

THE RHETORIC OF SILENCE IN THE CAPTIVITY NARRATIVES OF FOUR
AMERICAN WOMEN

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, SPEECH, AND FOREIGN LANGUAGES

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

LISETTE BLANCO-CERDA, B.A., M.A., M.S.

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 2020

Copyright © 2020 by Lisette Blanco-Cerda

DEDICATION

To my parents, Eligio and María Blanco-Cerda, for believing in me and for sacrificing so much so that I can become the first Blanco-Cerda to graduate with a college degree and the only Blanco-Cerda with graduate degrees. *¡Te amo y te extraño!*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking Dr. Phyllis Bridges for supporting me, offering me sage advice, pushing me when I needed pushing, and allowing me space and time when I needed it. I am thankful for your belief in my topic and for your incredible guidance as you helped me finetune everything from my line of argument to my sentences. I am humbled by your generosity of spirit, and I strive to be half the professional as you. Thank you.

I also want to thank Dr. Guy Litton and Dr. Linda Marshall; thank you for your insight into my writing and for the time and energy you have contributed to helping me realize my goals. Dr. Litton, thank you for your excellent question about Mary Rowlandson obliquely criticizing the English army. Through that one question so long ago I was able to solidify my approach to analyzing silence as rhetoric. Dr. Marshall, thank you for your incredible kindness and interest in my approach to examining embodied trauma in women's captivity narratives. Your keen eye helped me strengthen my subtle sociological angle in my overall argument. Both of you have made my long journey a bit easier because of your unwavering support and kindness.

To James, my partner in life: Thank you for believing in me. Since my parents' and sister's deaths, I have often felt alone. Your steady, gentle, and powerful presence has helped me regain my belief in myself. Your everyday acts of love do not go unnoticed. When I was terrified as I faced cancer, your simple act of shaving your head when I began to lose my hair from chemotherapy helped bring the fighter out in me. Your

daily acts of empathy continue to center me, especially while I worked on this often frustrating and lonely project. Thank you for always reassuring and comforting me, especially when I battle my own inner demons.

To John: If you were not my son, I would be honored to have you as a friend. Your amazing sense of humor has kept me going and your insight to questions I have posed to you, from teaching ideas to thorny sentences in this dissertation, have helped me in ways I hope you understand. Like your father, your steady presence helps to center me. Plus your music suggestions have helped me as I worked on this project late into the night so many times. I am humbled to be your mother, and I am so very proud of you.

Finally to my mother and father: I wish you were still here to see what your youngest daughter has accomplished. It is because of you, Dad, a “throw-away” kid from age eight to seventeen when you finally found your home in the Army as you fought to stay alive on Normandy, that I learned to follow my own path and realize I must live with intention and authenticity. I will always cherish my memories of our talks about folklore, literature, and philosophy as we rode our horses along the San Antonio Mission Trail. Because of you, Mom, I learned to love books and ideas and words and art as I grew up watching your quiet strength and unsung fortitude. I am forever grateful, Mom, for learning from you that there is no shame in being who I am. Thank you, both, for being my strongest supporters, especially when I was blind to your attempts so many times. Thank you for offering me words of wisdom and strong arms to help take my burden when I needed support. Thank you for your unfailing love, and thank you for believing in me. I hope that I have made you proud.

ABSTRACT

LISETTE BLANCO-CERDA

THE RHETORIC OF SILENCE IN THE CAPTIVITY NARRATIVES OF FOUR
AMERICAN WOMEN

MAY 2020

Women have been excluded from rhetorical tradition by varying methods. Whether by being defined against prescribed ideals of femininity or by being denied of agency by having their work appropriated, silenced, or trivialized, women have faced dismissal repeatedly as they have sought to engage in rhetoric. Often, women struggle to engage in rhetoric as the silence that is forced upon them results from the interruption of intellectual work as they navigate the domestic world.

