable to that of Smith although he came into being as a fictional character around a century after Smith: Robinson Crusoe. Just like Smith, Crusoe experiences Barbary captivity before “colonizing” his island in the Caribbean Sea. What makes Crusoe deserve a brief mention here, though, is not just the resemblance of his transatlantic experience to that of Smith. Crusoe might be the ultimate representative of the British Empire in the making as Linda Colley argues (1), but what happens to his ties to England in the process is what needs the most attention. *Robinson Crusoe* ends with its protagonist finding out, upon his return to England, that he was left out of his father’s will because his family believed him dead. Finding out there was no prospect for him in England, Crusoe had no other option but to rely on his estate in Brazil. In other words, Crusoe could only establish himself in life after his return to the “civilized” world by relying on the outcomes of his transatlantic experiences—on resources existing outside of England. It is exactly for this reason that John Smith and Robinson Crusoe can be considered as the embodiments of the British Empire. If, as Colley points out, “[d]omestic smallness and a lack of self-sufficiency
made for continuous British extroversion” (10), it was inevitable for Englishmen like Smith and Crusoe to look for prosperity outside their small islands. However, venturing out to the periphery was not without its risks—especially considering the threats against English identity that were believed to lurk outside the English soil.

The topic of early modern English anxiety over national and religious identity has received much attention from critics who treated it from various perspectives. Scholars agree that early modern Britons believed English bodies to be vulnerable to the influence of foreign cultures within which they peregrinated as travelers, merchants, sailors, or colonizers. In his discussion of this vulnerability in the New World context, John Canup underlines the early modern “concern that transplantation into an alien environment would transform English people into ‘Americans’ ” by turning them into “new creatures more compatible with the wilderness of America than with the relatively tame England that had formed their native temperament” (4). Jim Egan, Karen Ordahl Kupperman, and Joyce Chaplin, on the other hand, describe in their studies how the proponents of colonization had to appease the English anxiety over the possible adverse effects of the unfamiliar climate and geography of the New World on the British subjects intending to settle there. Encouraging English settlement in the New World required the proponents of colonization to produce counterarguments to the propaganda that leaving England meant leaving the English identity behind.55

Just as the danger of “turning Turk” was a very real source of anxiety for early modern Englishmen encountering the Muslim Other, “going native” was a similar threat to English subjects who were to settle in the New World among Native Americans.\(^{56}\) However, although the fear of “turning Turk” and “going native” might seem to be similar, early modern Englishmen’s experience among Muslims and Native Americans were not comparable and we can differentiate between the two notions and the rhetorics that characterized these notions. Jonathan Burton’s formulation that early modern Britons were concerned about “how to turn to the Turks without ‘turning Turk’” (18) helps explain this difference. The notion of “turning Turk” suggests a dynamic act of transformation that is not characterized by the idea of settling in the land of Muslims but by the fear that the allure of Islam and Turks might have an immediate effect on the English subject upon merely turning his face towards east. However, the notion of “going native” suggests a thorough and gradual transformation that was feared to be a result of settlement in and adapting to the conditions of a foreign geography yielding to the English subject’s estrangement from his natal bonds. Going native in the New World was not just about the psychological adaptation that the settlers experienced in the new environment, but it was believed to be a physiological adaptation to the harsher climate and geography of the New World as well. In other words, “going native” was feared to be
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an unavoidable physical and psychological change if the English subject wanted to settle outside the British Isles.\textsuperscript{57}

The Indian captivity narrative genre emerged amidst the above-mentioned concerns over the vulnerability of English bodies settling in the New World among the indigenous inhabitants of North America. Unlike Barbary captivity narratives written by ex-captives who were restored to their birthplace after a long period of captivity and enslavement, Indian captivity narratives were written by Britons who were not necessarily contemplating a return to England. They were settling in the New World despite the manifold threats against their bodies as well as identities. More importantly, they were supposed to procreate new “English” subjects in a completely un-English environment. English settlers in the New World were faced with an acute paradox: they were supposed to Anglicize the foreign geography if a new English settlement was to be founded there yet at the same time they had to take advantage of the un-Englishness of their new environment to fashion a new settler-colonial identity. Given the time and effort the process of Anglicization would take, English settlers first turned to the most convenient solution to the lurking threat of losing English identity—pitting the English body and identity against those of Native Americans. According to Jim Egan, “Colonial New English rhetoric seized on the Native Americans for purposes of preserving

Englishness. According to this rhetoric, the English body remained English by virtue of its difference from the Indian body” as it was believed that “any English body was aristocratic and by nature more balanced than the Indian body” (Egan Authorizing 24). In that sense, settling in the New World by default gave the colonists a sense of superiority that they lacked in England due to the rigid hierarchical social system. This sense of superiority in turn created a new sense of Englishness as we observe in the case of John Smith who believed in the possibility of social mobility in the New World. This newly defined Englishness would over time position itself against the English aristocracy and result in the birth of an Anglo-American identity within the next century.58

One concern over British expansion in the age of discovery was over the possible undesirable consequences of expanding “the unchanging, limited, and closed aristocratic body” (Egan Authorizing 26). Egan underlines that “[t]his enlargement of the body politic was complicated by the fact that bodies buried in England provided the basis of English monarchical rule.” For this reason, establishing an English dominion outside the British Isles suggested that the English subjects who would settle there were going to be dangerously far from the influence of the English aristocracy and monarchy rooted in the English soil and therefore become vulnerable to the contaminating influences of the New World (Egan Authorizing 26). As a counterargument to this belief, proponents of colonization promoted the idea that it was not the place that made the person but the person that made the place.59 It is within this framework that I will scrutinize the settler-colonialist discourse of Indian captivity narratives. Indian captivity narratives were the

58 For an explanation of the various terms I use to refer to this identity throughout this project, see p. 135 n. 72.
59 See Egan, Authorizing Experience, Chapter 1.
means by which English settlers could prove to fellow Englishmen in the metropole that they were in the process of creating an English place in the periphery. Creation of a new English dominion relied on English reproduction and the procreation of pure and healthy English progeny depended on the perpetuation of English domestic welfare: in other words, on the existence of chaste and domestic Englishwomen.

This issue of settlement and procreation in the New World, distinct from English travel in the Ottoman empire, resulted in two separate traditions of captivity narrative—Barbary and Indian—each of which employ two different rhetorics of othering characterized by gendered voices. The Indian captivity narrative, Mary Rowlandson’s *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* (1682) being its most well-known representative, is traditionally perceived as a genre that is predominantly represented by women.60 The other tradition of the captivity narrative genre, Barbary captivity, shows completely different characteristics. Not until the late eighteenth-century was a Barbary captivity narrative authored by a female ex-captive.61 In addition to the lack of a female voice, hardly a female figure appears in Barbary captivity narratives published throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Curiously, among a handful of women mentioned in these narratives, an Englishwoman can never be found. While the gender dichotomy in Indian captivity narratives is not as drastic as in Barbary captivity narratives—there are many male representatives of the tradition—there is a significant emphasis in these narratives on values that were associated with female identity among English settlers such as chastity, domesticity, and reproduction. Moreover, as Nancy
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60 See June Namias’s *White Captives* (2005) and Linda Colley’s *Captives* (2007).
Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse underline, even the male representatives of the genre “wrote from a position akin to that of women and children” since they “owned neither their labor nor their bodies” and therefore their eighteenth-century readers did most probably not deem them to be men (Armstrong and Tennenhouse Imaginary 204).

The gender dichotomy between the two traditions of the captivity narrative genre gives us significant clues about colonial American and British attitudes towards the Other (Native American and Muslim) and the discourse employed to (re)present these Others in Indian and Barbary captivity narratives. Both discourses show ambivalent attitudes towards the non-English other and utilize a rhetoric of othering to redefine what being English means in the face of the other. The settler-colonialist discourse of the Indian captivity narrative genre is more concerned with the reproduction of new English subjects in the New World while the rhetoric of othering employed in Barbary captivity narratives is meant to work towards reintegrating the British subject to his native culture as I discuss in the previous chapter. In that respect, the authors of Indian captivity narratives were not as concerned about their reception back in the center as the ex-Barbary captives who had to prove their Englishness to their audience to gain readmission to the English society. If we employ the framework of “writing oneself into existence” to contextualize Indian captivity narratives, we can argue that these narratives worked towards writing British subjects in the New World into existence as settler-colonists for whom acculturation was inevitable and even the requirement of the successful colonization of North America.

The main idea that characterizes the rhetoric of othering employed in the two different traditions of the captivity narrative genre is the idea of “returning” home—or to the English center—and the reception of the ex-captive in his or her native community.
As I have discussed in the previous chapter, ex-Barbary captives received a disappointing treatment upon their return to England and had trouble in reintegrating themselves into English society. In order to defeat the threat of social alienation they faced again upon their return from Barbary, ex-captives frequently emphasized that they were not contaminated and maintained their distinct English qualities despite having spent too much time among their Muslim captors. Ex-Indian captives, however, did not have such a concern. Once they returned from Indian captivity to their New English communities, they received much more favorable treatment than Barbary captives had received after their return to England. For instance, as Armstrong and Tennenhouse point out in their discussion of Rowlandson’s return to her community from Indian captivity, “Rowlandson ends up pretty much where she begins, in the bosom of her family and friends…and her return appears to restore that community's original state of wholeness” (Armstrong and Tennenhouse Imaginary 211). The popularity of her narrative on both sides of the Atlantic, they add, was contingent upon its message that an Englishwoman “could feel secure only with a specific English male and the offspring they produced together” (211).

Furthering their point, I argue that the success of Rowlandson’s narrative also depended on its representation of the Native American Other as a threat to English domesticity and reproduction. As we also see in the later Indian captivity narrative of Hannah Dustan, to which I will turn later in this chapter, the Native American threat to English reproduction was perceived as a more tangible peril than the assimilation of the English subjects into Native American culture. In that sense, we can argue that the threat of “going native” in the New World was not as intimidating as the threat of “turning Turk” after being exposed to the Islamic culture. As settler-colonists, English subjects in North America
were bound to adjust to their new locus of settlement, but since there was no prospect of settling in Barbary as superiors to the Muslim Other, there was no excuse for assimilation to justify Barbary captives’ assimilation into the Muslim culture. On the other hand, if English subjects wanted to establish a successful colony in North America, they had to outpopulate Native Americans, and therefore, the more the Native American Other was a threat to English procreation the more he had to be demonized. For this reason, the early Indian captivity narrative pioneered by Mary Rowlandson was not only interested in creating an image of the new English female subject as fertile, chaste, and domestic but also in amplifying this new image by pitting it against the Native American Other who was a threat to English reproduction. To tease out how representations of the Native American Other function within the larger tradition of the Indian captivity narrative genre, we should first turn to Rowlandson’s paradigmatic text.

Mary Rowlandson’s 1682 narrative, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* was not just a bestseller of her time; it also has long enjoyed great attention from literary scholars. Among many reasons why Rowlandson’s text is considered an emblematic example of colonial American literature is her female authorship. Many scholars have focused on the significance of her gender as a published author in the Puritan community and the ways Rowlandson abides by the gender constructions of her time. My focus,
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62 Rowlandson’s narrative enjoyed an unprecedented response from colonial American readers. The first edition of *The Sovereignty* was sold out immediately and the existing copies were passed around among many different readers. Today, no complete copy of this first edition exists. Printers in the colonies were quick to print new editions of the text in 1682 and 1720. (Colley Captives 151)

however, is on the larger implications of the dominance of the female voice in a genre that emerged in a patriarchal Puritan community.

Rowlandson starts the narrative of her three-month-long captivity among Native Americans—specifically among Nipmuc, Narrangansett and Wampanoag Indians—with a graphic depiction of the Indian attack on Lancaster. Rowlandson’s opening chapter is by no means particular to her text as almost all Indian captivity narratives start with detailed depictions of Native American attacks, thus enabling the readers to vividly imagine the chaos and brutality the attacks entailed. While these sensationalistic depictions of torture and massacre on the first pages of many narratives provided the very first image of the Native American Other to English readers in the metropole, their function within the larger narrative, I argue, was not merely to create an abhorrent image of the Native American Other, but also to spread the settler-colonialist ideology that the English domesticity had to be preserved against the threats prevalent in the New World in order to establish successful English colonies there. Yet, reading these depictions as mere products of xenophobia and colonial imagery would only yield a partial understanding of the Indian captivity narrative tradition. More complex and even benevolent images of Native Americans that appear on the subsequent pages of the very same narratives complicate and contest these xenophobic imageries of the Native American Other. While I do not intend to ignore the frequent depictions of Native Americans in sweeping terms such as “murderous wretches,” “merciless heathen,” or “barbarous creatures” by Rowlandson and other captives, I also believe focusing too much on xenophobic and colonial imagery blinds us to what these narratives have to say about captives’ perception of the self rather than about the otherness of their Native American captors. Therefore, I
would like to offer a reading of these depictions as reflections of anxiety over the loss of female values to Indian captivity such as domesticity, fertility, and chastity that were deemed the backbone of the Puritan society.

The first chapter of Rowlandson’s *Sovereignty*, as I have mentioned before, opens with a depiction of the Native American attack on her home: “On the tenth of February 1675, came the Indians with great numbers upon Lancaster: their first coming was about sunrising; hearing the noise of some guns, we looked out; several houses were burning, and the smoke ascending to heaven.” By introducing her reading that the natives start their attack “about sunrising,” Rowlandson accentuates the violent disruption of the serenity of the Puritan town. The noise of guns pierces its silence and the first images seen by the Rowlandson family upon waking are the burnt-down houses with their “smoke ascending to heaven.” With the image of burning houses, Rowlandson sensationalizes the destruction of English domesticity. With her depiction of smoke ascending to heaven as if to unite with God, she suggests that although English domestic welfare might be under Native American threat, it is still under God’s protection.

In the very first paragraph of her narrative, Rowlandson uses a variety of motifs that represent domesticity. Right after the image of burning English houses comes the brutal slaying of “the father, and the mother and a sucking child” of an English family. While this family consists of five people, the “other two” remain anonymous, the focus being on “the father, the mother, and the sucking child”: in other words, on the nuclear English family upon whom depends the success of English colonization of North America. The possibility that the anonymous “other two” are the older children of this family highlights the image of the sucking child. This image of a nursing baby under
threat forms an indispensable part of Indian captivity narratives and delineates English concern over perpetuating domestic welfare and procreation in colonial America. Rowlandson’s opening chapter reflects anxiety over the destruction of English family and identity by repeatedly emphasizing the efforts of Indians to separate children from their mothers and English mothers’ struggles to avoid separation from their children. “Infidels,” she narrates, “[were] hauling mothers one way, and children another” only to repeat on the next page that Indians pulled her “one way, and the children another.” God never wishes an English child to separate from her mother, even in death, Rowlandson suggests when she gives an account of how her sister’s prayers to die after receiving the news of her son’s demise were answered the moment she uttered them. Rowlandson’s opening chapter, in that sense, is as much concerned with perpetuating the sanctity of the English family as creating a xenophobic image of the Native American Other.

While the opening chapter of Sovereignty shows more anxiety over the destruction of the English family than anything else, the subsequent chapters reveal another anxiety of a similar nature. Along with posing an enormous threat to English domesticity and procreation, Indians were procreating themselves. Rowlandson does not hide her bewilderment that God keeps “preserving the heathen” upon seeing hundreds of Indians “old and young, some sick, and some lame; many had papooses at their backs.” Later on when the papoose of her Indian mistress dies, Rowlandson does not think twice and admits that she “could not much condole with them” and even sees a benefit in “its” death—“that there was more room.” Her statement is curiously ambiguous as it initially suggests lack of space in the wigwam for the Native American family and Rowlandson together, but it also reveals Rowlandson’s settler-colonist belief that there is not enough
room for Native Americans and English settlers to share in the New World. As a mother who has just lost a child herself, Rowlandson is remarkably unmoved by another woman’s loss of her child. On a personal level, she considers the death of the Native American baby a compensation for the death of her own child and reflects on her own sorrow: “Many sorrowful days I had in this place, often getting alone.” But when we consider the fact that her narrative is the embodiment of a settler-colonialist discourse, we can see why Rowlandson assumes a more matter-of-fact tone and focuses on the pragmatic effects of the decline of Native American population. As Patrick Wolfe underlines in his discussion of settler-colonist mentality, “[w]hatever settlers may say—and they generally have a lot to say—the primary motive for elimination is not race (or religion, ethnicity, grade of civilization, etc.) but access to territory” (Wolfe Settler 388). Kathryn Derounian-Stodola and James Levernier, in a similar fashion emphasize the significance of access to fertile land for English settlers and argue that “[o]nly after it became evident that using Indian lands to grow tobacco and cotton held more economic promise than trade did a more negative stereotype of the Indian begin to emerge.” (Derounian and Levernier The Indian 58). In that sense, as much as Rowlandson initially seems to be pitting the devout Puritan self against the pagan Native American in her bewilderment over God’s preservation of the “heathen,” her later lack of compassion over the death of a Native American baby reflects her settler-colonist concern over territory.