Yet women continued to engage in rhetoric, including public rhetorics, even when their rhetoric inhabits topos that are not recognized as rhetorical spaces. Two such rhetorical spaces are the gendered spaces of conversation and silence. This study investigates the rhetorical decision to engage in silence and the topos of silence's relationship with embodied trauma. By examining and providing examples in three captivity narratives written by women spanning the American literary landscape (Mary Rowlandson's *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*, Fanny Kelly's *Narrative of My Captivity Among the Sioux Indians*, and Amanda Berry's and Gina DeJesus's *Hope: A Memoir of Survival in Cleveland*), the argument is made that women have always engaged in public rhetorical spaces by engaging in traditionally-dismissed rhetorical strategies as

deliberately engaging in silence and then transgressing silence while navigating societally-constructed and highly gendered parameters. This study examines the four captives' rhetorical negotiations with their captors in order to experience as little trauma as possible. Additionally, this study utilizes the relocation of the Aristotelian concept of ethos to be that which exists in the "betweens" (Karen Burke LeFevre and Kate Ronald qtd. in Reynolds 333). Thus, rather than locating the ethos of the four captives within the traditional and gendered concept of ethos, this study locates ethos as the space between the written text and the reader, a space that is permeated by women's experiences and their authority.

This study concludes with a discussion of how it will add to the growing body of research into silence as rhetoric and how it also offers transdisciplinary benefits by revealing multilayered nuances in the rhetoric of silence, particularly when such rhetorical decisions intersect with embodied trauma.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE AMERICAN CAPTIVITY NARRATIVE AND ITS EVOLUTION.....	30
III. HOW THE CAPTIVES USED (EXPECTED) SILENCE TO SUBVERT POWER DYNAMICS	61
IV. ETHOS RE-EXAMINED AND THE RHETORICS OF TORTURE AND EMBODIED TRAUMA	101
V. CONCLUSION	136
WORKS CITED	151
NOTES.....	160

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This narrative was penned by the gentlewoman herself...that she might never forget...

--Mary Rowlandson, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*

...I propose to give a plain, unvarnished narrative...

--Fanny Kelly, *Narrative of My Captivity Among the Sioux Indians*

We have written here about terrible things that we never wanted to think about again. But our story is not just about rape and chains, lies and misery...Our story is about overcoming all that.

--Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus, *Hope: A Memoir of Survival in Cleveland*

Women's voices historically have faced silencing, resistance, and challenge. From being silenced or outright erased to being accused of acting outside one's sphere, women's voices remain a contentious field in rhetoric. Since rhetoric has historically often been defined as public speaking or oration and since women have historically been discouraged from entering the public space of oration, women have used other methods for communication. However, it is essential to note that although women have faced resistance in rhetoric, women have not remained silent—at least in the pure definition of

the word. In “Between Silence and Certainty: A Codicil to ‘Dialectical Tensions of Speaking and Silence’,” Robert L. Scott quotes Wittgenstein from *Tractatus Philosophicus*, “What we cannot speak about we must pass over in silence” (108). Calling silence a “mystery,” Scott argues that the “that about which we cannot speak,” or Wittgenstein’s premise of humanity’s inability to speak necessitating silence, necessarily involves “the many borders of finiteness [which] leads [individuals] to negotiate...the boundaries that we would make meaningful” (Scott 108). These borders, because of Scott’s nomenclature of mystery, then presuppose a supernatural, even supra-natural, intrinsic quality to silence. In “Silence: A Politics,” Kennan Ferguson identifies the political conflicts, identities, and ideologies that are “negotiated linguistically” with the strategy of silence being “often used in situations of profound disagreement” such as sexuality, religion, and politics (Ferguson 113). Nancy Myers expands upon Cheryl Glenn’s concept of “‘expected silences,’ acts that reinforced women’s subordination” (Myers 57) with her concepts of “purposeful silence and perceptive listening” (59). According to Myers, purposeful silence depends upon a “woman’s deliberate restraint and choice” while perceptive listening depends upon a “woman’s processes of reasoning and reflecting” (59). In *Borderlands/La Frontera*, Gloria Anzaldúa remarks upon the culturally engrained Mexican tradition of silence: “En boca cerrada no entran moscas,” or flies do not enter closed mouths (76). Further remarking upon the gendered nature of silence within the Mexican-American community, Anzaldúa discusses yet another Mexican saying that “[m]uchachitas bien criadas” (well-bred girls) were not “habladoras,” for to be so talkative was to show “una falta de respeto,” or a lack of

respect. In fact, telling stories, especially of others, was to be “mal criada,” or a bad girl (76). Thus, silence becomes entwined with gendered expectations and the perceived worthiness of women.

As evidenced in these quotes, silence suggests agency, particularly with regards to negotiating borders or boundaries as they relate to power. While Foucault focuses on socio-economic spaces and power in “The Eye of Power” (149), the spaces of silence and speech are similarly imbued with power, including socio-economic power. Women historically have held little socio-economic power and have been granted less space, especially space outside the domestic sphere. Silencing, whether outwardly enforced or self-enforced, consists of the negotiation of power to transgress borders, political conflicts, identities, and societal expectations.

In sum, silence is not merely muteness; for, unless the mute individual is so by design (i.e. physical inability to speak), to be mute is to make a decision. The one who chooses to abstain from speech employs silence as a rhetorical strategy. On the other hand, when a more powerful entity (an individual, culture, or religion, for example) forebears one to be silent, silence is then thrust upon this individual. Silence is therefore committed against an individual or done to another individual or group of individuals, effectively diminishing or negating that individual's or group's agency.

While one can trace the lineage of silence within women's rhetoric, one cannot ignore the reality that many women have acted upon their agency and either refused to remain silent or have used silence itself as a subversive rhetorical strategy. Aligning with the general foundation of the classical Greek concept of rhetoric as being “primarily an

art of persuasion,” “primarily oral,” and “involv[ing] utterance on a specific occasion,” this dissertation examines the “act” of rhetoric by closely interrogating each captive’s use of silence and her implied agency (Kennedy 2). Through their self-penned narratives of captivity, Mary Rowlandson, Fanny Kelley, Amanda Berry, and Gina DeJesus publicly speak of their physical and emotional captivities. This dissertation employs a dual-pronged approach to rhetoric: each woman’s “act” of silence as persuasion and each woman’s public voice as manifested in the materiality of the captivity narratives. This dissertation also examines the intertwining links of public voice, intimate voice, torture, pain, and ethos. Using the principal rhetorical strategy of silence as a perspective from which to examine the construction of the captive, including her ethos, and by examining the rhetorics of pain and torture within captivity, this dissertation limits its investigation into the use of silence within three captivity narratives written by four American women. Because silence and the body vis-à-vis pain and torture intersect, this dissertation examines the role of each captive’s body in her use of silence. Furthermore, because each woman was held captive for a specific amount of time wherein she was removed from her previous life’s experiences, this dissertation likewise examines what American author Tillie Olsen refers to as “hidden silences,” that is, work “aborted, deferred, denied” and, consequently, “hidden by the work” each woman was then expected to perform during her captivity (Olsen 8).

Although history is filled with women who have experienced “hidden silences” or endured prohibitions and prescriptions against active engagement in the public sphere, women have always found a way to practice rhetoric. From Mary Rowlandson’s eventual

publication of her captivity despite her initial reluctance until “Some Friends ... judge[d] it worthy of publick [sic] view” (Per Amicum 9) to Amanda Berry’s hoarding of paper scraps on which to take notes throughout her ten-year captivity, women have actively practiced rhetoric, even seeking agency. Whether one’s perspective aligns with Margaret Ezell’s premise, in *The Patriarch’s Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family*, that women’s education had not declined in the Tudor and Stuart periods (Staves 90) and, thus, women were not unduly prevented from practicing rhetoric, or whether one’s perspective aligns with Margaret Fuller’s “sheer revolutionary daring...to question existing gender hierarchies and to disrupt accepted sexual practices” (Kolodny, “Margaret Fuller” 138), when one knows where to look one can see women actively engaging in rhetoric, thereby claiming agency.