Rowlandson’s bewilderment over the number of Native American women with babies on their backs serves no other purpose than juxtaposing English procreation with that of Native American. She reflects the English concern over being outnumbered by
Native Americans if they continue to reproduce at the same rate. As an attempt to suppress her anxiety over Native American procreation, she finds it necessary to glorify English domestic life by contrasting it with Native American nomadism. She cannot help but notice that “[t]he greatest number at this time with us were squaws, and they traveled with all they had, bag and baggage, and yet they got over this river aforesaid; and on Monday they set their wigwams on fire, and away they went.” In this description, she conceals her scorn for a Native American nomadic lifestyle that does not have a well-defined role for each gender, unlike the domestic life that the English glorify. Native American women, just like their men, carry everything they have in their bags and they don’t look back when it is time to burn down their wigwams and move on. In this nomadic life, women have to be physically strong enough to cross the rivers and carry all their belongings together with their babies on their backs. Native American women only differ from men in their childbearing abilities; therefore, it is alarming to Rowlandson that there are more Native American women than men around her. In other words, Rowlandson experiences anxiety over Native American women’s fertility that is combined with their physical strength. One can see her bewilderment upon observing how Native American women do not fulfill the necessary roles of the female sex according to her English understanding such as preserving the family and the house.
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64 Carol Berkin outlines in *Revolutionary Mothers* (2007) that colonial English men and women “took the gendered world as they found it” and perceived the woman as “a helpmate to man.” It was expected from the woman that she be obedient, loyal, industrious, and frugal. In the gendered world she occupied, “her natural function was bearing and nurturing children” (4). In 1712, Benjamin Wadsworth described women’s role as “keepers of the home” and the hierarchy within the household was strictly determined with the wife placed “under the obedience of her husband” (qtd. in Berkin 4).
These women do not even look back when it is time to destroy their houses and Rowlandson can only shudder at the idea that they are responsible for parenting children.

The anxiety over Native American women’s unsuitability for motherhood is further perpetuated in later Indian captivity narratives when settlers are faced with the possibility that English babies might be Nursed by Native American women. Captives to Jeagas of Florida in 1696, Jonathan Dickinson and his wife initially feel uneasy when the wife of the Indian chief begins nursing their baby. Despite feeling relatively comfortable with the idea once they observe their son gaining his health back, they cannot help but feel extremely concerned about their child’s fate if they are executed by their captors: “One thing did seem more grievous to me and my wife, than any other thing; which was, that if it so happen’d that we should be put to death, we feared that our child would be kept alive, and bred up as one of those people: When these thoughts did arise, it wounded us deep” (50). According to Pauline Strong Turner, the Dickinsons’ anxiety over their son’s ingesting a Native American woman’s breast milk should be read next to their fear of cannibalism: “Breast-feeding, like cannibalism, involves the incorporation of the substance of another. When this substance belongs not to a mother but to an Other, breast-feeding becomes a form of transformation and appropriation” (156). The Dickinsons unquestionably face a dilemma in this situation; their six-month-old son would either die of malnutrition or live with the danger of “transformation and appropriation.” While their anxiety seems to be solely geared towards the fate of their child, it unquestionably has larger implications. Baby Dickinson in a way represents the English settlers, who were dependent on Native American resources and benevolence in order to survive in the New World. Considering the mother-daughter analogy that was
used to describe the colonies’ relationship with Britain, English settlers were conscious of
the fact that they were not nurtured by their mother but by resources belonging to an
Other, who had an inherently different nature. To apply Strong’s formulation, they were
under threat of “transformation and appropriation” and this threat was even more acutely
felt by Rowlandson when she faced the androgynous Native American women and
realized that assimilation into their culture would pose a threat to the patriarchal and
domestic English family on which the continuity of the English colonization of North
America depended. Rowlandson’s anxiety proves valid with respect to later experiences
of English female captives, particularly that of Hannah Dustan, who inverts gender roles
in the absence of her husband and kills her captors—an entire Native American family—to
escape from captivity. However, despite her inversion of gender roles, as I will discuss
later, Dustan still emerges as a celebrated figure and is embraced by her community
because her actions are considered a retaliation for the slaying of her infant by her Native
American captors, in other words, for the disturbance of English domesticity and
reproduction.

Feeling threatened by the inversion of gender roles enacted by Native American
women, Rowlandson dignifies English domesticity by emphasizing her vulnerability in
the face of the harsh climate as well as the long journeys enforced by her Indian captors.
As a domestic Englishwoman, Rowlandson was only supposed to procreate and to
perpetuate English domestic welfare and was therefore unsuited for a long journey in the
harsh climate of New England. She emphasizes her weakness when she mentions how
“my head was light and dizzy (either through hunger or hard lodging, or trouble or all
together), my knees feeble, my body raw by sitting double night and day.” A few
paragraphs later, after describing crossing a river in canoes made out of dry trees, she underlines how her feet did not get wet “as a favor of God to my weakened body, it being a very cold time.” What follows this description deserves attention as Rowlandson mentions immediately that she “was not before acquainted with such kind of doings or dangers” perpetuating the image of domestic Englishwoman who would not survive these hardship were it not for God’s protection. Indian captivity, she suggests, not only keeps an Englishwoman away from her community and loved ones but also exposes her to a lifestyle that threatens her domesticity. By naming each chapter of her narrative a “remove,” Rowlandson not only implies her anxiety over her removal from English society as some scholars suggest, but also highlights the physical burden the action of constant removals requires.  

Just as expected from a true Puritan, Rowlandson relies on a providentialist framework and attributes her survival under harsh conditions to God’s protection over English settlers. However, the threat against her image of domestic woman posed by constant removals and interactions with Native American women required her to rewrite herself into existence as a domestic Englishwoman whose female identity has remained uncontaminated despite the time she spent among nomadic Native Americans. In order to do that, Rowlandson often narrates how she kept herself busy with domestic and maternal duties during her captivity. Through these depictions, Rowlandson advances the notion that skill matters in the New World rather than noble blood. In her case as an Englishwoman whose fertility and virtue is the precondition of a successful English
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settlement, these skills include domestic and female ones such as knitting, sewing, and the most importantly childbearing. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich considers Rowlandson’s survival of Indian captivity an outcome of her “use of English huswifery in the services of her captors” (227). However, Michelle Burnham directs attention to the paradox Rowlandson’s situation creates: “while the skills Rowlandson employs may be those of the English housewife, her structural deployment of those skills moves away from the Anglo-American model and toward conformity with the Amerindian culture in which she was living” (29). In that regard, Rowlandson’s narrative of her experience as an Indian captive demonstrates how ideas of Englishness were bound to change in the New World and that English settlers were not necessarily uncomfortable with the idea of adaptation as long as the female English subject could preserve her childbearing abilities and continue to procreate white English progeny. Reflecting this sentiment, Rowlandson makes constant references to her motherhood, demonstrating a desire to be remembered as an Anglo-Christian mother more than anything else. The readers of her narrative are given an image of Rowlandson as a mother whose greatest concern is to save her children and whose greatest pain is to witness her daughter getting wounded in her arms and later die. In the first three chapters (or “removes” as she names them) of her narrative, Rowlandson vividly depicts her agony in the face of a dying child, relying on an image of a suffering mother to nourish her readers’ sensibility. She keeps reminding her readers that she is still a mother—a domestic English woman whose sole purpose in life is to take care of her children and to maintain the welfare of her family.

Rowlandson emphasizes that her maternal duties remained strong during her captivity despite the many physical and emotional hardships she experienced. She
endured the death of a child but remained strong for her other children. After her daughter’s death, Rowlandson turns her attention to her remaining children whom she saw briefly on a couple of occasions. “God having taken away this dear child,” she mentions, “I went to see my daughter Mary.” Rowlandson’s attempt to see her daughter proves futile as Mary’s master does not let the two unite even for a short period of time. Right after her abortive attempt to see her daughter, Rowlandson finds a temporary relief when her son comes to visit. Rowlandson notes that it was the wife of her son’s master who brought him to Rowlandson, giving her readers one of the first images of a benevolent Native American that complicates the xenophobic images of the Native American Other abundant in Indian captivity narratives. One can only speculate as to the motivation of this Native American woman in bringing Rowlandson her son given that Rowlandson herself does not ponder over it but “took this to be some gracious answer to my earnest and unfeigned desire.” Despite Rowlandson’s attribution of the Native American woman’s gesture to God’s providence, in her revelation of this gesture there is a subtle reference to female camaraderie. Probably a mother herself, this Native American woman must have empathized with Rowlandson and decided to let the mother and son unite albeit temporarily. Rowlandson in a way returns her gesture by letting her readers know about the benevolence of this Native American woman. Rowlandson’s acknowledgement of a Native American woman’s “female” virtue also suggests that she tries to find relief from her previous anxiety over Native American women’s dangerously masculine ways. She in a way relieves her English readers that her assimilation into the Native American culture would not necessarily deprive her from her female virtues and transform her into androgynous women she has observed previously.
Rowlandson loses one child and gets to see her other two children within a chapter and probably within the duration of a day or two. She depicts herself as first and foremost a mother and only after she is relieved of her motherly anxieties by seeing her son, whose whereabouts she did not previously know, was she relieved of her religious anxiety by coming into possession of a Bible. As noted by Armstrong and Tennenhouse, as a white female captive among Native Americans, Rowlandson “describes her solitary state as a significantly fallen one in contrast with direct participation in the community of believers” (207). While her isolation from her Puritan community often encourages her to rely on God’s mercy in a time of great distress, her recurring references to being surrounded by a great number “pagan” Native Americans reflect her anxiety as a Christian woman who fears that God might “cast [her] out of His presence forever.” Rowlandson eventually finds relief from her distressing thoughts when given a Bible by one of the Native Americans returning from a fight in Medfield. It bears repeating that this Bible arrives the day after Rowlandson reunites with her son. In that sense, Rowlandson writes herself into existence first as a mother—the reproductive force of English settlers, in other words—and then a Christian: this sequence reveals the ways in which Rowlandson contributes to an emerging settler-colonialist discourse whose priority is to justify outnumbering Native Americans not for religious reasons but for access to territory.66

Rowlandson’s first reflection on what she read in her newfound Bible demonstrates her privileging of motherhood over Christianity. While her initial reading of the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy does not give her the hope she needs, she finds the

---

66 See Wolfe’s “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” p. 388.
encouragement she is looking for in chapter 30, which promises her and the Christians that “though we were scattered from one end of the earth to the other, yet the Lord would gather us together, and turn all those curses upon our enemies.” Rowlandson finds comfort in the promise that her family will come together no matter how far away they are from each other now. But there is also more at stake in this section of her Bible. The line clearly refers to the large number of Christians by promising an end to their dispersion from “one end of the earth to the other” and prophesizes an end to Native American lineage with a curse upon them. The first relief Rowlandson finds in her Bible is God’s promise of a reunion with her family and the continuum of English reproduction, which in the end will result in the outnumbering of Native Americans by Europeans. This newfound hope revives Rowlandson’s spirits and gives her strength to help other English captives as well.

Intriguingly, the first person Rowlandson tries to help is a pregnant English woman who entertains the idea of running away. Able to see the impossibility of carrying out this plan by a pregnant woman with a two-year-old child, Rowlandson turns to her Bible to offer relief to this Englishwoman. God tells her to “Wait on the Lord, Be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine Heart.” This happens to be the closing sentence of the third chapter of Rowlandson’s narrative in which she constructs an image of herself as first a mother and then an obedient Christian. Rowlandson, however, does not forget to inform her readers about the sad fate of this Englishwoman. Being very close to her due date, this poor woman keeps begging her Native American captors to let her go home to no avail. Unwilling to send her home yet irritated by her importunity, her captors give her a horrific execution the details of which require attention:
They] gathered a great company together about her and stripped her naked, and set her in the midst of them, and when they had sung and danced about her (in their hellish manner) as long as they pleased they knocked her on head, and the child in her arms with her. When they had done that they made a fire and put them both into it.

The scene, with its depiction of Native Americans singing and dancing around a pregnant Englishwoman and her other child in her arms before slaying both of them, makes the reader wonder why her captors did not choose to slay her quickly. Making their decision even more enigmatic is their killing of the two-year-old child as well just because his mother begged for her freedom. Execution of this Englishwoman together with her child and unborn baby is intriguingly depicted as a ritual that involves dancing and singing. Frequent descriptions of Native Americans as temperamental people in Rowlandson’s text as well as other Indian captivity narratives make one expect a sudden killing of the woman by one irritable Native American. However, this scene suggests a planned sacrifice that involves dancing and singing around the victims. In that sense, in this ritual an Englishwoman is not just killed but English fertility and domesticity are eradicated. Rowlandson suggests that Native Americans feel threatened by a pregnant English woman and a little English child, in other words, by English procreation. While they knock the woman and her child on the head and kill them once their singing and dancing is over, this apparently does not satisfy them as suggested by their burning of the bodies afterwards. Burning the bodies after execution suggests a closure to the ritual. While the woman and her child are knocked on the head, the baby inside the woman’s womb, the ultimate symbol of English fertility in that ritual, does not receive any visible harm.
Burning, it is suggested, ensures the annihilation of the fetus physically and the destruction of English fertility ritually. Rowlandson’s depiction of this scene might at first seem like just another contribution to the xenophobic images of Native Americans and it definitely is so. What is important to keep in mind, though, is how this imagery is implanted in the context of the Native American threat to English fertility and reproduction. In other words, the more the Native American Other threatens English reproduction, the more horribly he and she should be depicted.

In the middle of these physical, psychological and emotional trials, Rowlandson manages to establish an image of herself as a strong Christian who never parts with her Bible and finds relief in it from any challenge she faces. As I have mentioned before, the first challenge she manages to overcome, thanks to her Bible, is the fear of never being able to see her family again. Immediately after receiving her Bible, she turns to Deuteronomy and in it finds God’s promise that “the Lord would gather us together.” Not long after she falls captive and her family is dispersed in the wilderness, she is thus given reassurance that she will find the comfort of her family soon. While the Biblical references throughout her narrative enable her to emphasize God’s providence in Indian captivity, a defining characteristic of all Indian captivity narratives, it also helps her maintain her image as a Bible-reading domestic woman despite spending three months in the wilderness among Native Americans. This image was undoubtedly a requirement for the narrative of an Englishwoman who had spent a dangerously long time among the Native American Other. To discuss the significance of Bible-reading for an Englishwoman further, I now turn to another Indian captivity narrative, John Williams’s The Redeemed Captive (1707). By juxtaposing Williams’s last image of his dying wife to
Rowlandson’s self-depiction as a Bible-reading woman, I will demonstrate how this image is a staple of an emerging settler-colonialist discourse.

John Williams, the minister of Deerfield, fell captive to Indian and French soldiers in 1704 together with his family. Twenty-five years after the publication of Rowlandson’s *Sovereignty*, Williams published *The Redeemed Captive*, another well-known representative of the Indian captivity narrative genre although less canonical than that of Rowlandson.67 Opening in the middle of the action with a description of the Native American attack on Deerfield, Williams’s narrative immediately fulfills one of the first requirements of the genre. When juxtaposed with Rowlandson’s narrative, Williams’s opening does not show significant differences in any aspect but one. Having been awoken from his sleep by the Indian attack, Williams immediately reaches for his pistol to defend himself. The image of the passive woman in Rowlandson’s narrative who only takes her children to run away is replaced with that of the active male in *The Redeemed Captive*. However, his active defense, which cannot prevent him from falling captive, does not make him forget about his family, especially his wife who has just given birth. “I cannot relate,” Williams reflects, “the distressing care I had for my dear wife, who had lain-in but a few weeks before, and for my poor children, family, and Christian neighbours.” With this concern is highlighted again the disruptive effect of Indian captivity on the English family. This idea is further perpetuated once Williams informs his readers that Indians immediately killed two of his children and later his wife when she lost her strength to keep up with the rest of the company.

67 John Williams’s narrative “was published in Boston in 1707, and reprinted in America half a dozen times over the course of the century.” Unlike Rowlandson’s *Sovereignty*, though, it was never printed in Britain (Colley *Captives* 153).
Not possessing the necessary strength to endure the long and challenging journey as a domestic English woman, Williams’s wife informs her husband that he will soon need to leave her behind. Before long, she is proven right by their master who forces Williams to march with the rest of the company. It is right after this moment of farewell that Williams depicts a final image of his wife in an attempt to immortalize her as a Bible-reading domestic English woman:

After our being parted from one another, she spent the few remaining minutes of her stay in reading the holy Scriptures; which she was wont personally every day to delight her soul in reading, praying, meditating of, and over, by herself, in her closet, over and above what she heard out of them in our family worship. (18)

Williams’s description of his wife’s last minutes is significant in two respects. First and foremost, it superimposes English domestic space over the North American wilderness revealing an English settler-colonial imaginary that is ready to perceive each and every corner of the new land as “home.” On another level, Williams suggest that regardless of whether she is in the wilderness as a captive or in her closet as a wife and mother, an English woman always conserves her domestic habits. It is hard to ignore how both Rowlandson’s and Williams’s narratives strive to establish similar imagery with regard to English domestic womanhood. Regardless of the gender of their authors, both narratives revolve around female virtues suggesting how the first and foremost victim under the threat of Indian captivity is English domesticity and reproduction.

While Williams’s wife is killed “at one stroke” by her Native American master, earning herself an everlasting image as a Bible-reading wife, Rowlandson survives her three-month trial and finds herself having to prove, while still experiencing the
traumatizing effects of captivity, that she is still a virtuous Christian woman and a mother despite her long exposure to the nomadic and “barbaric” lifestyle of the Native American Other. Her experience as the author of a narrative outlining her captivity to the non-English Other shows similarities with the experience of ex-Barbary captives, who felt obliged to prove that they were still the same person despite their long interactions with the Muslim Other. As Colley points out, the ex-captives, by penning their narratives, could receive “a measure of control…tell their sides of the story, put themselves at the center of the plot, and make it clear that they still matter” (84). In other words, both Barbary and Indian captivity narratives represent the attempts of ex-captives to write themselves into existence after experiencing the dehumanization of captivity, and in some cases, slavery. Despite this strategic similarity, though, these two traditions of the captivity narrative genre show a paradigmatic difference when it comes to the fulfillment of the goals their authors would like to achieve. As I discuss in the previous chapter, Barbary captivity narratives are the embodiments of their authors’ confusion with regards to their identity and often exemplify the failure of ex-Barbary captives to reintegrate themselves into their natal societies. The Indian captivity genre, on the other hand, works towards creating a new settler-colonialist identity in the New English society. Indian captives were participating in the building of a New English society that was open to the idea of assimilation whereas Barbary captives were trying to gain re-admittance to the old English society characterized by rigid social norms that refused anything and anybody.

---

68 For an analysis of the psychological commentary Rowlandson’s narrative contains, see Kathryn Zabelle Derounian’s “Puritan Orthodoxy and the ‘Survivor Syndrome’ in Mary Rowlandson's Indian Captivity Narrative” (1987).
un-English. For this reason, reintegrating into their native societies was an easier task for the ex-Indian captives than it was for the ex-Barbary captives.

For Rowlandson, publishing the narrative of her captivity as a woman was without doubt a difficult task, yet her success proves that she had a better lot as a female ex-captive in the New English community than her male counterparts in the old English community. Although she could only publish her narrative sandwiched between a preface authored by an anonymous male writer (who is most probably Increase Mather as argued by many scholars) and the last sermon her husband gave before his death in 1678, she could subvert her entrapment between two male voices by taking advantage of the settler-colonialist concern over female and domestic virtue as the backbones of English reproduction in the New World. The anonymous author of the preface to *Sovereignty* forewarns anyone who might “cast any reflection upon this Gentlewoman, on the score of this publication of her affliction and deliverance” right after underlining that “this Gentlewomans [sic] modesty would not thrust it into the Press.” Considering the idealized image of a Puritan woman as one who privately reads her Bible in her closet, Rowlandson’s publication of her narrative would inevitably cast a shadow on her reputation as a domestic English woman who was not supposed to reveal her private thoughts and emotions. It would certainly be considered forward by some for a woman to publish her writings and might even be seen as the first indication of how the time she spent among Native Americans in wilderness had irreversibly compromised her domesticity.\(^{69}\) So, while the Biblical references throughout her text suggest a

\(^{69}\) Michelle Burnham underlines that “Rowlandson’s record of her daily life among the Algonquins reveals her participation in a radically independent role” (28). Her participation in Native American daily life does not only suggest that she is beginning to
providentialist framework that is concerned with creating an image of the Native American Other as God’s scourge, her constant emphasis on female values such as motherhood, chastity and domesticity, when read in light of the preface to her narrative, compels us to consider that the motivational force behind Rowlandson’s publication of her narrative is to perpetuate her own image as a Christian mother and a domestic Englishwoman rather than merely to create a xenophobic image of the Native American Other. In fact, conflicting representations of the Native American Other, not just in *Sovereignty* but also in other Indian captivity narratives, as both barbarous and benevolent further supports my argument that these narratives are more concerned with maintaining the English self than demonizing the Indian Other. In other words, the demonizing depictions of the Native American Other in these narratives work towards perpetuating English domesticity—the more the Native American Other poses a threat to English domesticity the more horrifically he should be depicted.

As I have discussed in the previous pages, Rowlandson successfully creates an image of herself first as a mother and then a Christian woman within the first three chapters of her narrative. While the brutality of the Native American attack on Lancaster is emphasized in the opening pages of the narrative, my earlier close reading reveals that the focus of the opening pages is intriguingly on the destruction of English domestic welfare by the Native American Other. Rowlandson is understandably horrified by what she has witnessed and admits that the actual experience of the attack made her revise her previous reflections with regards to a possible attack:

---

conform “with the Amerindian culture in which she [is] living” but also move away “from the role of Puritan goodwife that she occupied when she was taken captive” (29).
I had often before this said that if the Indians should come, I should choose rather to be killed by them than taken alive, but when it came to the trial my mind changed; their glittering weapons so daunted my spirit, that I chose rather to go along with those (as I may say) ravenous beasts, than that moment to end my days; and that I may the better declare what happened to me during that grievous captivity.

In this confession Rowlandson reveals conflicting thoughts on two issues: captivity and self-representation. Her fear of being taken alive by Native Americans obviously suggests that Rowlandson has pondered Indian captivity, given the fact that it was a lurking threat at the time. Preferring to die rather than be held captive reveals that she entertained many horrific scenarios in her mind concerning the threat of captivity. However, once she experiences a real attack, she prefers captivity to death in the hope that she can “better declare what happened to me during that grievous captivity.” Contrary to what the author of the preface claims, Rowlandson from the very beginning desires to “declare” her experience not for the reasons that would taint her “modesty” but exactly because she wants to keep her modesty intact in the eyes of her people. She believes that only her own words can represent her as a compassionate mother and a Bible-reading domestic woman, despite being forced to live among the Native American Other in the wilderness for three months. But even more importantly, only Rowlandson herself could reassure her readers and her people that her chastity has never been under the slightest threat from these “ravenous beasts.”

Rowlandson inarguably employs her narrative to ease the minds of her people and eliminate any possible slander that she might face with regards to her chastity. As an
Englishwoman who is responsible for the procreation of white English progeny, she was acutely aware of such a slander’s devastating effects on her reputation and her survival in her natal community. While the ex-Barbary captive had to emphasize the intactness of his spiritual condition, a female captive like Rowlandson had to prioritize the intactness of her chastity—or her womb to put it more bluntly—over the strength of her Anglo-Christianity. The first time Rowlandson reassures her readers that her chastity has never received any threat from Native Americans is right after she recounts how she got lost while she was going to see her son who lived at a distance of one mile:

And I cannot but admire at the wonderful power and goodness of God to me, in that, though I was gone from home, and met with all sorts of Indians, and those I had no knowledge of, and there being no Christian soul near me; yet not one of them offered the least imaginable miscarriage to me.

Right before this reflection, Rowlandson relates how she “quickly lost [her]self, traveling over hills and through swamps” while looking for her son. Before going back to the paragraph above, I would like to briefly analyze Rowlandson’s double disorientation in this scene. As an Englishwoman who has been displaced when she fell captive to Native Americans and removed from her English community into the “wilderness,” she experiences further disorientation as demonstrated by her inability to navigate her way around the wilderness without the help of her master. The scene in that sense serves to amplify her double displacement. This double displacement is an indication of how Rowlandson has gradually come to embrace her new dwelling among Native Americans as her new normal, as her new home. This idea is further supported when she says, “I turned homeward again, and met with my master” after she fails to navigate her way to
where her son is being kept. Her master, in an act of benevolence, shows Rowlandson the way to her son, complicating again the demonizing depictions of the Native American Other abundant within her narrative. More significantly, in her reassurance to her readers that not a single Indian offered her “the imaginable miscarriage,” Rowlandson suggests that she perceives the Native American Other as capable of possessing various traits by underlining that she “met with all sorts of Indians, and those [she] had no knowledge of.” Here she not only admits that the more she got to know the Native Americans the more she began to trust them but also suggests that Native Americans, just like other people, show diversity among themselves. It was God’s goodness that Rowlandson believed saved her chastity, yet she apparently could not make herself act ungratefully toward her Indian captors. Right after this scene, Rowlandson reminds her readers again that she is a mother whose main concern is her children. Once she meets with her son with the help of her master, she finds out that he is in much pain due to “a boil on his side.” After commiserating with her son Rowlandson has to go back to her own dwelling place despite her discontent upon seeing him in pain. She describes herself as going “up and down mourning and lamenting; and my spirit was ready to sink with the thoughts of my poor children.” She then immediately turns her thoughts to her daughter, whom she “knew not where she was, nor whether she was sick, or well, or alive, or dead.” By putting her motherhood next to her chastity, she not only emphasizes that she has never been negligent of her domestic duties but also shames those who would think of questioning her chastity, reminding them of the agonies she went through as a captive mother.
The second time Rowlandson underlines how she was never offered “the least abuse of unchastity…in word or action” is right before she sets out to reunite with her English friends and family. Her rhetoric in this instance, therefore, differs significantly from her previous reflection on the same issue. Now that it is time to leave the company of the Native American Other for the company of her English community, it is necessary to complement the physical separation with a mental estrangement:

I have been in the midst of those roaring lions, and savage bears, that feared neither God, nor man, nor the devil, by night and day, alone and in company, sleeping all sorts together, and yet not one of them ever offered me the least abuse of unchastity to me, in word or action.

Her less biased and more inclusive rhetoric in the previous scene describing the Native American Other as a human being capable of showing various personality traits gives way in this case to a rhetoric of othering and demonization. Closest to her English community than at any point in her captivity, Rowlandson begins to remind herself of the inherent differences between the English subject and the Native American Other. In one of the final xenophobic depictions of the Native American Other in her narrative, Rowlandson not only writes herself into existence as a chaste Englishwoman, but also conveniently implies that the Native American community, “sleeping all sorts together,” does not have a sense of family in contrast to the English community, at the center of which is positioned the nuclear family with “the father, and the mother and a sucking child” living in their private and sanctioned household. With this final image of the Native American Other, Rowlandson provides relief to her readers on two issues: that no one has ever attempted to stain her chastity and that the Native American Other cannot
offer a threat to English settlers since their lack of domestic values will inevitably result in a decrease in their numbers. Only the English family can reproduce effectively and only thanks to virtuous Englishwomen, who will eventually be responsible for the successful colonization of the New World.

The providentialist framework, together with the rhetoric of othering, helps Rowlandson maintain her image not just as an untainted woman but also as a humble Christian returning to her community. Yet this return is not without its own anxieties as suggested by Rowlandson’s constant emphasis on her impeccable womanhood and motherhood. With the help of a small anecdote recounting a Native American couple’s suggestion to run away together with her, Rowlandson makes one last point before her reunion with the English community. The answer she gives to this couple is revealing in many aspects: “I told him no: I was not willing to run away, but desired to wait God's time, that I might go home quietly, and without fear.” In this answer is hidden her reminder to her people that she desired to go home “without fear.” Going home without fear had only one precondition: leaving everything “Native” behind. As much as her emphasis is on refusing to run away in this answer, it should not go unnoticed that she also refuses to bring a Native American couple with her. In a way, she reassures her people that she is returning to them without bringing any traces from her Indian captivity—not on her body, not on her faith—and therefore deserves to be readmitted to her community without fear.

As much as Rowlandson rejects assimilation to the Native American community, her narrative is replete with scenes suggesting her inevitable acculturation during her
three-month captivity. She admits, for instance, that her eating habits have gone through a significant change:

The first week of my being among them I hardly ate any thing; the second week I found my stomach grow very faint for want of something; and yet it was very hard to get down their filthy trash; but the third week, though I could think how formerly my stomach would turn against this or that, and I could starve and die before I could eat such things, yet they were sweet and savory to my taste.

Her hunger so drastically transforms Rowlandson that she could see no harm in taking from an English child’s hand a boiled horse foot that the child could only suck but not eat. But more significantly, Rowlandson integrates herself into the daily lives of Native Americans by participating in economic transactions through utilizing her domestic skills such as knitting and sewing. She often sells her products to Native American customers in exchange for food or tools, which suggests that she begins to purge herself of her captive persona and assumes a role within the Native American society akin to that of its free members. No matter how much Rowlandson’s utilization of her English skills ends up removing her from her Anglo-American culture, as argued by Michelle Burnham, eventually she finds readmission to that culture she was estranged from for three months. Her readmission is due to her successful self-representation as a Christian mother and her effective rhetoric of othering that works towards glorifying English domesticity and reproduction in the face of the Native American Other who aims at destroying it. However, I believe we should not dismiss the idea that the Indian captives’ acculturation paradoxically contributed to their readmission to their Anglo-American society—unlike
the ex-Barbary captives whose assimilation into the foreign culture almost always caused their estrangement from their natal society.

In order to discuss the role of assimilation in Indian captives’ readmission to the New English society, I will turn to another captivity narrative in which the assimilation of the English subject under Indian captivity goes beyond enjoying raw horse flesh or exchanging goods in order to survive Indian captivity. This captive is none other than Hannah Dustan, who escaped Indian captivity by killing and scalping ten Native Americans (four adults and six children) with the help of her nurse and a young male English captive from Worcester. Dustan’s narrative is not only paradigmatic for describing her story of escape by taking an uncannily “Indian” course of action but also because it is a third-person narrative embedded in Cotton Mather’s lecture “Humiliations follow’d with Deliverances” (1697). Unlike Rowlandson, who, despite having her narrative published entrapped in between two male voices, was able to maintain her voice, Dustan not only had her narrative delivered within the context of Cotton Mather’s lecture but also lost her voice to Puritan patriarchy. However, her narrative’s incorporation within Mather’s lecture has more significance than that of the loss of female voice as the Puritanical framework of Mather’s lecture lends more authority to her action of scalping ten Native Americans to escape Indian captivity. Dustan’s narrative, therefore, stands as a testimony to how English minds and bodies were expected to change in the New World and how this transformation did not raise concern among the leaders of the New English community who were essentially responsible for the preservation of English identity in the new and strange environment English men and women were now in.
Dustan’s narrative opens with the Native American attack on Haverhill in the spring of 1697. Having delivered a baby just a week previously, Dustan was accompanied by her nurse, Mary Neff, her husband not being home at the time. Mather shifts focus from Dustan to her husband for a short while and describes how he protected seven of his eight children, or “his Little Army of unarmed Children” as Mather describes them, against the Native American attack. Mather’s description of English children as an “unarmed army” reflects the settler-colonialist preoccupation with English reproduction in the New World. The biggest weapon settlers could possess in the New World was their fertility and the English children were the ultimate embodiments of this fertility. In that sense, the image of the English woman who just has given birth meant to perpetuate the image of the Native American Other as a threat to English reproduction. Returning his focus to Dustan, Mather informs his congregation that she witnessed Native Americans “dash out the Brains of the Infant, against a Tree” (italics original) before falling captive to Indians together with her nurse. The two women were forced to travel 150 miles within a few days, Mather emphasizes, “without any sensible Damage, in their Health, from the Hardships, of their Travel, their Lodging, their Diet, and their many other Difficulties.” In other words, they showed extraordinary resilience in the face of physical hardship, resembling very much the androgynous Native American women Rowlandson observed and felt threatened by during her captivity.

Dustan’s resemblance to the Native American Other became even stronger when she decided, upon finding out that they would be “Stript, & Scourged, and Run the Gantlet, through the whole Army of Indians,” to “take away the Life, of the Murderers, by whom her Child had been butchered.” Mather contextualizes Dustan’s decision to
murder her captors within her child’s execution by “those, Whose Tender Mercies are Cruelty.” Her situation allowed Dustan to make a judgment that since “she had not her own Life secured by any Law unto her…she was not forbidden by any Law” to take the lives of her captors. She did not, however, just end up killing her captors in an act of self-defense, but adapted a practice that was dangerously “Indianized” and “cut off the Scalps of the Ten Wretches.” Unlike Rowlandson who refused to bring anything “Indian” with her upon her return to the English community, Dustan returned with ten Native American scalps and was warmly welcomed by Mather and his congregation after a brief reminder that she should not let this redemption fill her with pride, but should remain humble. As Joyce Chaplin underlines, “[i]t was unprecedented for female violence to be so celebrated and rewarded” (267), since it suggested the inversion of gender roles—a notion that Rowlandson shuddered at when she observed the androgynous Native American women. However, Dustan’s “gender inversion worked only because, as the account explained events, Indians had created the inversion and should suffer thereby. Otherwise, Englishwomen were not to fall into such savage behavior, lest they pervert their colonial role as reproducers of English bodies” (267). In the idiosyncratic case of Dustan, though, she was far from perverting her colonial role as the reproduce of English bodies since in the New World, English identity was assuming a settler-colonialist ethos, which required an active resistance against any force that worked towards preventing English reproduction. By pitting a “Little Army of unarmed [English] Children” and Dustan’s infant whose brain was “dash’d out” against the Native American family and particularly six of their children who were scalped by Dustan and her fellow captives, Mather redefines Dustan’s violence as her attempt to protect the English population. In that
sense, Dustan’s adoption of Native American practices was something to be celebrated rather than feel threatened by. As June Namias points out, an English woman’s violence was justified and even glorified “given the nature of the wilderness frontier” (36). For the English settlers to survive this wilderness frontier, they had to embrace acculturation.

Dustan’s acculturation in a way validated the worries of the opponents of English colonization of North America I have discussed earlier—leaving the English soil carried the danger of leaving English identity behind. Mather’s justification of her violence by the nonexistence of any laws in the New World to secure English subjects’ life further suggests that English men and women, bound by no English and Christian law, would eventually fashion a new system that was more suited to the conditions of the New World. John Smith’s populist experiment can be considered as the first attempt to establish this new system in the New World away from old England and the experience of later settlers proved that English identity was bound to be revised and eventually reconfigured away from English soil. Stories of English settlers ranging from John Smith to Hannah Dustan suggest that Britons in the periphery were not as uncomfortable with the idea of fashioning a new English identity as those in the imperial center. This notion is further proven by the New English society’s leniency when it came to readmitting the Indian captives when they returned from wilderness having one way or another assimilated into the Native American culture. What metropolitan English society denied to ex-Barbary captives was readily available to ex-Indian captives. Far from threatening the newly fashioned settler-colonialist identity, Indian captives’ return to the New English community in fact perpetuated it by reassuring the settlers that English
reproduction was in the good hands of not only chaste and virtuous but also strong Englishwomen.