A case in point involves Pythagoras who, approximately over one hundred years before Plato’s Academy, “gave his [Pythagoras’] women pupils considerable training in philosophy and literature; but he also had them instructed in the maternal and domestic arts” (Glenn 31). A guiding principle of Pythagorean philosophy, *harmonia*, typically applied to the harmonious relationship among art, literature, poetry, rhetoric, and music. It also served to underscore his idea that *harmonia*-as-moral-reform must exist in order to engender harmony within the state and within the home. Women were primarily the ones who helped spread this idea, thus enjoying agency in ancient Greece. Perhaps Pythagoras’ wife, Theano, is to be lauded. Not only did she help to spread Pythagorean philosophy of *harmonia*, she applied this philosophy to the home and her quotidian life. According to Cheryl Glenn in *Rhetoric Retold*, Theano was responsible for eight of the

ten women-penned letters (from sixteen extant letters by both sexes) elucidating *harmonia*. Thus, letter writing was used as a form of moral education for women (Ward qtd. in Glenn 31). Because *harmonia* was regarded as a “perfect fit,” Pythagorean texts “mark the intersectionality of influential Pythagorean women with domestic, personal *harmonia*” (Glenn 32, 31).

Although some women in ancient Greece experienced more agency in their education and rhetoric than women living in later epochs, women’s rhetoric and education were nevertheless deeply connected to the domestic sphere. Intimate forms of communication, such as letters, speak to a quieter form, even a more palatably-gendered form, of rhetoric in that the audience is typically much smaller and intimate. Thus, while there were women who spoke publicly, letter writing became an acceptable form of communication for women. Letters are written to one, perhaps two people; but by their very materiality, one reads the letter (even if to others) in an intimate, such as a domestic, setting. Of course, if the letter travels to multiple readers or is read before a large crowd (or later published), a wider audience can be reached. Nevertheless, by virtue of the intimacy of letters, the immediate audience reading the letter frequently remains intimately small. *Ars dictamandi*, or the art of letter writing, employed stylistic strategies and adhered to a parallel structure of the five rhetorical canons of memory, arrangement, invention, delivery, and style. According to classical Latin rhetorical handbooks, correct epistolary form consisted of five parts: “*salutatio*, or greeting...*captatio benevolentiae*, or exordium, *narratio*,... *petitio*, or specific request...and...a relatively simple *conclusion*”

(Kennedy 214). Thus, women who engaged in letter writing and were taught proper form learned and employed the principle of rhetoric.

This intersection of the domestic sphere and rhetoric continued into the Medieval period. Although preaching increasingly became a feature in rhetoric's domain, letter writing remained a regular space for communication. Even though medieval women "seldom achieved literacy" (Bizzell 445) and could thus "hardly leave records of the eloquence they undoubtedly exercised in many private, and some public, venues," women nevertheless practiced rhetoric (Bizzell 445). In *Epistolae and Epitomae*, Virgilius lauds a woman grammarian, Fassica, as being "a woman so wise and so learned that her name will ... be celebrated as long as the world exists" (qtd. in Copeland and Sluiter 251). In Elizabeth Alvilda Petroff's *Body & Soul: Essays on Medieval Women and Mysticism*, Petroff examines the revealing of women mystics and their contributions to rhetoric. While she situates women's voice within spirituality, specifically mysticism, she nevertheless acknowledges the inherent paradox of doing so within medievalism: "...not only was mystical experience difficult to communicate but *as women they lacked authority, and the authoritative language, to communicate truths*" (Petroff 4, emphasis added).