Karen Ordahl Kupperman begins her comprehensive study of the Virginia colony with an obvious notion on which we don’t reflect enough: “Americans prefer to think of Plymouth colony in New England as our true foundation” (2) instead of Jamestown, which is associated in American mind with “greedy, grasping colonists in America and their arrogant backers in England” (1). The Pilgrims in Plymouth, on the other hand, are remembered as the exact opposites of the colonists in Virginia: “They were humble people who wanted only a place to worship God as they saw fit, and they lived on terms of amity with one another and with the neighboring Indians, relationships memorialized in the First Thanksgiving” (2). Regardless of whether or not these romanticized depictions of Plymouth colony reflect the truth, there is one reality Kupperman wants to underline—despite its messy beginnings, Virginia colony stood as a model for subsequent colonies, including Plymouth. Following the years that witnessed the Virginia colony’s establishment as a colonial outpost and transformation into a settlement, new English settlers were able to arrive to the New World having learned from Jamestown’s experience. The Virginia colony was “the archetype of English colonization” (3).

I conclude with Kupperman’s observation because it highlights how the idea of settlement changes the perception of a colony by its own inhabitants as well as outsiders. One of the major reasons for the initial struggles of the Virginia colonists was arguably the lack of consensus over the goals they had set for their colonial project. While upper-class investors were largely interested in achieving economic gain in the most efficient way possible, Englishmen of middling sorts like Smith always entertained the idea of
settlement and pursuing the opportunities the New World presented them in the form of social mobility. It was thanks to the aspirations of these middle-class Englishmen that further successful settlements in North America were established. Having experienced the constraining effects of social stratification in England, these Englishmen strove to establish a more inclusive New English society. This was by no means an unconditional inclusiveness; it was extended just to white men regardless of their social standing; however, this was still a considerable social reform given the lack of opportunities in old England. This inclusive nature manifested itself the most when the New English community was asked to extend their welcome to English men and women returning from captivity. In the next chapter, I will demonstrate the relatively welcoming nature of the New English community when it comes to readmitting ex-Barbary captives. This welcoming attitude, I will argue, proved essential in transforming scattered colonial settlements into a nation over time. By the end of the eighteenth century, a nation is born out of these colonies and this nation owes more to the notion of captivity than we tend to believe.
Chapter 3
The Importance of Feeling Captive: Barbary Captivity and Early American Transformation from Colony to Nation

It was a mighty Relief unto them that the English Captives there formed themselves into a SOCIETY, and in their Slavery enjoyed the Liberty to meet on the Lords Day Evening, every Week & annually choose a Master and Assistents, and form a Body of Laws, to prevent and suppress Disorders among themselves.

Cotton Mather, *The Glory of Goodness* (1703)

In the previous chapter, I trace the transformation of early modern Anglo-colonial subjects into settler-colonial Anglo-Americans in the New World by contextualizing Indian captivity narratives penned by Puritan settlers within early modern Englishmen’s encounters with the Islamic East. I discuss how these narratives demonstrate a profound concern over the perpetuation of Anglo-American domestic welfare and procreation in the New World without necessarily being protective of an “Englishness” as defined in juxtaposition with old English values like adherence to a hierarchical social structure. Furthermore, I demonstrate how the New English community proved relatively inclusive and embracing of English men and women returning from Indian captivity by not considering their acculturation a threat to their Englishness. The primary concern of the New English community, in other words, was not the threat of English settlers’

---

70 Here I would like to clarify my choice of words to describe the English settlers. I use “Anglo-American” and “English” interchangeably in this chapter at times to highlight the fact that I don’t mean that English settlers lost their Englishness as soon as they settled in North America although I essentially make an argument for the beginning of their quest from separation from the imperial center as early as the late seventeenth century. In this chapter, I will demonstrate how in late seventeenth-century texts we can find evidence for the beginning of a distinctive American identity-formation that is not necessarily defined by its ties to the mother country.
acculturation into Native American ways but the possibility of remaining outnumbered by Native Americans. In accordance with this concern, the more the Native American Other was a threat to English domesticity, the more he or she was represented as savage and horrendous by the settler-colonial discourse of the emerging Indian captivity narrative genre. Appropriately, these demonizing depictions served to aggrandize the image of the English captive, who, most of the time, was represented as a chaste, fertile, domestic English woman. Even in narratives about male captives, English procreation and domesticity remained a central point. For instance, when Indians attack his house in 1704, John Williams immediately turns his thoughts to his wife, who has just given birth, and Jonathan Dickenson, eight years earlier than Williams, shudders at the idea of a Native American family raising his baby should he and his wife expire in captivity. These examples demonstrate the Indian captivity narrative’s concern with creating and perpetuating a certain image of white womanhood that gains its strength by surviving the threat of Indian captivity in the New World and procreating. The strength of the white women in the face of the Native American Other reassures the settlers of their colonies’ permanency. The ideology of settler-colonialism depends on this image of strong white womanhood and Mary Rowlandson is the ultimate embodiment of this image. Ironically, given the ostensible spiritual concerns of Puritan texts, this strength is more physical than

---

71 This settler-colonist and Puritan concern over an idealized image of white womanhood is implied in Rowlandson’s refusal to bring back a Native American couple to her Puritan community on which I comment in the second chapter. This couple presumably converted—or was willing to convert—to Christianity as suggested by their desire to live among Puritans. Rowlandson’s refusal to bring a Christian Native American couple back to her community, in that sense, implies that she privileges her whiteness as an identity marker over her Christianity.
spiritual and has more to do with adapting to Native American ways than striving for the preservation of a pure Englishness.

Given the concern of English settlers with the perpetuation of the image of a strong, chaste, and domestic white woman, the popularity of Mary Rowlandson’s narrative in the colonies is hardly surprising. According to Kathryn Zabelle Derounian, Rowlandson’s narrative saw three editions in 1682, the year of its publication, and another edition was printed in 1720. Today, no copy of its first edition can be found due to the fact that it was passed around among so many readers. It was undoubtedly a very popular text in colonial America but the same cannot be said about its popularity on the other side of the Atlantic according to Linda Colley. While Derounian describes its printing history in England as more or less a success, Colley maintains that the reading public in England was not as interested in Rowlandson’s narrative of her captivity as the readership in colonial America in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Colley further argues that this was not particular to Rowlandson’s narrative as no Indian captivity narrative enjoyed the attention of the English readership before 1750 (151). She believes that one reason for the lackadaisical response of the British readership might be “that—to mainstream Anglicans—the Puritan religiosity informing so many of these texts appeared alien and even uncongenial” (154). Another reason, she contends, might have had to do with the English crown’s hands-off approach to the colonization of North America that “authorised private investors to take the risk of establishing colonial outposts in America,” an approach she describes as a “cheap and indirect version of empire” (155). For these reasons, the reading public in England felt unconnected to

72 See Derounian’s “The Publication, Promotion, and Distribution of Mary Rowlandson’s Indian Captivity Narrative in the Seventeenth Century” (1988).
settlers in North America. On top of this, the threat of Barbary captivity directed the public’s attention to the east of England, to English captives in North Africa, who needed their compatriots’ financial support to be redeemed from a captivity that was an imminent and intense threat to their Anglo-Christian identity. Unlike Barbary captives, English captives of Native Americans did not need the financial support of the Englishmen in the center; settlers could raise the ransom money themselves (Colley 154).

The discrepancy between the attentions given to Indian captivity narratives on the two sides of the Atlantic is crucial to the discussion I pursue in this chapter. To begin with, this discrepancy supports one of my central arguments in this project: peripherally located Englishmen began experimenting with new modes of Englishness as soon as they left the center and therefore their experiences in the New World did not necessarily resonate with Englishmen in the metropole. The settler-colonial identity the English assumed in the New World was fashioned in a triangular model in which colonists began contrasting their Englishness with that of the Englishmen in the imperial center utilizing newfound identity markers, such as malleability and acculturation, which emerged in the face of living with Native Americans. While peripheral Englishmen began to gradually distance themselves from metropolitan Englishmen, their distinctive identity increasingly depended on whiteness as the notion of race, and whiteness for that matter, assumed new value vis-à-vis the racial other in the New World. I by no means suggest a complete isolation from the center; however, I propose an argument against defining early settlers’ experience in North America as one that firmly depended on strong ties with the mother
country. In that respect, I partially disagree with scholars like Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, who identify the “importance of feeling English” as an essential early American notion that helped early settlers claim membership in an “imagined community” that existed in the metropole. In this notion’s stead, and yet still drawing from Tennenhouse’s formulation, I propose that it was the “importance of feeling captive” that initiated the transformation of English colonies from settlements to a New English community and finally to the United States of America. I will argue in this chapter that the threat of captivity experienced simultaneously in North America and Barbary during a time when a “New English” identity was burgeoning among English settlers resulted in captivity’s becoming an essential part of that new identity. In the absence of attention and sympathy from the center, New English subjects, who experienced both Indian and Barbary captivity at the same time, imagined themselves as a community of captives. The notion of captivity, despite being a threat to Anglo-Christian identity, turned into a catalyst that united the settlers against a common enemy—the non-English Other. In other words, it helped the settlers to gain a sense of

---

73 In The Importance of Feeling English (2007), Leonard Tennenhouse argues that “[f]or a colonist in America to declare himself a Briton was evidently to make a reasonable claim to national identity” (2). Arguing for the lack of a sense of shared identity among the colonists, Michael Zuckerman contends that “Americans were still very far from being a people bonded by a shared sense of purpose and identity by the third quarter of the eighteenth century” (157).

74 See Chapter 8 in Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse’s Imaginary Puritan for their discussion of Indian captives’ reliance on their membership to an imagined English community to survive captivity.

75 For Tennenhouse’s formulation, see The Importance of Feeling English (2007).

76 According to Colley, the British in the imperial center began referring to the colonists in North America as ‘Americans’ “a decade or more before white Americans themselves began habitually doing so” (199). This tendency to rename the colonists in North America suggests that the English in the center began perceiving the colonies as separate constructions from England and the colonists as different from their English selves.
community of their own that gained its strength from unifying against the threat of captivity posed by the non-English other—both Native American and Muslim. This unity in the face of the threat of captivity mattered because it showed that settlers did not have to try to identify with free Englishmen in the center; they were now a separate community with their own concerns and problems. More importantly, there existed another peripheral English community—community of English captives in Barbary—with whom they could identify.

As Cotton Mather’s sermon *The Glory of Goodness* indicates, Puritans in New England were aware of and concerned with English captives in Barbary even though they were geographically far removed. Therefore, Mather’s sermon, which he delivered in 1703 on the occasion of the redemption of about 300 English captives from Barbary captivity, is a text we should turn to in order to trace the emergence of a sense of community among English settlers that was greatly indebted to the notion of captivity. I will contextualize two Barbary captivity narratives written in the late seventeenth-century by two residents of New England alongside Mather’s sermon to demonstrate how a new sense of Englishness emerged with the aid of captivity on both sides of the Atlantic.  

These two narratives appear in Abraham Browne (1655) and Joshua Gee’s (1687) journals, both of whom recount their experiences in Barbary as captives in the second half of the seventeenth century. Neither of these narratives enjoyed the attention of early American readers as they both remained manuscripts for centuries. Browne’s manuscript still resides in the Massachusetts Historical Society, a small part of it having been

---

77 I will refer to this new construction as “New English” with capital “N” throughout this chapter.
published within an article in 1980.\textsuperscript{78} Gee’s journal, on the other hand, was published in 1943 by Charles Godwin, who did not have information about the history of the manuscript or where it was bought.\textsuperscript{79} The fact that these narratives were never published in colonial America might initially seem to work against my argument. I acknowledge that this suggests a lack of interest in Barbary captives and their stories among New Englanders and therefore makes it difficult to make an argument with regard to Barbary captivity’s role on the construction of a New English identity in the colonial period. However, by situating these two narratives within the context of Mather’s sermon I am able to demonstrate how they embody colonial American sentiments in the face of Barbary captivity. Understanding these sentiments as articulated by the spiritual leader of the New English community and epitomized by actual Barbary captives demonstrates that Barbary captivity helped English settlers perpetuate their New English identities.

As I have mentioned above, the discrepancy between the publication histories of Indian and Barbary captivity narratives suggests a lack of interest in Barbary captivity narratives within the New English community. This lack of interest has been carried over to this day and scholars, save for a couple mentions in passing, often ignore these two colonial American Barbary captivity narratives. Brief attention is paid to them by Gerald MacLean and Nabil Matar, who explain the lack of interest in Browne’s and Gee’s accounts with the presupposition that “[a]ccounts by ransomed, and thus un-heroic, captives were ignored” by the reading public, who “wanted contemporary, living heroes” (MacLean and Matar 149). While this is a plausible explanation, it has one major flaw.

\textsuperscript{78} See Stephen T. Riley’s “Abraham Browne’s Captivity by the Barbary Pirates, 1655” in \textit{Seafaring in Colonial Massachusetts}.

\textsuperscript{79} See Godwin’s foreword to \textit{The Narrative of Joshua Gee}.
Matar and MacLean seem to be uninterested in separating the Barbary captivity narratives penned by “Old” English subjects from the ones penned by New English settlers. They juxtapose the case of these two unpublished New England manuscripts with the cases of narratives published in England by the ex-captives who returned to England after their redemption from Barbary captivity. To put it into perspective, if we apply their methodology to the case of Indian captivity narratives, Mary Rowlandson’s narrative should not have received the attention it did since she was merely ransomed and Hannah Dustan’s narrative should have been the most emblematic Indian captivity narrative since Dustan was the subject of a more “heroic” escape. Matar and MacLean’s predisposition to consider Browne and Gee’s narratives as English rather than Anglo-American reflects the prevalent tendency among scholars to perceive colonial America as first and foremost an extension of England. However, considering Browne and Gee’s journals within the particular context of the New English society will not only help us better understand New Englanders’ idiosyncratic experience with and attitudes towards the notion of captivity but also reveal how a New English identity was emerging in the colonial period. The fact that these two narratives were never published in the lifetime of their authors also bolsters one of my main arguments in this project. While early modern Barbary captives felt obliged to publish their narratives of captivity to write themselves

---

80 For instance, Linda Colley argues that “[b]efore 1776, the majority of white inhabitants of what became Britain’s Thirteen Colonies in America did not view themselves exclusively or even primarily as Americans. In their own minds, they were English, and ultimately Britons, free subjects of the monarch in London, albeit subjects on another shore” (148). Also, see Michael Zuckerman’s “Identity in British America: Unease in Eden” in *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World* where he contends that “the colonists of British America always strove to be Britons and that they attained political independence at the end of the eighteenth century without even declaring their common character or distinctive identity” (115).
into existence back in England, New English ex-captives arguably did not feel such a pressure given that their New World community did not share the old English view of ex-Barbary captives that was predominantly characterized by skepticism. In order to better contrast New and old English attitudes towards ex-Barbary captives, I now turn to Mather’s sermon since, as the spiritual leader of the New English community, Mather can serve as a guide to his community’s sentiments in the face of Barbary captivity.

Mather’s 1703 sermon celebrates the return of some of the (New) English captives from Barbary captivity to their communities. Having set sail from England towards New England, these Englishmen (and possibly women) were abducted by Barbary pirates and had to endure captivity and slavery before they were redeemed by the English government. In the preface, Mather declares that the majority of “English-Prisoners, that were languishing in Barbary under the Bloody Tyrannies of the Emperour of Morocco…are now returned unto NEW-ENGLAND, the Countrey to which they belonged” (2 italics original). Mather pits New England, “the Countrey to which [the captives] belonged,” against the Moroccan Empire: this is notable because it suggests the inception of the North American colonies in the New English imagination as a country; in other words, as a separate construction from the mother nation. Against the tyrannical “Emperour of Morocco,” the settlers have “the Goodness & Glory of our Great LORD REDEEMER” and fervent, constant, and remarkable prayers (2). Against the strong and established Moroccan Empire, the residents of the burgeoning colonies in British North America had their collective prayers and God’s help. The notion of captivity, as revealed

---

81 There is very little information about these captives and the date they were abducted. In *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*, Nabil Matar notes that they fell captive while traveling from England to New England (94).
in Mather’s sermon, clearly works towards transforming scattered settlements into a community that unites in prayer against the strong empires of the East. Solidifying this sentiment, Mather once again places settlers’ collective prayers against the imperial power of Morocco at the end of his sermon:

   What has brought all this about? Oh! 'Tis PRAYER, 'Tis PRAYER, that has done it all. Give me leave to speak it with all due Humility; This Deliverance never began thoroughly to operate, until God began to awaken a Spirit of Prayer in the Churches of poor NEW-ENGLAND for it. When the Sons of New-England, and of some very Praying people here, fell into so dire a Captivity, presently a Cry of PRAYER made a Noise that reach'd up to Heaven. We did not Sin by ceasing to Pray for them. Thus was the Alm of the Lord awakened for the Deliverance of these our Sons; and, thou, O Mully Ishmael, with all thy Diabolical Fury, art no longer able to with-hold from us, the Friends, about whom God gave thee an Efficacious Order, To let them go. (45-46)

New Englanders’ sense of insecurity and vulnerability against the established states of Barbary becomes evident in Mather’s contrasting of North African imperial power with the settlers’ prayers in “Churches of poor NEW-ENGLAND.” English settlers could only rely on a sense of community to stand against the imperial power of their captors. This unity in prayers mattered even more since the captives under threat were “Sons of New-England.” Describing Barbary captives as “sons of New-England,” Mather suggests the existence of an organic bond between the settlers and the New World.  