Even though the women mystics Petroff examines felt "compelled to write by God, and not through any presumption on their part" (Bowie qtd. in Petroff 4), the women mystics nevertheless entered the public arena of rhetoric. While their writings focused on bodily experiences and while they attributed their writing to a larger, more powerful entity than they, namely the masculine God who lent authority to the women

mystics, women like St. Clare of Assisi and St. Bona of Pisa nonetheless transgressed societal norms of silent women, some more radically than others. For example, St. Clare of Assisi offers her rendering of utopian visions while St. Bona of Pisa, the more radical rhetor, transgresses societal expectations of the invisible female saint by being described as traveling, pilgrimaging, and exhibiting bodily levitation in public space. Furthermore, the writer of the *Life of St. Bona of Pisa*, Johannes Presbyter, chooses to quote directly St. Bona's words while indirectly recording the male monks before whom she performs the miracle of flight (Petroff 169, 182).

Even though silent women were regarded as the ideal, many women resisted this prescription. By navigating the rhetorical conventions allowed them, women from Theano to St. Bona of Assisi used language to reach certain ends. Doing so, these women engaged in applying rhetoric by subverting or outright transgressing rhetorical conventions limited to their sex. Consequently, they claimed agency.

Directly addressing the widows of the fallen soldiers in “Pericles’ Funeral Oration,” Thucydides *warns* the women of their acceptable behavior:

If it is necessary that I also be mindful of the excellence of the wives who will now be widows, I shall indicate it all with a brief admonition. Great glory will come to you if you live up to your existing natures, and greatest will be hers who is least spoken of among men whether for her excellence or for blame. (Tracy 76)

Sophocles later mirrors this belief in *Ajax* as seen in Tecmessa’s retelling of her brief exchange with Ajax:

TECMESSA: He [Ajax] took his two-edged sword, as if intent

On some wild expedition. So I chid him,
Saying, "What dost thou, Ajax, why go forth?
No summons, messenger or trumpet blast,
Hath called thee; nay, by now the whole host [household] sleeps."
He answered *lightly* with an ancient saw [my emphasis],
"Woman, for women silence is a grace." (Sophocles, *Ajax* 29-32)

Sophocles, through Tecmessa's relating of Ajax's words, echoes the long-standing belief that woman's greatest virtue is her silence. In the exchange between Ajax and Tecmessa, Tecmessa asks a question in an intimate setting, their home, and Ajax responds in a "light," perhaps teasing, manner. Yet he nonetheless admonishes her for speaking; and because Tecmessa, a woman, is the medium for this message, the normalization of the silent woman as ideal is achieved.

While higher-classed boys were schooled to accept the reality that speaking in public would be their "rightful province," lower-classed boys were similarly taught to accept the fact that they, too, would speak in public, but in roles their "station demanded: ... [with] respectful communication with their journeymen-masters" (Kamensky 25). While men were encouraged to study and engage in rhetoric even if needing to navigate the class-based boundaries, women, on the other hand, were expected to remain silent and to express the only form of rhetoric allotted them: "maiden blushes and bashfull [sic] smiles" (Richard Brathwaite qtd. in Kamensky 25).

Underlying these gendered (and classed) foundational assumptions of appropriate expectations in public discourse is ethos, the speaker's acceptance and believability as