---

82 Using the same mother-child analogy half a century before Mather in a slightly different fashion, John Smith describes the English colonies in North America as “his Children that never had Mother” (The True Travels 403). By utilizing the mother-child
role for England as a mother figure in the consolidation of this organic bond, Mather’s sermon testifies to the role of Barbary captivity in the emergence of a sense of autonomy among New Englanders.

My analysis of Mather’s sermon suggests that Barbary captivity perpetuated the settlers’ sense of New English identity as one that was becoming increasingly conscious of its estrangement from the mother country as early as the initial years of the eighteenth century. The case of Abraham Browne further supports my argument. Browne was born in Plymouth, England in 1630 and lived a spiritually unstable life until he was commissioned by his master to manage his estate in New England at the age of twenty. Initially unwilling to accept his master’s proposition yet unable to resist his mother’s pleas, Browne arrived New England in June of 1650. He quickly integrated into the New English community and “found congenial companions, attended the lectures as well as the Sabbath sermons” (Riley 34). Although he admits in his journal that these sermons initially “had butt Little or noe Imprisson upon my hart nay it did hardly reach my head” (qtd. in Riley 34) he eventually had a spiritual transformation three years after his arrival in New England and at a Sunday lecture in Boston he was converted to the Puritan cause. Browne had already made up his mind to settle in New England for good when he returned to England four years later to see friends and complete some business transactions. Four years in New England was enough to estrange Browne from his native country.

analogy in a fashion that denied England the role of the mother figure, Smith and Mather complicate later usages of the same analogy to describe America’s relationship with England. In a way, they suggested that not all colonial Englishmen believed in the unconditional existence of an organic bond between England and her colonies.
During his return trip to New England, Browne fell captive to Algerian corsairs and experienced three months in captivity—a relatively short time given the years and even decades long captivities of many Englishmen in Barbary. According to the dedication of his journal, which was penned to Browne’s father-in-law, Browne wrote the second part of his journal in captivity for his friends in England. In this second part of his journal, Browne describes his experience of captivity and his means of maintaining his faith under the difficult conditions of Barbary captivity. Most of Browne’s account of captivity follows the norms of the Barbary captivity narrative genre. He first depicts the fight with the corsairs and the heroic defense he and his fellow Englishmen gave against the “Coward” and “Crewell” Turks and later describes how the English captives were examined like beasts in the slave market (Riley 37 and 40). What makes Browne’s narrative paradigmatically New English, though, is its emphasis on being a part of a Christian community even under captivity and the strength the Christian captive gains from his faith and his Bible.

Twice in his journal, Browne underlines the relieving effect of being with fellow Englishmen in captivity. The company of Englishmen provided a practical relief as they informed the new captives about the manners of their captors and the strategies to make their condition as favorable as possible. Furthermore, Browne notes that despite the sad condition the captives were in, “it was some kinde of staye to our spirets to con overe with our Cuntrymen” (qtd. in Riley 40). Although they were made to lay “on the beare grownd” and live under grave conditions, the sense of community the English captives shared helped them maintain their spirits (Riley 40). While Browne’s journal only gives
us a small glimpse of this sense of community, Mather’s sermon amplifies the message of Browne’s reflection:

It was a mighty Relief unto them that the English Captives there formed themselves into a SOCIETY, and in their Slavery enjoyed the Liberty to meet on the Lords Day Evening, every Week & annually chuse a Master and Assistents, and form a Body of Laws, to prevent and suppress Disorders among themselves. The Good Orders of their Society, were a great Reputation, and Preservation unto them. And it afforded them no small Comforts to delight them, in the multitude of the Griefs upon them, that at their Meetings they still had one or other, who by his Prayers, and other Exercises of Religion among them, greatly Edified them. (37 italics original)

Mather’s emphasis on the importance of forming an English society under Barbary captivity illustrates how New English captives carried their settler-colonial ethos to Barbary. Given the power dynamics on the Atlantic stage at the time—strong North African nations on one side and England with her burgeoning colonies in North America on the other side—it is fundamentally erroneous to think of Barbary captives as a colonizing force in North Africa. However, we cannot separate the settlers from their colonalist ethos considering that many of them fell captive on their way to North America from Britain to populate the colonies there. Browne, for example, was on his way to settle in New England for good when he was captured by North African corsairs. In that context, we cannot assume that English colonists were instantaneously purged of their colonalist ethos when they were captured and enslaved in North Africa. The question we need to ask, therefore, is how that ethos functioned under Barbary captivity
and helped both “free” settlers in North American colonies and the captive New English subjects imagine membership in a new community which was fashioned into a New English identity. Here my reformulation of Tennenhouse’s concept “the importance of feeling English” as “the importance of feeling captive” is instrumental in dissecting this reconfigured English identity.

As we gather from Mather’s sermon and Browne’s account, Barbary captivity made English settlers realize that in order to be able to maintain their identities in the face of the temptations the non-English Other presented, they had to become a community. While English settlers were facing a similar, though not identical, threat of captivity in the New World, Barbary captives’ displacement in a completely un-English setting increased their dependence on an English community to preserve their identities. For example, Mary Rowlandson could find a deserted English house, identify the traces of English cattle, or locate a “deserted English field” all of which reminded her that she was surrounded by English people despite her captivity among Native Americans. Moreover, thanks to her settler-colonial imagination, she could freely designate the lands that belonged to Native Americans for thousands of years as “English.” The condition of the Barbary captives, however, was fundamentally different. They were in a completely strange setting without any hope of coming across a free English community. The only English community that existed in Barbary was that of the English captives and the only relief Barbary captives could find came from imagining an English colony of captives in Barbary, a pseudo-colony as I would like to call it, which, as Mather describes, had all the characteristics of a real settlement—“a Master and Assistents, and…a Body of Laws, to prevent and suppress Disorders among themselves.” In that sense, captivity helped
Barbary captives perpetuate their New English identity by enabling them to imagine being settlers rather than captives in a time and space where English colonial aspirations did not have the slightest chance of being fulfilled.

As Mather’s emphasis on the role of community in the preservation and redemption of Barbary captives reveals, New Englanders relied on the notion of Barbary captivity to perpetuate their New English settler-colonial identity by imagining membership to a pseudo-colony situated in a geography that was even further away from England. In a way, this pseudo-colony contrived by Barbary captives enabled the settlers to bypass the mother country when it came to finding an imagined community. A spiritual link was extended to Barbary that incarnated in the form of New Englanders’ “Cry of PRAYER…that reach’d up to Heaven.” I believe this spiritual link, by circumventing England and connecting two peripheral English communities, became a truly transatlantic medium that formed New English identities—a medium that was not rooted in a particular geography and therefore better encapsulated the New English experience of identity formation in the age of transatlantic expansion and colonization than imagining membership to the English community in metropole. That this link connected two remote corners of the Atlantic without making a stop in England is a crucial detail in light of the early modern English belief that “bodies buried in England provided the basis of English monarchical rule” (Egan Authorizing 26). As I have mentioned in the previous chapter, the opponents of England’s overseas expansion believed that the English subjects who populated the new English dominions overseas 83

---

83 According to Benedict Anderson, nations are first and foremost imagined communities “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (6).
would immediately find themselves under the threat of contamination due to lack of proximity to the English soil in which were located the roots of the English aristocracy and monarchy. By circumventing this locus of English aristocracy and monarchy and unifying under the notion of captivity, New English subjects demonstrated readiness to assume a transatlantic identity that was removed from Old English values even if this removal entailed falling captive to the non-English Other.

This removal from England and Old English identity is underlined by Michelle Burnham in her reformulation of Armstrong and Tennenhouse’s argument that the English readers of Mary Rowlandson’s narrative were asked “to imagine being English in the New World” (Armstrong and Tennenhouse Imaginary 205) and thus were granted membership to an “imagined national community through the process of reader identification” (Burnham 45). While Armstrong and Tennenhouse’s formulation depends on the assumption that Rowlandson is conscious of her survival’s dependence “on her ties to a community that cannot be experienced directly”(206)—namely, on her ties to a traditional English community—Burnham proposes that “it is not Mary Rowlandson’s Englishness at all that determines her survival during her captivity but precisely the degree to which she abandons her Englishness in the process of transculturation” (46). The premise of Burnham’s assertion is that Rowlandson, by gradually adapting Indian ways in order to survive her three-month captivity, in fact demonstrates that her survival depends on assimilating into the culture of her Native American captors: “[S]he must

learn to travel in Indian fashion through the wilderness, to recognize Algonquin words and customs, to barter for Indian food, and to tolerate it once it is given to her. Her narrative documents...her increasing familiarity with and practical acceptance of” such alien customs” (45). Rowlandson’s narrative in that sense reveals the predicament of settler-colonial identity—that it is inevitably prone to acculturation. In Barbary, this settler-colonial identity is conveniently refashioned to assist New English captives in their resistance against acculturation and assimilation into the Muslim culture. By imagining themselves members of a New English pseudo-settler community through reproducing the “social topography of New England” (Baepler 13) in North Africa, Barbary captives not only further alienated themselves from the Old English community but also contributed to the propagation of a New English community that gained its strength from uniting against the non-English Other.

Browne and Gee’s narratives, despite not having enjoyed the attention of a New English readership, are therefore of great significance in my discussion of Barbary captivity’s role in the emergence of an Anglo-American identity that relies upon a gradual removal from Old English values. It is hardly surprising that later Barbary captivity narratives published during the early national period reflect a more distinct, albeit not fully developed, Anglo-American identity; however, spotting the traces of an emergent New English identity in narratives penned as early as 1655 requires us to be more embracing of the idea that the English settlers were not as invested in imagining membership to the English community in the metropole as we tend to believe, nor were they firm in the belief that their survival’s depended on their ties to that community. If anything, the experiences of these two New English captives reveal that their survival in
fact depended on their lack of ties to the Old English community, or, to put it in other words, on the existence of an alternative and inclusive New English community to which they could return after their redemption from Barbary captivity.

In my first chapter I show that the disappointing reception early modern ex-Barbary captives received upon their return to England played a crucial role in their struggle with adaptation and reintegration into their natal cultures. Never able to purge themselves of the stigma of captivity and the skepticism of their fellow Englishmen, these ex-captives found themselves unable to enjoy their freedom and reestablish a new life even after they were away from the horrors of Barbary captivity and the dehumanization that captivity and enslavement entailed. Saved from one kind of servitude, ex-captives found themselves forced into another kind upon their return to England as a sermon delivered in 1702 to a group of ex-Barbary captives by an English clergy, William Sherlock, clearly illustrates:

‘Tis not only the charity of private Christians, but the care the government hath taken of you, to which you owe your liberty. And therefore pray consider what it is you owe your country…to be loyal to your prince, obedient to your government, ready to defend it against all enemies…They redeemed you, that you might serve them, not as slaves, but as free-born subjects. (Qtd. in Colley 79)

Sherlock’s sermon reveals a great deal about early modern English attitudes towards the ex-captives; however, reading it side by side with Mather’s sermon is even more illuminating. I should start with noting the similarities between the two sermons which accentuate the inherent differences between new and old English perceptions of Barbary captivity. Both sermons were delivered on the occasion of English subjects’ redemption
from this captivity. While Sherlock’s sermon was delivered in 1702, Mather preached his in 1703. The fact that both sermons were crafted around the same time is a noteworthy detail that presents us with important clues about the fundamental differences between the attitudes towards captivity in the Old and New English communities. In *Glory of Goodness*, Mather, unlike Sherlock, underlines the congenial acceptance the New English society is willing to extend to their kinsmen returning from Barbary captivity:

> To what a sweet *Change* of their Condition, are these our *Friends* now arrived!
> Instead of Hellish *Moors* at their pleasure Kicking and Scourging and Plaguing of them, they are in the Arms of their most agreeable Relatives, and others whom they daily behold with mutual Delight. Instead of being driven to Servile, Tedious, Vexing *Employments*, they are now Employ'd Easily, and as they would be. Instead of the *Sabbaths* which they saw without any *Rest* in them, they have now as many Opportunities for the Service of God and their Souls, as they wish for. (45)

The two sermons show clear distinctions when it comes to what freedom from Barbary captivity means to their respective authors and to the communities they represent. Sherlock’s sermon inverts Paul Baepler’s formulation that “the English captives re-created the social topography of New England by remaking their world in Africa” (13). In the case of ex-captives returning to England, rather, the social topography of North Africa was re-created for them by their compatriots in the metropole. The master-slave dichotomy was reconfigured into that of master-servant in England and the ex-captives were left without a choice but continue servitude to their governments and benevolent Christians to whom they “owed” their liberty. However, Mather’s sermon suggests that
ex-captives returning to New England could expect a much better treatment. While Sherlock emphasizes one condition that would not change for ex-captives upon their return to England when he reminds them that they are expected to maintain their servile position, Mather makes sure to underline that the New English ex-captives can enjoy an absolute change in their conditions now that they have arrived in the community to which they belong. The only service they should engage in is the one they owe God and they are free of any “Servile, Tedium, Vexing Employments” captivity forced them into. “[T]hey are now Employ’d Easily, and as they would be,” Mather adds, reminding them of their responsibilities as settler-colonists. They have returned to an egalitarian settler community-in-progress and they are expected to contribute to the successful establishment of this settlement among their “Relatives, and others whom they daily behold with mutual Delight” not below benevolent “private Christians” or their prince and government like their counterparts in England.

I have already scrutinized three early modern ex-Barbary captives’ narratives in chapter one to illustrate how they struggled with reintegration into their natal societies and how their community showed little interest in assisting them with that struggle. The narratives I analyze in that chapter of Joseph Pitts, William Okeley, and Thomas Pellow testify to the prevalence of Sherlock’s sentiments in early modern England. Except for Pitts, whose narrative enjoyed considerable popularity as a text that provided English readership with novel information with regard to Muslim traditions and practices, none of these ex-captives were able to find prospect and contentment in their native countries. Apart from the information we gather from their narratives, we don’t know much about these Barbary captives, which suggests that they fell into obscurity not long after
publishing their narratives. Curiously, though, today we have more information about Abraham Browne and Joshua Gee’s post-captivity lives despite the fact that their accounts never ceased to be just manuscripts in their lifetimes. Although the information we have about Browne also comes solely from his journal, thus making him no less obscure than the old English ex-captives, his does not cease to be a paradigmatic case as he did not stop documenting his life after his return from North Africa. Exclusion of post-captivity biographical information in old English ex-captives’ accounts arguably suggests the lack of noteworthy and more importantly favorable experience in these captives’ lives after captivity. In the case of Abraham Browne, though, we learn from his journal that “the Lord was pleased to bring [him] to a seeming settled condicon” (qtd. in Riley 42) and despite a temporary slide to an ungodly life after his return, he married Rebecca Usher, the daughter of a wealthy Bostonian merchant, in 1660 (Riley 42). We only have Browne’s words that he found contentment in New English community upon his restoration from Barbary captivity, but it is strong evidence considering he firmly desired to return to New England after spending the first five months of his freedom in England (Riley 42).

When compared to Browne’s, Gee’s experience proves even more illuminating of the opportunities the New English community offered to the ex-captives. After his return from North Africa, Gee was able to find a place in the social circle of one of the prominent figures in Boston, Judge Samuel Sewall. As recorded in Sewall’s diary, Gee would frequently visit Sewall and engage in conversations on various topics with him (Bates “Introduction” 10).85 One year after his return to Boston, Gee married Elizabeth

85 See Albert Carlos Bates’s “Introduction” to The Narrative of Joshua Gee.
Harrisse, who, according to Albert Carlos Bates, “may have been…the daughter of Rev. Thomas Thornton” and within two decades of his return he had a well-established reputation as a shipwright (11). One of his children, named Joshua as well, graduated from Harvard College in 1717 and served as the minister of Boston’s North Church between the years of 1723 and 1748, overlapping with Cotton Mather for the first five years of his tenure (Baepler 1). Quite a different and prosperous post-captivity life compared to those of the ex-captives I discuss in chapter one!

Gee’s prosperous post-captivity life is in and of itself strong evidence of how New Englanders were more than willing to help ex-captives with their reintegration into their community. This willingness gains even more significance when we turn to the details Gee’s narrative provides with regard to his life during captivity. In many ways, Gee’s narrative reminds us of Rowlandson’s narrative of her Indian captivity. Just like Rowlandson, Gee firmly believes that God will assist him through all adversities and “bring me bak to this place to give thanks to his name for his Remarkable: favers to me thro the hole of the voige” (15) and in a very similar fashion to Rowlandson, he gains his strength from the Bible: “I always fownd Relefe in seking god when I Cowld fing it noe wheare els: it was greate Relefe to me that I had Lerned soe moch scripture by har[t] when I was yong: It aforded swete meditations in the night of my pilgrimage. when my bred was that of adversity: & wine of astonishment of harte” (27). Perhaps the most striking similarity between Gee’s and Rowlandson’s experiences is that both figure out early in their captivities that their survival depends upon their participation in the social life of their captors. While Rowlandson’s participation was limited to adjusting to Indian ways of eating, traveling, or communication, Gee’s assimilation into to the North African
social life was more drastic: he had to participate in corsair raids against Christian, and more significantly English, ships in order to survive his captivity (Gee 17-18).

Intriguingly, Gee does not hesitate to note the details of his participation in these attacks in his diary. While the fact that his narrative was never published in his lifetime keeps us from assuming that his community was informed about his involvement in North African piracy, the manner in which he records the details of his captivity suggests that Gee did not intend to keep his journal only for his own perusal. Given his close relationship with Judge Sewall, who also played an active role in his redemption, it is highly possible that Sewall and circle of friends were informed about the details of Gee’s captivity. In that regard, Gee’s smooth reintegration into the New English community and the prosperous life he led after his return from Barbary captivity becomes even more significant considering the anxiety early modern Barbary captives such as Pitts and Pellow experience when they admit in their narratives that they had converted to Islam during their stay in North Africa. Despite their insistence on the pretense of their conversion, neither Pitts nor Pellow could experience a similar favorable treatment from their compatriots to the one received by Gee, who readily admits fighting against English ships as a Barbary captive. Furthermore, Gee’s smooth adaptation into the New English community even after fighting against the English on the side of Barbary corsairs stands as a testimony to John Smith’s contention that the English colonies in North America can serve as sanctuaries for Englishmen lost to North African ways. Just as Smith claims at the end of his autobiography, Gee could regain his “wonted Reputation [in] those fair Plantations of our English Nation” (Smith True Travels 412).
I should note that the warm reception Barbary captives received from fellow New Englanders was by no means unconditional. As with Rowlandson, the English captive of Native Americans had to make it explicit that she was returning to her New English community without bringing any traces from her Indian captivity—not on her body, nor on her faith. Mather’s sermon, on the other hand, informed the captive Englishmen returning to their New England communities that their readmission depended on one condition: repentance. “The Goodness of God,” Mather reminds his congregation and specifically the redeemed captives, “leads thee to Repentance.” He furthers his advice with an explanation of repentance as “the whole Conversion of a sinner, from Sin to God in the Lord Jesus Christ” (6 italics original). In the first thirty pages of his lecture, Mather expands on the goodness of God and how his goodness gives hope to sinners for redemption emphasizing that “If I Return to so Good a God, after all the Evil that I have committed against Him, He will Pardon me, He will Accept me, He will Adopt me” (16 italics original). Notice the emphasis on the stages of redemption: God first pardons the sin, then accepts and adopts the sinners. These steps become more significant when read in the context of Barbary captives’ readmission into the New English community. In this context, just being pardoned does not suffice as implied by the necessity of the sinner’s being accepted and adopted afterwards. This process suggests Mather’s concern, just like his contemporaries on the other side of the Atlantic, over the ex-captives’ spiritual contamination due to a prolonged interaction with the Muslim Other. However, he still reassures the ex-captives that there is no sin that cannot be pardoned and that God will

---

86 As I have mentioned earlier in this chapter, Michelle Burnham compellingly discusses the paradox of Rowlandson’s narrative as a text that both illustrates its author’s acculturation and at the same time demonstrates her attempt to prove her community her Englishness.
surely accept back even the ones who committed the unthinkable crime of conversion as long as they repent and seek re-admittance to Christ’s path. Given the theological absolutism of the Puritan New English society, we cannot read these stages as only representative of a sinner’s position in the eyes of God—these were also the steps whereby a sinner would be admitted back to the Puritan community.

The anxiety Mather’s sermon reflects over spiritual contamination due to Barbary captivity in many ways resembles the anxiety experienced on the other side of the Atlantic. However, as I have tried to demonstrate earlier in this chapter, the reception of ex-captives showed significant differences in the two different communities. The main reason for this discrepancy was New English subjects’ increasingly settler-colonial identity that was constructed right in the midst of captivity. Only by imagining themselves as captives could New English settlers create a community in solidarity and only thanks to Barbary captivity could they transport their settler-colonial ethos over to North Africa—in other words, to a geography they could not imagine entering as colonizers. In that sense, the notion of captivity in the colonial period helped New English subjects imagine membership to an alternative community to the old one left behind in England.

***

Given the fact that Barbary captivity did not cease to be an imminent threat to Anglo-Americans within the next two centuries, we can also trace the evolution of early American attitudes towards it. To put it succinctly, in the early national period, the Barbary captivity crisis helped the citizens of the new republic to gain a sense of national identity and unity while at the same time enabling the United States to claim a reputation
on the world stage as an emerging power. My analysis of colonial American attitudes towards captivity suggests how New English settlers began perceiving their community as a separate construction from England as early as the late seventeenth century. By turning to Barbary captivity narratives printed in the early national period in the second half of this chapter, I will build on this argument and discuss the ways in which a notion of captivity contributed to the perception of Europeans—particularly Englishmen—as “others” in the Anglo-American imagination, which would eventually help them become Americans of the United States.

As a genre, the Barbary captivity narrative had to wait until the late eighteenth century to receive any attention from the American readership. Similarly, although Mary Rowlandson’s narrative was published in the early seventeenth century, it had to wait almost a century to become a bestseller. Essentially, the two genres of captivity narrative became popular around the same time suggesting a peak in early American readership’s interest in captivity in two different contexts at the same time. According to Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, the simultaneous surge in early American interest in both forms of captivity narrative has to do with the models of government each narrative supports. They note that the Indian captivity narrative genre assumes a “kind of subject…who makes deliberate choices, whether by submitting her will to a higher will or by internalizing that authority and displaying what Foucault calls discipline” (Armstrong and Tennenhouse “The Problem” 671). While “puritan” Indian captivity narratives embrace a “theological absolutism,” they further argue, “secular” narratives validate “ethnic assimilation.” The Barbary captivity narrative, however, “endorses…an

---

entirely different model of the social body” (669). Barbary captivity narratives are by and about people who are not defined by their national identities per se but “by their encounters in a world produced by the circulation of goods and peoples” (672). The model of government the Barbary narrative offers does not “insists on preserving an ethnically pure community” (674). As the products of transatlantic commercial encounters, these narratives are more concerned about “free circulation of both goods and people” (673).  

Understandably, the abolitionist rhetoric prevalent in later examples of the genre is what Armstrong and Tennenhouse focus on in their argument regarding how Barbary captivity narratives express “a commercial ethic that equates freedom with the freedom of exchange” assuming that human beings “cannot be objects of exchange” (673). In that sense, by depicting their kinsmen in the deplorable condition of slavery, these narratives, in a fashion that keeps up with the increasingly popular sentimentalist tradition of the time, demonstrated to an American readership what slavery meant for those who were unfortunate enough to experience it. Many scholars agree that Barbary captivity narratives in the early national period often expressed abolitionist sentiments by idealizing an American identity that rejects the abhorrent institution of slavery prevalent in “tyrannical” Barbary nations.  

88 This concern over “free circulation of both goods and people,” however, brings about an irony that is hard to ignore. As Elizabeth Maddock Dillon underlines, the rhetoric that emerges in the context of the Barbary captivity crisis—more specifically of the Tripolitan War (1801-05) that paves the way for the United States’s presence in the world economy with an imperialist ethos—“celebrates a commercial freedom to engage in an economy supported by slave labor” (426). See Dillon’s “‘Slaves in Algiers’: Race, Republican Genealogies, and the Global Stage” (2004).

89 See Robert Allison’s *The Crescent Obscured* (1995), Malini Johar Schueller’s *U.S. Orientalisms: Race, Nation, and Gender in Literature, 1790-1890* (2001), Lawrence
Americans to define their developing American identity against North African Muslims by questioning how the new nation could claim to be a land of liberty if it continued to practice the same sin as Muslim states governed by oppression, tyranny, and sensuality.⁹⁰ While I do not intend to dismiss this argument in its entirety, I believe there is more at stake in early American Barbary captivity narratives than a mere depiction of North African Muslims as entities against which an American identity should be constructed.⁹¹ Such a reading of these narratives eventually bears problems identical to the ones created by the readings of early modern narratives as embodiments of a nascent imperialist discourse that heavily relies on binary oppositions. In these narratives, the Muslim, the North African, or the Arab was more than an entity who was characterized as merely un-American. On the contrary, my analysis suggests that Americans in the late eighteenth century were also interested in viewing the Muslim as a complex figure to be assimilated to developing American, republican values.

One paradigmatic example of the Barbary captivity genre that contains a number of complex Muslim figures is James Riley’s narrative, *An Authentic Narrative of the Loss of the American Brig “Commerce,”* that was published in 1817 and became an instant success upon its publication.⁹² While his narrative easily stands as a testimony to early

---

⁹¹ Robert Allison is one of the first scholars to make an argument of this kind. In his 1995 study, *The Crescent Obscured,* Allison argues that Americans had to face the reality that they shared the same sin with Muslims they condemned so much when they read the horrifying accounts of white slaves in Barbary.
⁹² The full title of this narrative is *An Authentic Narrative of the Loss of the American Brig “Commerce,” Wrecked on the Western Coast of Africa, in the Month of August, 1815, with an Account of the Sufferings of the Surviving Officers and Crew, who were Enslaved by the Wandering Arabs of the Great African Desert or Zahahrah.* First
American Barbary captivity narratives’ abolitionist agenda, the complex Muslim characters it depicts are instrumental in fulfilling a larger purpose. Riley’s narrative contains a perfect triangular model in which the Muslim other is not depicted merely as un-American and/or un-Christian but as a catalyst that enables Americans to position themselves as the citizens of the new republic vis-à-vis European nations, especially England; in other words, to complete their transformation from Anglo-Americans to Americans—a transformation that had already begun in the late seventeenth century as I argue in the first half of this chapter. Riley’s narrative is an account of the shipwrecked American vessel, *Commerce*, and the encounters of her crew with numerous Muslims including Bedouin Arabs that are depicted as subhuman, “civilized” Arab traders that receive a relatively favorable and nuanced discursive treatment from Riley, and a Spanish-speaking Moor who is the confidant of the British consul in Mogador and a friend to American slaves.  

My reading of Riley’s narrative challenges the assumptions of scholars such as Robert Allison, Timothy Marr, and Thomas Kidd who describe early American responses to the Islamic East as more bigoted and “Orientalist” than anything else. As Denise Spellberg underlines in her extensive study on early American perceptions of and attitudes towards Islam, “most historians have proposed that Muslims represented nothing more than the incarnated antithesis of American values…[and] that Protestant Americans always and uniformly defined both the religion of Islam and its practitioners published in 1817, Riley’s narrative saw more than a million copies and was translated into French and German in the year following its publication (Allison 220).  

93 Riley calls tribal Arabs “wandering Arabs” and describes them in a fashion that is strikingly similar to Jonathan Dickinson’s when he describes the Florida natives in his 1699 journal. In fact, he immediately compares the wandering Arabs to Native Americans (33).
as inherently un-American” (10). For example, one of the pioneers of this tradition, Robert Alison argues that Americans inherited the European perception of the Muslim world as an entity representing barbarism in the face of the civilized Western world and “pursued this enemy more relentlessly than the Europeans had done” (xv). In accordance with this early American sentiment against Muslims, Allison further argues, the literature printed at the time consistently depicted the Muslim world as “an inverted image of the world the Americans were trying to create anew.” In other words, early Americans could only learn from the Muslim world “what not to do...how not to construct a state, encourage commerce, or form families” (xvii). Timothy Marr, on the other hand, claims in the introduction *The Cultural Roots of American Islamicism* that his book aims “to reveal the hidden details of how Islamic difference has been naturalized into a constituent part of the formation and celebration of early national cultural production” (19). However, in suggesting that the images of Islam circulating in the colonial and early national periods “frequently stood in opposition to many qualities that citizens of the United States affirmed in their own bid for moral legitimacy as an emerging civilization” (10), he paradoxically portrays a more bigoted early American view of the Muslim world than one that embraces and celebrates its cultural differences. Thomas Kidd, in a similar fashion with Allison and maybe even more forcefully, contends that American Christians in the colonial and the early national periods (and some even today) always harbored hostility towards the Muslim world and perceived it as a locus of tyranny and oppression (Kidd *American* 17). By depicting early American attitudes towards Islam and Muslims as one that inherently considers the Islamic East as a locus of tyranny and despotism, these scholars essentially ignore the complexities of early American texts like James
Riley’s *Wandering Arabs* or Royall Tyler’s *Algerine Captive*. I will now turn to Riley’s narrative to underline some of the nuanced depictions of Islam and Muslims that contest the current critical interpretations of early American responses to Islam.

One of the Muslim characters at the center of Riley’s narrative is an Arab trader and slave-owner, Sidi Hamet, who first buys Riley and his crew from Bedouin Arabs and later becomes instrumental in their redemption from slavery but allegedly perishes in the desert while trying to free other American slaves.94 In a perfect example of triangulation, this Arab slave-owner collaborates with the British consul in Mogador for the redemption of the American slaves in North Africa. In this triangulation, American slaves are strategically placed on one side while an Arab-British negotiation and collaboration is taking place in which the Arab slave-owner becomes an abolitionist whilst the British consul temporarily becomes a slaveholder by buying slaves from Sidi Hamet only to sell them back to their American sponsors. Naturally, the British consul does not become a slave-owner in the traditional sense when he buys American slaves from Sidi Hamet as his intention is to help them gain their freedom. However, he seeks reassurance that “the

94 In his narrative, Riley speculates that Sidi Hamet must have died in the desert during his self-imposed mission to free American slaves:

Mr. Porter's description of the trader who bought him on the Desart, and the company of men with whom he was associated, makes me believe it must have been my old master, Sidi Hamet. In corroboration of this opinion, the fact of his having in his possession hard biscuits, dried figs, and dates, proves they had been to Mogadore,—for biscuits are no where else to be had along the coast; and this was precisely the same food with which Sidi Hamet was furnished when he left that City, and under a most solemn oath, to do his utmost in endeavouring to procure the redemption of the remainder of my crew; and as I have never since heard from him, and believe he would keep his word if possible, I am convinced that in striving to fulfil his promise, Sidi Hamet has lost his life in the above mentioned en counter. (455)

Intriguingly, the excerpt above can be found in the 1817 Hartford edition of Riley’s narrative but is omitted from the 1817 New York edition.
respectable references” Riley claims he has are legitimate and if not, that Riley himself “will readily reimburse [him] the whole of the expenses that may be incurred in obtaining [Riley’s] redemption” (192). It is true that in the British consul Riley finds a compassionate friend, yet his narrative bears testimony to fragile American-British relations after the revolution and their re-appropriation in the context of Barbary captivity and slavery.

Throughout his narrative, Riley clearly distinguishes his American self from the British in a way that relegates the British to the position of “other.” The letter Riley sends to Mogador with Sidi Hamet in hopes to find a Christian benefactor who will redeem American slaves illustrates how Riley by default differentiates his American self from Europeans. Without any knowledge as to which countries have ambassadors or merchants in Mogador or Swerah, Riley directs his letter “to the ‘English, French, Spanish, or American consuls, or any Christian merchants’” (182). Strategically, Riley never mentions their being Americans, a tactic he explains as follows: “I purposely omitted mentioning that we were Americans, because I did not know that there was an American agent there, and I had no doubt of there being an English consul or agent in that place” (182). His short explanation as to why he did not make note of their national background reveals Riley’s apprehension of the possibility of the British consul’s shutting his eyes to American subjects’ deplorable situation as slaves. As an extra precaution, Riley makes sure to speak to the conscience of the possible recipient of his letter by emphasizing that he has left “a wife and five helpless children to deplore [his] death” and he is “[w]orn down to the bones by the most dreadful of all sufferings—naked and a slave” (181). If all fails, he hopes, he will speak to a Christian’s sentiments.
That Riley addresses his letter to “any Christian merchants” seems to bear testimony to Said’s formulation against which I argue here: “[t]he European encounter with the Orient, and specifically with Islam,…turned Islam into the very epitome of an outsider against which the whole of European civilization from the Middle Ages on was founded” (70). The image of Americans enslaved by North African Muslims and seeking their fellow Christians’ help for redemption certainly perpetuates this image of Islam as an outsider against which a Christian identity was formed. Paradoxically, though, Riley’s strategy of hiding his American identity also makes clear how a collective Christian identity does not hold sway on the shifting global stage where each nation has its own imperial agenda. As the citizen of a nation who strives to consolidate its autonomy in the Atlantic, Riley certainly knows better than to rely on Christian benevolence alone. His strategy, therefore, not only suggests the collapse of Christian unity against Islam in the context of Barbary captivity but also in some ways considers Christians Europeans—much like Muslim North Africans—as entities against which a distinctive American identity can be constructed.

British consul William Willshire’s response to Riley’s letter reveals how national and religious identities are ephemeral and an alleged Christian unity vis-à-vis Muslims is vulnerable in the context of Barbary captivity. Assuming the air of an older brother, Willshire kindly reprimands Riley for not mentioning his nationality:

By a Gibraltar paper I discover…the name of your vessel, and that she was American, from which I conclude both you and your crew must be subjects of the United States: had it not been for the paper adverted to, some delay would have occurred, as you do not state in your notes to what nation you belong. (191)
Willshire’s letter makes it clear that Riley’s overthought strategy almost backfired. More importantly, it suggests that the notion of Christian camaraderie sometimes bears the risk of failing. Willshire emphasizes that he would not think of sending help without first verifying to which nation the captives belong regardless of the fact that they are Christians. Riley’s account proves that national identity clearly comes before religious identity, which in turn prompts us to avoid relying heavily on binary oppositions in explaining the rhetoric of early American Barbary captivity narratives. In fact, an alliance formed among the British consul, American slaves, and the Arab slave-owner to free American slaves further suggests a triangulation as an alternative to the Christian-Muslim binary.