one who inhabits his or her allotted station. If women were to adhere to what Richard Brathwaite considers ideal, then all females, from young girls to grown women “*should be seene, and not heard*” (qtd. in Kamensky 25). Thus, the woman’s voice is silenced; and the silenced female voice is regarded as the ideal feminine voice. This silenced voice characterizes woman’s ethos, her believability and acceptability as a woman, specifically as a “gentlewoman.” In “Reigning in the Court of Silence: Women and Rhetorical Space,” Nan Johnson notes that in an article titled “Quiet Woman” that appeared in the 1868 *Ladies Repository*, an anonymous author advocated that “quiet women [are] the wine of life” (48, brackets in original). This praise of quiet women furthered the construct of the ideal woman: the “angel of the hearth,” a postbellum, later Victorian, concept that privileges women’s domesticity, submission, piety, and silence.¹ Johnson notes that the portrait of the angel of the hearth “deifies the quiet woman and categorizes other possibilities negatively: the enthusiastic woman, the talkative woman [my emphasis], the brilliant woman, and the babbling woman” (Johnson 48). In other words, the proscriptions for acceptable femininity are painfully narrow and the transgressions of undesirable femininity are woefully broad. Through *apophasis* or *negatio*, the reality of women’s discourse is thereby denied desirability. In other words, any woman who does not remain silent or verbally docile is categorized as less than simply for her transgression in engaging in verbal discourse. Such a transgressive woman must either learn to negotiate the very narrow parameters of acceptable behavior, or face becoming a cautionary tale for young girls or by being ostracized.

In “Quiet Women,” the ideal woman is a “mild and mellow queen of the court of silence” and is “graceful and calm, and *most important of all...is quiet*” (Johnson 48, emphasis added). From Thucydides’ declaration that a woman’s glory is essentially her erasure by being the “least spoken of” (Tracy 76) to the postbellum construction of the ideal woman as being rhetorically subdued, silence remains a constant construct of women’s rhetoric. Consequently, the ideal woman’s ethos resulting from silence becomes reified.

Aristotle states that society believes “moral character...constitutes the most effective means of proof” (*Rhetoric* 17). But since the predominant and preferred voice that was allowed in public discourse was male and which was thus capable of achieving believability, the female voice that dared to enter public discourse was, by default, not capable of gaining believability and, perhaps, not a “good” woman. Some women were, nevertheless, “invited to become educated but only with those rhetorical skills that allowed them to perform better the roles of wives and mothers, and were discouraged by this same education from intruding on [what Nan Johnson refers to as] men’s ‘public rhetorical space’” (Donawerth 3). According to Nan Johnson in “Reigning in the Court of Silence”:

By constructing rhetorical performance as a conduct issue and by bringing speaking under the watchful eye of advisers, conduct books participated in a widespread cultural project to police the borders between domestic and public space and to keep the average woman in her home and off the podium. (Johnson 225)

Thus, when a woman ventured into public discourse, she became imbued with a lack of believability and credibility. The female author, because she transgressed gendered and societal expectations of rhetoric, was often deemed to lack credibility.

However, there have been and will continue to be exceptions. An earlier example other than Theano's letters is the 1792 printing of the religious tract, *Some Arguments Against Worldly-Mindedness features a subtitle of A Dialogue or Discourse between two, called by the Names of MARY and MARTHA*.² Below this lengthy title is the author's name: Eunice Smith. Differing from the classical Greek letters attributed to Theano, this 1792 religious tract boldly states the author's evidently feminine name. Although satires against educated and learned women “flourished in Restoration and eighteenth-century literature [and w]riters on education...warned against the danger of too much female learning” (Vietto 19-21), women continued their education and even entered the public sphere of rhetoric. In fact, “the author-as-mother was a particularly resonant ideal in the post-Revolutionary United States” because of the emphasis on Republican motherhood, the idea that encouraged female learning so as to educate better their children in the new nation (Vietto 37).

In the mid-seventeenth century, Madeleine de Scudéry argued for the inclusion of women's “conversation as model for public discourse” (Donawerth 17), and from the seventeenth century to the twentieth century, “Christian women published defenses of women's preaching—until they gained the right to preach” (Donawerth 73). While gendered conventions of conversation served as the model for women's preaching, women, nevertheless, became a persistent presence in public speaking. This thread of

persistence, however, is made visible, with the development of technology and the Internet.