The triangulation I propose rejects the strict binary of the self-other. Riley’s narrative is rich in evidence for a triangular model despite abundant depictions of Bedouin Arabs—or “wandering Arabs” as Riley names them—in a fashion that relies on the binary oppositions of the Orientalist discourse. I should note here my position with regard to Barbary captives’ depictions of their Muslim captors through binary opposition. We cannot expect to read glorifying descriptions of the Muslim Other in Barbary captivity narratives given that they are accounts written by dehumanized slaves who are trying to reclaim their subjectivity. Therefore, it would be erroneous to consider the binary constructions in these narratives such as barbarous Muslim vs. virtuous Christian or sensual East vs. sensible West as necessarily parts of a larger imperialist discourse. For this reason, I suggest that we should see beyond these binary constructions of identity abundantly found in captivity narratives—Indian and Barbary alike.
As I have stated above, Riley’s narrative is replete with examples that perpetuate the triangular model I propose. To begin with, Riley manages to establish communication with the British consul only when his Arab slave-owner, Sidi Hamet, agrees to carry his letter to Mogador. This communication is further maintained by another Muslim, a Spanish-speaking Moor, Rais bel Cossim. This complex model is a paradigmatic example of how Barbary captivity both obliterates and validates national identities at the same time. William Willshire, upon receiving Riley’s letter, sends Rais bel Cossim, his Moorish confidant, to meet Riley and bring him to Mogador together with his crew. Meanwhile, he holds Sidi Hamet hostage as a precaution until the American slaves are safely brought to the city. Upon meeting with Rais bel Cossim and finding out that he is the person that will eventually carry him to his place of redemption, Riley puts all the binaries aside and admits that he has found “a soothing and sympathising friend in a barbarian, and one who spoke perfectly well the language of a Christian nation” (193-94). Note the oxymoron in Riley’s depiction of Rais: a soothing barbarian. He, on the other hand, cannot help but be astonished at Rais’s competence in the language of a Christian nation. His sentiment vis-à-vis the Moor illustrates that Riley wants to validate his difference from Rais by depicting him as a barbarian while at the same time his captivity obliterates his sense of religious or national belonging and transforms him into a vulnerable human being.

While Riley feels obliged to accentuate the otherness of the Moor, he cannot help but consider Rais a friend. He still attributes all this improbable experience to God’s sovereignty, yet it is worth noting that he can find a friend in a Moor despite considering Rais and himself as inherently different. Even more notably, Riley asks his readers to
imagine being in Riley’s place instead of merely being readers of his account of captivity. This requires his American readers to not just imagine being an American slave in North Africa but also to imagine finding a friend in a Moor rather than to consider Riley’s experience as one of a kind:

[T]o form an idea of my emotions at that time, it is necessary for the reader to transport himself in imagination to the country where I then was, a wretched slave, and to fancy himself as having passed through all the dangers and distresses that I had experienced:… let him find a soothing and sympathising friend in a barbarian, and one who spoke perfectly well the language of a Christian nation.

(193-94)

As much as Riley presents benevolent Muslims like Rais and Sidi Hamet as instruments in God’s plan of redeeming American slaves, he does not completely dismiss them as others who are his inferiors. Adding to the complexity of his perception of his situation as an American slave to North African Muslims waiting to be saved by the British consul, Riley does not see the British consul in a much different light when it comes to his “otherness.” While Willshire receives a different discursive treatment in Riley’s narrative for being his ‘equal’ as a white Christian man, God’s providence comes into play as well when Riley explains his benevolence towards American slaves: “[God] prepared the heart of a stranger to accomplish what had been before determined” (194 italics added). It is not just the Muslim Other’s humanity that is attributed to God’s softening their hearts, but rather an Englishman’s benevolence is also believed to be a part of God’s bigger plan leveling him in a way with Sidi Hamet and Rais. Regardless of their religious or national
backgrounds, these three men are strangers to Riley and it is thanks to God’s protection of Americans that these strangers are instrumental in Riley and his crew’s redemption.

We are able to gain insight into American captives’ sense of self in the face of the Muslim “other” thanks to existing accounts of their captivity in North Africa. Lack of accounts written from the perspective of Muslims deprives us of gaining a similar insight into the Muslim sense of self vis-à-vis the Christian other. Riley’s narrative is invaluable in that respect as well and presents us with a unique opportunity to observe the Muslim response to the Christian other, albeit briefly. More importantly, by giving voice to Muslim figures, Riley contributes to an understanding of Muslims as multi-dimensional characters with their own complexity and anxieties. Upon finding out that Sidi Hamet sold Riley and his crew for nine hundred and twenty dollars, Sidi Hamet’s father-in-law Sheick Ali, believing that American slaves are worth much more money than the amount given, becomes furious and blames Rais for siding with the Christians and trying to rob his son-in-law of his slaves and his life. Rais delivers a carefully articulated response—one that depicts Muslim sense of superiority against Christians and utilizes a rhetorical structure reminiscent of Orientalism’s binary constructions: “We are of the same religion…and owe these Christian dogs nothing; we have an undoubted right to make merchandise of them, and oblige them to carry our burdens like camels” (194). Rais clearly positions Sheick Ali and himself on one side of the binary as Muslims and American slaves on the other side as Christians. I should note that Rais relies on this binary opposition only to appease Sheick Ali as he is mainly concerned with bringing the American slaves to Mogador safely. It is of little consequence if Rais actually believes in the strict binary construction he articulates as Sheick Ali clearly does. What is more
important in this context is that Riley never comments on the depiction of American slaves as Christian dogs and more significantly he describes Rais as “a man of great courage, as well as knowledge and eloquence” (195). Riley’s experience with various Muslim individuals—ranging from Bedouin Arabs whom he depicts as subhuman to Rais bel Cossim whom he depicts as courageous and eloquent—culminates in a narrative that challenges the cookie-cutter model of the Muslim Other that is believed to dominate the early American thought.

While Rais, a Spanish-speaking Moor commissioned by the British consul to purchase the freedom of American slaves from Arab slave-owners, is one of the most multi-faceted Muslim characters depicted in early American Barbary captivity narratives, Sidi Hamet’s role in Riley’s narrative is of greater significance. Riley might depict Rais a courageous and eloquent man but his discursive treatment of Sidi Hamet eventually provides the early American readership with a perfectly round Muslim character that goes against the traditional understanding among scholars that early American discursive treatment of the figures of Islam mirrors that of English Orientalism. Sidi Hamet, from the very first moment he appears in Riley’s narrative, is depicted as a man who is capable of change and more importantly who possesses a value that is dear to the American readers of Riley’s narrative: sentimentality. Riley’s first meeting with Sidi Hamet is particularly striking. He introduces this Arab slave-owner as a man of great compassion who, despite the stigma attached to crying men in his culture, could not hold his tears while listening to Riley’s miserable experience as a slave to wandering Arabs:

I found him to be a very intelligent and feeling man — for although he knew no language but the Arabic, he comprehended so well what I wished to
communicate, that he actually shed tears at the recital of my distresses, notwithstanding that, among the Arabs, weeping is regarded as a womanish weakness. He seemed to be ashamed of his own want of fortitude, and said that men who had beards like him ought not to shed tears; and he retired, wiping his eyes. (100)

Yet, several times in his narrative Riley depicts the same Sidi Hamet as a man who would not think twice of killing Riley if he cannot find a sponsor in Mogador willing to pay the ransom for American slaves. Clearly, Riley sees Sidi Hamet as a man who is capable of sympathy but who prioritizes his own profit over a Christian slave’s life. Further complicating his character, Riley depicts the transformation of Sidi Hamet from a “thievish Arab” (262), who, without remorse, can rob a poor villager of his goats (144) to a man who is willing to sacrifice his life to “do what is in [his] power to redeem Christians from slavery” (294). Riley in fact lets Sidi Hamet describe his own journey from a cruel man to a sentimental one. Giving an account of this transformation in Sidi Hamet’s voice, Riley creates a truly round character who is aware of his own wrongdoings and strives to become a worthy men. Despite its length, Sidi Hamet’s description of his spiritual journey is illuminating:

I was once as bad a man as Seid, but I had been in distress and in a strange land, and had found friends to keep me and restore me to my family; and when I saw you naked and a slave, with your skin and flesh burnt from your bones by the sun and heard you say you had a wife and children, I thought of my own former distresses, and God softened my heart, and I became your friend. I did all I could to lighten the burden of your afflictions: I have endured hunger, thirst, and
fatigues, and have fought for your sake, and have now the high pleasure of knowing I have done some good in the world; and may the great and universal Father still protect you: you have been true and kind to me, and your friend has fed me with milk and honey; and I will always in future do what is in my power to redeem Christians from slavery. (294)

Sidi Hamet emerges in this paragraph as a human being rather than an un-English other—a human being who is simply reminded of his own miserable past when he witnesses the distress of American slaves. Yes, he expresses an abolitionist sentiment when promising Riley that he will do everything in his power to save the Christian slaves but there is more at stake in this depiction than a simple intention to create in the hearts of Americans the feeling that they should be better than Muslims they detest so much. Sidi Hamet is not an entity against whom an American identity can be founded. He is a human being who teaches Americans the republican values of sentimentality, selflessness, and benevolence.

By giving voice to Sidi Hamet and Rais, Riley introduces his American readers to truly round Muslim characters that are capable of change. What makes Riley’s narrative even more nuanced is his suggestion that an Arab and an American can in fact be completely superimposable. When Riley reflects on his own spiritual journey towards the end of his narrative, he uses a strikingly similar language to that of Sidi Hamet in his own reflection over his journey from a “bad man” to a friend of American slaves. Notice the identical sentiments in both men’s reflections:

Adversity has taught me some noble lessons: I have now learned to look with compassion on my enslaved and oppressed fellow creatures, and my future life shall be devoted to their cause:—I will exert all my remaining faculties to redeem
the enslaved, and to shiver in pieces the rod of oppression; and I trust I shall be
aided in that holy work by every good and every pious, free, and high-minded
citizen in the community, and by the friends of mankind throughout the civilized
world. (446)

Both men emphasize how their own distress has taught them to be more compassionate
towards fellow human beings regardless of their racial or religious background. Both seal
their reflection by promising to do everything in their power to redeem enslaved
individuals—Sidi Hamet Christians and Riley Africans. In that sense, Riley does not
consider Sidi Hamet any different from his Christian self. They both are capable of
reaching maturity. A Muslim slave-trader can carry in his heart as much compassion as
an American. In short, Riley’s narrative demonstrates an American identity in the making
not by pitting the Christian self against the Muslim other but by highlighting the ways in
which the two can actually be significantly similar.

By attending to complex Muslim figures in Riley’s narrative like Sidi Hamet and
Rais bel Cossim we can better perceive how, as an American, Riley engages in a more
nuanced process of identity-formation than binary opposition against the Muslims he
encounters during his captivity. His narrative exposes the vulnerable position of the new
nation on the Atlantic stage and the collapse of the idea of a Christian camaraderie
against the Muslim east. By positioning himself and his crew on one corner of a
triangular construction, Riley helps his American readers to appreciate true American
values as emulated by his English and Arab benefactors. Riley’s strategy most certainly
proved successful as his narrative is the most popular of American Barbary captivity
narratives. First published in 1817, Riley’s narrative saw more than a million copies and
was translated into French and German in the year following its publication (Allison 220). More significantly, Abraham Lincoln named Riley’s narrative among the three books that influenced his view on slavery the other two being the Bible and *The Pilgrim’s Progress*. Among the “mainstream” citizens of the new nation, the book struck disparate chords with regard to the emotions it aroused among Americans towards Arabs. While a South Carolina man saw fit to name his son after Sidi Hamet, another reader from North Carolina could not wait to “to shoulder [his] gun, to go and seek redress of them Arabs” (qtd. in Allison 221). To historian Robert Allison, these examples only work to prove that “Riley captured the imaginations and engaged the sympathies of his readers in a way that would make any writer wonderous and envious” (221). Allison chooses to ignore the significance of the disparity between these two responses to the figure of the Arab in Riley’s narrative. The variety of responses to the Muslim characters in one of the most popular Barbary captivity narrative of all times represents the variety of perspectives among Americans on Islam and Muslims. Muslim figures in Riley’s narrative were not flat and neither were American readers. The Islamic East was not just an entity that taught Americans what to avoid in establishing their own nation as Allison claims, it was also a locus that carried values worth emulating. If an Anglo-American child could be named Sidi Hamet then the Islamic East could not be a space that harbors nothing but anti-American or anti-Christian values in early American thought.

***

Not all early American Barbary captivity narratives were as generous towards Muslim figures as that of James Riley. For example, printed in 1798, John Foss’s

95 See Gerald McMurtry’s “The Influence of Riley’s Narrative upon Abraham Lincoln” (1934).
narrative of his captivity in Algeria shows a stark contrast to Riley’s account in its depiction of Algerian Muslims. However, while Foss does not miss any opportunity to depict his Muslim captors as merciless, tyrannical, and diabolical, these depictions do not merely serve to amplify a binary construction but help him engage in a triangular identity-formation in which Foss contrasts American captives against Europeans rather than merely pitting the American self against the Muslim Other. In Foss’s American-European binary that is catalyzed by his Muslim captors, American values of egalitarianism and social equality emerge in a fashion that brings to mind the initial argument I put forward in this project: early modern English subjects’ encounters with the Islamic East implanted in their minds ideas of social mobility, which, in turn, aided in the emergence of Anglo-colonial modes of identity. Written and published in the early national period, Foss’s narrative demonstrates how these new modes of Englishness gave way to an egalitarian understanding of citizenship that is further perpetuated in the context of Barbary captivity.

John Foss’s 1798 narrative is a paradigmatic example that unites American readers from all strata of the social system in patriotically cheering for the redemption of American slaves in North Africa. Foss sets the stage from the very beginning of his narrative by underlining in his preface that he is an “illiterate mariner” who begs his readers to “pardon the inadvertent inaccuracies” in his narrative. Besides serving as an apology that was almost a prerequisite of publishing a first-person account at the time, Foss hints at the social commentary that would appear in the forthcoming pages. As expected from any Barbary captivity narrative, his text depicts the horrible conditions of the slaves in Barbary. Yet, his narrative achieves much more than just depicting the
The horrors of slavery, it unites each and every American citizen in the pride of being a member of that great nation. Social classes disappear in this “illiterate” mariner’s narrative. What matters is the new nation’s strength in the face of international challenges and its citizens’ elevated position on the world stage regardless of their social background back at home.

When the Dey of Algiers refuses to negotiate with the United States of America for the redemption of American slaves, the American government provides supplies and a monthly allowance to relieve the misery of its slaves in Barbary. As much as American slaves are disappointed to find out that their redemption will not be possible in the near future, they take pride in their nation’s support of its citizens oppressed under Barbary captivity. While the monthly allowance and the clothes as well as the provisions relieve the American slaves to some extent, perhaps a greater relief comes from the fact that the United States of America is the only nation that supports its citizens in slavery. Foss’s lengthy reflection on the generosity of his nation deserves a close reading:

This generosity of the United States to us their enslaved countrymen was of inestimable value. It was more precious from being unexpected. No nation of christendom [sic] had ever done the like for their subjects in our situation. The Republican government of the United States have set an example of humanity to all the governments of the world.—Our relief was matter of admiration to merciless barbarians. They viewed the character of Americans from this time in the most exalted light. They exclaimed, that “Though we were slaves, we were gentlemen;” that “the American people must be the best in the world to be so humane and generous to their countrymen in slavery.” (54-55, italics added)
This excerpt is significant for several reasons. To begin with, Foss is more concerned with his nation’s reputation among other Christian nations than perpetuating American identity by pitting it against the Muslim Other. Yet, we cannot ignore that the reputation of his country can best be elevated in the context of Barbary where all Christian nations face a similar sense of inferiority. A nation’s ability to send help to its enslaved citizens in Barbary becomes an issue of pride among its people. On the other hand, the most frequently used expression of othering in captivity narratives, “barbarian,” is used in this context only to amplify the grandness of the American government’s benevolent act, not necessarily to demonize the Muslim Other to render him inferior. This usage of the word in fact demonstrates how the rhetoric of othering is not necessarily employed in captivity narratives to merely justify colonization or assimilation; it is also used to better perceive the self in the unimaginable context of captivity. To further support this point, Foss demonstrates his care for the Muslim Other’s perception of the American citizens as revealed by his pride in Americans’ being called gentlemen by the “merciless barbarians” who, despite their “barbarity”, admire the way American government is able to offer relief to its citizens.

Later in his narrative Foss juxtaposes the position of American subjects under Barbary captivity with that of the subjects of other nations, supporting my claim that Barbary serves as a locus of elevating the place of the new republic among other Christian nations rather than a site in which to pit the American citizen against the Muslim Other. Once the government of the United States manages to resume negotiations with the Dey of Algiers, American slaves begin to entertain the prospect of freedom. The expected news arrives one morning when “the Bagni-keeper, informed [American slaves]
that all taken under the American flag must stay in the Bagnio, and hold [themselves] in readiness to go to the Dey’s palace, and receive [their] (tiscaras) or pass-ports from the Dey” (65). In case the distinction between “all taken under the American flag” and the rest of the slaves is not clear, Foss repeats it in the very next paragraph and this time more lucidly: “On the 11th after the slaves of other nations had gone out to work, we were all called out of the Bagnio, and conducted by the Dey’s chief clerk to the palace where we received our pass-ports from the Dey” (65 italics added). This is the last time in his narrative Foss mentions slavery as the rest his narrative gives the details of his journey from Algiers to Boston. In this last scene of the American slaves’ leaving the bagnio—a symbol of Barbary captivity—Foss intriguingly contrasts American slaves with the European slaves instead of the engaging in a binary opposition against the Muslim Other. In that sense, Barbary is imagined as a stepping-stone for America in Foss’s narrative—a new nation that is striving to establish its authority on the world stage.

Foss’s narrative becomes most revealing when he assumes the role of the “seeing man,” which I discussed in chapter one, and begins providing ethnographical descriptions of Algeria and its inhabitants. Despite his less-than-glorifying depictions, Foss challenges the understanding that the Western subject relies on stereotypes in understanding the Orient without taking into consideration any nuances. Two times in his narrative, Foss differentiates between the various inhabitants of Algeria acknowledging the ethnic and cultural differences among the peoples sharing the same geography. What stands out in Foss’s depictions is his casual comparison of Turks to Americans: “The Turks are a well built robust people, their complexion not unlike Americans, tho’ somewhat larger, but their dress, and long beards, make them appear more like monsters, than human beings”
(47). While he finishes his depiction with a clear reference to American superiority over Turks, it is hard to ignore that Foss sees no harm in superimposing the Turk on the American. When read in light of Foss’s previous description of Turks, this depiction becomes more significant: “The Turks...have all the government and power in their own hands, and no man can hold any post of great distinction among them except he is a Turk” (34). Read side by side, Foss’s two different depictions of Turks expose his attempt to perceive his Algerian surroundings by making the foreign as familiar as possible through superimposing his native society over his captive society. While this is an attempt at familiarization, it clearly demonstrates how Foss perpetuates a racialized American discourse by juxtaposing Turks’ superiority over other races with white American superiority over other minorities in his native country. In that sense, as much as Foss wants to emphasize the inhumanity of Turks by referring to their long beard and dress, he cannot help but acknowledge the similarities between the Turk and the American.

Foss’s superimposition remains relatively superficial when we take into consideration how Riley’s narrative contains an unprecedented juxtaposition of Islam and Christianity against which shatters the binary construction of Christian West vs. Muslim East. What makes this juxtaposition further paradigmatic is the fact that it challenges not only the Christian understanding of Islam at the time as a pagan religion but also the Muslim perception of the notion of trinity in Christianity as heretical. In Riley’s narrative, the Muslim and the Christian melt their religious differences in one pot and claim submission to the same God without making any distinction about whether he is the God of Christians or Muslims. Having opened up to Rais bel Cossim about how he had
often found himself in despair during his captivity, Riley is reprimanded by the Moor thus:

What! (said he) dare you distrust the power of that God who has preserved you so long by miracles? No, my friend, (added he) the God of heaven and of earth is your friend, and will not forsake you; but in his own good time restore you to your liberty and to the embraces of your family; we must say, 'his will be done,' and be contented with our lot, for God knows best what is for our good. (216-17)

The Moor instantaneously turns upside down Riley’s American perception of Muslims: “To hear such sentiments from the mouth of a Moor, whose nation I had been taught to consider the worst of barbarians, I confess, filled my mind with awe and reverence, and I looked up to him as a kind of superior being” (217 italics added). Riley’s sentiments are sealed when Rais finishes his speech with a contention that might raise the eyebrows of both Riley’s American readers and Muslims: “We are all children of the same heavenly Father, who watches over all our actions, whether we be Moor, or Christian, or Pagan, or of any other religion; we must perform his will” (217). Rais proves with this speech that he earned the previously mentioned title of “soothing and sympathizing friend” from Riley (193). More importantly, though, he becomes instrumental in establishing an understanding in the minds of Riley’s American readers that a Muslim Moor might not be as inherently different from their American selves as they have been made to believe. Riley clearly suggests, through the character of this Spanish-speaking Moor, that the two
religions can actually be superimposable and a Muslim can be as devoted to God—more importantly to the same God—as an American, if not more.  

While Foss and Riley’s narratives imply that Americans and North Africans can be seen as ethnically and religiously superimposable, the protagonist of a fictional captivity narrative evinces that such a view does not pose a threat to American values that were still in the making in the early nineteenth century. Royall Tyler’s *Algerine Captive* narrates the adventures of a New Englander, Updike Underhill, who spends the initial years of his adulthood trying to find an occupation in his native country only to become a doctor on a slave ship and fall captive to Algerian pirates during one of his voyages. *The Algerine Captive* deserves significantly more attention than I can offer in these pages; however, I will attend, in closing, to one of the most discussed chapters of Tyler’s novel—to the scene in which Underhill agrees to attend a Muslim “college” in return for which he would be excused from the menial work his slavery entails.

I am turning to Updike Underhill at the end of this chapter—and this project—because he embodies the distinctive American identity whose emergence and evolution I trace in this project. The new forms of Englishness that originated in the face of Ottoman and North African Muslims were eventually instrumental in the fashioning of colonial modes of Englishness to be utilized in the New World as I have demonstrated in my discussion of John Smith in chapter two. Smith and his contemporaries who shared his

---

96 In *Thomas Jefferson's Qur'an: Islam and the Founders* (2013), Denise Spellberg notes that “Jefferson as president would insist to the rulers of Tripoli and Tunis that his nation harbored no anti-Islamic bias, even going so far as to express the extraordinary claim of believing in the same God as those men” (8). Spellberg’s contention suggests that Riley could find an audience in early America sympathetic to the sentiments reflected in his narrative.

97 Throughout his novel, Tyler refers to this place of education as “college,” the Arabic equivalent of which can be “madrasa.”
vision of an egalitarian society planted the seeds of the New English community, which was more inclusive and embracing towards the idea of assimilation and acculturation and therefore more welcoming towards the English men and women who had experienced captivity among the non-English, non-Christian, other. Underhill, in that sense, represents the point where this American identity-formation has evolved in the early national period. If Foss’s and Riley’s narratives see no harm in superimposing Americans and Turks ethnically and religiously, Tyler’s novel goes one step further and depicts its protagonist experiencing first a physical transformation and then an intellectual stimulation catalyzed by a Muslim “mollah,” which despite allegedly leaving no mark on his American identity leave him in a state of confusion.98

Having found himself unable to endure the torments of slavery, Tyler’s Underhill assents to spending time in a Muslim college where he would be safe from any torture or physical burden slaves have to endure. In exchange for this break from slavery, Underhill only has to attend to lectures that aim to proselytize him. Before meeting with the mollah, who would deliver these lectures, Underhill goes through a very sensual experience in the Turkish bath to be rinsed of the physical effects of slavery:

[M]y attendants, as if emulous to cleanse me from all the filth of error, rubbed me so hard with their hands and flesh-brushes, that I verily thought they would have slayed me…I was then anointed, in all the parts of my body which had been exposed to the sun, with a preparation of gum, called the balm of Mecca…In twenty-four hours the sun-browned cuticle peeled off, and left my face, hands,

98 Tyler defines mollah as “Mahometan Priest” (129) in his novel. The more standard English transliteration of this word is mullah and it is used as a title in Persian and Turkish to refer to “a person who is learned in Islamic theology and law; a Muslim cleric” (OED).
legs, and neck, as fair as a child’s of six months old. This balm the Algerine ladies procure at a great expense, and use it as a cosmetic to heighten their beauty…After I had been clothed in the drawers, slippers, loose coat, and shirt of the country, if shirt it could be called, which neck had none; my hands and feet were tinged yellow, with a decoction of the herb henna; which colour, they said denoted purity of intention. (132-33)

This physical transformation is extremely telling as it goes completely against what early modern Englishmen believed and signifies the change in attitudes towards Islam and the threat of assimilation from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century. For early modern Englishmen traveling to or being held captive in Muslim lands, merely wearing Muslim clothes meant spiritual contamination as suggested by the use of the phrase “wearing the Turban” to describe a Christian’s conversion to Islam. In the case of Underhill, however, he not only indulges in a sensual experience in the Muslim college but also finds his prejudices against Islam and Muslims shattered by a Muslim mollah, who himself has converted from Christianity to Islam. When Underhill confronts the “priest” with the claim that Islam was “promulgated by the sword,” the mollah responds thus: “We leave it to the Chistians [sic] of the West Indies, and Christians of your southern plantations, to baptise the unfortunate African into your faith, and then use your brother Christians as brutes of the desert” (140). More than the mollah’s answer, Underhill’s reflection deserves attention here: “Here I was so abashed for my country, I could not answer him” (140). Having been reminded of his country’s sin of slavery, Underhill cannot come up with a plausible answer. After a seven-and-a-half page transcript of his conversation with the mollah, Underhill readily admits there is not much he could add: “I have thus given a
few sketches of the manner of this artful priest. After five days conversation, disgusted with his fables, abashed by his assurance, and almost confounded by his sophistry, I resumed my slave’s attire, and sought safety in my former servitude” (142 italics added). With a short and blunt end to his indulging yet confounding experience in the Muslim college, Underhill proves in his own way that it is very easy for the American slave to walk out of the Muslim college without jeopardizing his American and Christian identity. Further perpetuating the idea that he can easily maneuver between Islam and Christianity, once he is saved by the Portuguese he throws his “Mahometan dress over the ship’s side” having been provided with “every necessary, and many ornamental articles of European clothing” (238). He might have been abashed and confounded by his experience in the Muslim college but coming to his American senses proves as easy as exchanging his Muslim clothes with European ones.

My analysis of early American Barbary captivity narratives suggests that early Americans did not merely dismiss the Islamic East as a locus of tyranny and sensuality and neither did they have an exclusively bigoted view of Muslims as entities against which an American identity could be constructed. I acknowledge that these narratives do contain depictions of Muslims that can easily be described as relying on the binary constructions of Orientalism. However, by situating these depictions in the triangular model of this project, we can observe that they often serve as catalysts enabling the American subject to define his emerging American identity vis-à-vis Europeans—particularly the English. Further supporting this argument is the ample evidence found in these narratives that prove the American subject’s strong ties to his New English/American community regardless of the amount of time he spends among
Muslims. Showing a stark contrast to the early modern English ideas, early Americans believed that it was possible to maneuver between identities and one’s experience in the Islamic East, no matter whether it resulted in assimilation or not, did not necessarily entail the severance of ties with natal communities. On the contrary, the idea of assimilation, a notion that played a crucial role in the transformation of the English colonies into first the New English community and then to the American nation, was seen as an indispensable part of the American experience. This understanding eventually resulted in the creation of the distinct American identity I have been tracing in this project. This identity, despite being racialized, was inherently more inclusive than the English identity in the early modern period from which it evolved in the sense that it extended a more welcoming attitude towards its middle-class, white citizens returning from captivity. Unlike their early modern English counterparts, American captives returning from North Africa could expect to be weaved into the fabric of American social life. More importantly, they could bring back more nuanced depictions of their Muslim captors without fearing any backlash from their readers. Ultimately, these depictions worked towards perpetuating a certain sense of American-ness—not simply through binary opposition, but also by utilizing the more inclusive model of triangulation I have outlined in this project.
Conclusion

By the mid-nineteenth century, Barbary captivity had ceased to be a threat for the Western world. The United States, thanks to the relatively successful outcomes of the two Barbary Wars that took place in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, managed to prove to both its citizens and to the rest of the world that it was “no longer…an idea or an experiment: it had…become a nation” (Battistini 471). The fact that the first Barbary War (1801-1805) was the first overseas battle the US fought after becoming a nation crystallizes the role of the Barbary captivity crisis in helping the new republic establish itself as an emerging power on the world stage—even as an imperial power as some scholars suggest. This understanding essentially depicts the Barbary crisis and the subsequent wars as means to create a national identity for Americans as the citizens of a new yet powerful nation. For this reason, the scholarship on the United States of America’s relationship with the Islamic East predominantly argues that an American identity came into being in the early national period partly due to a process of pitting the American self against the Muslim Other—an entity Americans perceived as the embodiment of everything un-American. This argument is uncannily similar to the arguments proposed by many scholars with regards to early modern English encounters with the Islamic East. By depicting Europe’s relationship with the Muslim world as profoundly relying on a binary construction of Christian self-Muslim other, many of these scholars paradoxically both criticize and yet shadow Said’s theory of Orientalism.

---

To avoid this paradox, I have proposed in this project a triangular model—one that does not deny the figures of the Islamic East a paradigmatic role in early modern English and early American identity-formation, but one that refrains from describing these Muslim figures merely as entities against which English, Anglo-American, and ultimately American identities were forged.

In the triangular model of this project, one of the three legs is always the non-English Other in the form of either Ottoman Turks, North African masters, or Native American captors. These non-English (and non-American) figures, I have demonstrated, functioned as catalyzers in the reconfiguration of English, Anglo-American, and American identities. Thanks to these figures, the white Christian subject could question his or her position within the community—national or colonial—of which s/he was a part. The significance of this model lies in the fact that it does not perpetuate the notion of a long-lasting enmity between the Christian West and the Islamic East. I do not, however, naively assume that demonizing and otherizing depictions of these non-Christian figures never existed in the narratives I scrutinize in this project. Nevertheless, I firmly believe in a need to shift the focus from such otherizing depictions to more nuanced and sophisticated ones, to the depictions that acknowledge the humanity of the “other” and the complexity of the foreign culture. These depictions, as I have worked to prove in the previous pages, suggest that the Christian self was inclined to perceive his/her culture more critically than we tend to believe and to define his/her position within this culture in a manner that created possibilities for self-advancement—as in the cases of Thomas Dallam and John Smith—as well as for the advancement of his community—as in the case of America’s journey from a colony to a powerful nation. To
put it in other words, in this model, the western subject emerges as more interested in coming to a better understanding of the self as well as his natal culture than reimagining and recreating the East in order to make it easier to override and dominate it as Said’s *Orientalism* suggests.

This dissertation essentially suggests that for every self vs. other binary a triangulation exists. Ample contemporary cases exist to demonstrate the universality of this triangular model and help us understand the intricacy of identity construction in the face of the “other.” The most recent of these cases has yet again to do with captivity. Two centuries after the Barbary crisis ended, captivity has once more become a subject of grave concern in the western world after 2014-2015 beheadings of American and European hostages by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). According to the *New York Times*, ISIS was holding captive twenty-three “foreign” hostages from twelve different countries as of January 2015 some of whom were executed when their countries rejected paying a ransom in return for their release. Since its establishment as a so-called caliphate in the Middle East, ISIS has considered the western world, to no one’s surprise, as its archenemy. In other words, they set out to define their very existence in a manner heavily relying on a binary construction that has committed to annihilating anything and everything on the other side of this binary.

ISIS’s destructive opposition suggests that human beings have the tendency to define their selves in *contrast* to an “other.” This project, however, proposes an alternative: human beings also understand their selves in *relation* to an “other.” Ultimately, the existence of an “other” is vital for individuals to achieve a certain sense of self. Yet, this does not mean that this other always and exclusively has to be demonized.
In certain cases, as I discuss throughout this dissertation, this other can also serve as a catalyst and help the individual question what he or she has come to perceive as normal and unchangeable. Thomas Dallam, for example, would not have reconsidered his self-worth as a middle-class artisan in relation to an English gentleman and aspire social mobility had he not been reminded by the Ottoman Sultan of the value of his talent. To Dallam, it was not necessarily a binary opposition that helped him define his Englishness but a triangulation that made him aware of the possibility that he could redefine his Englishness.

Today, many Muslims around the world are experiencing a very similar process of identity-construction to those of Thomas Dallam and other Britons and Americans I turn to in the previous pages. Instead of defining their Muslimness in opposition to the Christianity of the western world, the majority of the Muslims living in the US and Europe are increasingly redefining their religious identities against the radical Islamists, in other words, against fellow Muslims.\(^{100}\) I did not bring up the issue of radical Islam in

\(^{100}\) No matter how much mainstream Muslims might disagree with ISIS’s or Al-Qaeda’s extremist interpretations of Islam, in the end both identify themselves as Muslims.

The statement below that was published on the website of Al Huda Islamic Center of Athens, GA on the 15\(^{th}\) anniversary of September 11 attacks bears testimony to Muslim Americans’ desire to define their Muslim identities in contrast to radical Islamists but in alliance with Americans:

Today is the 15th anniversary of the tragedy of September 11 terror attack. We remember nearly 3,000 innocent lives lost, who were sons and daughters, husbands and wives, neighbors and colleagues and friends. They were from all walks of life, all races and religions, all colors and creeds, from across America and around the world. We stand shoulder to shoulder with the survivors who still bears [sic] the scars of that day. Also, in our remembrance are men and women in uniform, diplomats and our intelligence, homeland security and law enforcement professionals, who serve, and many of whom even have given their lives, to help keep us safe. (Italics added)
the conclusion to this dissertation because it serves as a convenient example to relate my project to this day. Yes, the ISIS example shows that the history repeats itself, but more importantly, it provides me with the opportunity to demonstrate that for each binary opposition a triangulation exists. It also enables me to conclude this project by turning to the Muslim experience of identity-formation, albeit very briefly. This brief glimpse at the Muslim experience in the twenty-first century and the revelation it brings—that a seventeenth-century Englishman’s experience of identity-formation can in fact be very similar to that of a twenty-first-century Muslim as they both rely on an “other” but not necessarily define themselves against that “other”—compels us to reconsider conventional depictions of the East-West relations through centuries as one that gains its strength from demonizing and otherizing the other. The triangular model I propose in this project can become a useful apparatus to distance us from the deceptive convenience of binary opposition in understanding the complex history of East-West relations. In this project, I utilized this triangular model to give an alternative narrative of the emergence and evolution of an American identity to the one that considers this narrative as one of othering. Essentially, the fact that many Americans today are still defining their American-ness by distancing themselves from the xenophobic rhetoric employed by some of their fellow Americans bolsters the utility and universality of the triangular model I have introduced in this project.

---

101 The 2016 U.S. presidential election created the optimum atmosphere to prove the continuing utility of this triangular model today. In response to the Republican candidate Donald Trump’s xenophobic rhetoric against immigrants, many Americans feel compelled to take a strong stance against him and emphasize that they consider the rhetoric of his campaign as un-American. While some suggest that his “values are not America’s” (Rubin), some go so far as to claim that he has declared a “war on American values” (Diaz).
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