For obvious reasons, early women's writing could not benefit from the Internet with its speed, method of delivery, and arrangement of delivered rhetorical works. However, as mentioned earlier, women nevertheless persisted in their exercise of rhetoric, whether through letters, conversations, preaching, or, what this dissertation examines, personal narratives that explore women writers' lived experiences of their own harrowing trials: their captivity narratives. Captivity narratives proved to be a field of texts wherein women gained authority. While men have written captivity narratives, such as Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca's brutal yet humanizing *La Relación* and John Williams' haunting *The Redeemed Captive*, captivity narratives eventually became a domain for women authors. In early American captivity narratives, women, like Mary Rowlandson, needed a male author or publisher to help establish her credibility with the masculine publishing world. Perhaps, through this recognition resulting from publication, women's rhetoric began to find larger audiences. From the intimate settings of letters and conversations to the increasingly enlarging audience of captivity narratives, women's stories, their narratives, and their experiences became visible and heard. This is not to say that captivity narratives were the only means for women's discourse. According to Josephine Donovan, women's literature emerged in the fifteenth century and "contributed to the genesis of novelistic discourse...[that] stands on its own as the first women's tradition in Western prose fiction" (Donovan ix).

Although there are many forms of women's rhetoric, with more being revealed as research into women's discourse grows, this dissertation limits its analysis to three captivity narratives that span four centuries and feature four specific women speaking of their own lived experiences: seventeenth century Mary Rowlandson, nineteenth century Fanny Kelley, and twenty-first century Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus.

Captivity narratives have remained popular reading material for Americans. From colonial America to contemporary America, captivity narratives provide the graphic details of what captives have gone through while either reinforcing normative ideologies or, in some cases, creating new ideologies. By providing a rhetorical analysis of the use of silence in the three captivity narratives of Rowlandson's *A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson*, Kelly's *Narrative of My Captivity Among the Sioux Indians* (1856), and Berry and DeJesus's *Hope: A Memoir of Survival in Cleveland*, this dissertation examines the ethos of each woman captive.

From the 1600s to 1800s, when many captivity narratives were published, the genre of the captivity narrative itself underwent a transformation in purpose; and the producers of captivity narratives underwent a similar transformation. Authorship of captivity narratives shifted from being male-authored to female-authored. While early North American narratives featured Indian captivity, that is, white women and children held captive by Native Americans, the narratives produced prior to the English captivity narratives in the 1680s were written by French and Spanish priests and "focused largely on Catholic conversions and martyrdoms or male strategies of survival...and self-promotion in the mother country" (Toulouse 1). Not until the New England captivity

narratives were women portrayed as the protagonists through the narratives. Women captives were thus allowed voice and agency in their own ordeals. Once the New England Protestant female captive became the protagonist of her own narrative, her captivity narrative followed certain conventions: the female captive was viciously torn from her family while continuing to “manifest culturally valorized qualities of religious acceptance, humility, and obedience until she was ‘redeemed’ to her local colonial community” (Toulouse 1). Only after her “forced, prolonged imprisonment with the enemy, a fearful contamination, a separation from one’s community, a loss of spouse and children, and a communion with or at least relentless exposure to representatives of the devil” (Namias 2-3), did the female captive come to symbolize the entire community while simultaneously upholding her community’s belief systems. Thus, the idea of the *Judea Capta* flourished within the early captivity narratives, effectively intermingling gender construction and religious ideology. As Richard Slotkin notes in *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860*:

In [the New England Indian captivity narrative] a single individual, usually a woman, stands passively under the strokes of evil, awaiting rescue by the grace of God...The ordeal is at once threatful [sic] of pain and evil and promising of ultimate salvation. Through the captive’s proxy, the promise of a similar salvation could be offered to the faithful among the reading public, while the captive's torments remained to harrow the hearts of those not yet awakened to their fallen nature. This is the pattern suggested by [John] Underhill in his account of the captive maids, whose condition he likens to that of ‘captive Israel’ [*Judea Capta*]

and whose adventure is presented as a parable of the colonists' collective salvation-through-affliction. (Slotkin 94-95)

While the New England captivity narrative threads Puritan religious ideology throughout its text, the "ideal" captive remains a woman since the captive woman continues to stand as surrogate for her community. Thus, the woman's body remains a proxy for her society's condition. Whereas in Puritan America, Rowlandson's captive body was proxy for her community's potential salvation, the succeeding three women's captive bodies become proxy for their emerging communities. Fanny Kelly's body becomes proxy for westward expansionism; and Amanda Berry's and Gina DeJesus's captive bodies become proxy for the intersection of race, class, education, poverty, and contemporary America's construct of womanhood.

This dissertation examines the intersecting religious, political, and cultural contexts surrounding the four women's captivities by examining each woman's ethos and her use of silence as a rhetorical strategy. Using Judith Butler's concept of performativity and Michel Foucault's concept of body/power as foundational ideas, this dissertation examines how the female captive's "performance" of her captivity underscores the contextualized social and captive body, or as Foucault argues, the "materiality of power [that] operat[es] on the very bodies of individuals" (55).

In *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Judith Butler examines the discursive formation of "the subject." She states that the "domains of political and linguistic 'representation' set out in advance the criterion by which subjects

themselves are formed, with the result that representation is extended only to what can be acknowledged as a subject” (Butler 4). Butler continues:

The question of ‘the subject’ is crucial for politics, and for feminist politics in particular ... the political construction of the subject proceeds with certain legitimating and exclusionary aims, and these political operations are effectively concealed and naturalized by a political analysis that takes juridical structures as their foundation. Juridical power inevitably ‘produces’ what it claims merely to represent; hence politics must be concerned with this dual function of power: the juridical and the productive. (Butler 5)

Thus, a somewhat perversely symbiotic and circular relationship occurs: the criteria of the captive-as-subject must be met before representation of captive can be extended. The female captive who does not fit within the cultural expectations of the acceptable captive may inform the juridical production of the captive. This paradoxical process becomes apparent in the production of captives or missing people. As her removal is set within the rising tensions between the Indians and Puritans during King Philip’s War, Mary Rowlandson was readily constructed as captive. Fanny Kelly was likewise constructed as captive because her kidnapping occurred amidst rising tensions among the American Indians, encroaching Western settlers resulting from the Homestead Act of 1862, and the general chaos surrounding the Civil War. Yet although both Rowlandson and Kelly were held captive, they nevertheless experienced physical movement and other freedoms as they traveled from one locale to another. On the other hand, Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus were held captive for ten years by Ariel Castro in

a boarded-up house in an impoverished Cleveland neighborhood. Both Berry and DeJesus were initially physically bound, only to be allowed movement within the confines of Castro's house or by donning disguises when taken outside in the backyard. While this dissertation focuses essentially on the rhetoric of silence within the captivity narratives under examination, other silences also are addressed.

The dual level of voicelessness—the inability to communicate with the captors due to language barriers or enforced silence or the inability to be heard by the neighbors—is silence and a form of erasure. Yet because Rowlandson, Kelly, Berry, and DeJesus eventually published their captivity narratives, their voices have not remained silent.

In “Female Captivity and the Deployment of Race in Three Early American Texts,” Maureen Woodard posits that Mary Rowlandson's “radicalized language...demonstrates one of the ways... [captivity] narratives sought to control or interpret the threats to social order implied by the protagonists' experiences” while effectively reflecting “the anxieties of an entire community” (Woodward 115). The sociological construct of Otherness is evidenced in the language used in captivity narratives, in whose stories are allowed to be told, and, in sum, whose stories are privileged. In *Mind, Self, and Society*, George Herbert Mead posits the idea that identities are produced through negotiation, agreements, and disagreements:

In that sense these two factors—one the dominance of the individual or group over other groups, the other the sense of brotherhood and identity of different

individuals in the same group—came together in the democratic movement; and together they inevitably imply a universal society... (Mead 287).

While Mead breaks down the “I” and the “me” in detailed psychological analysis, the fact remains that the individual’s identity and societal identity form a symbiotic relationship that then helps to create the individual identity and societal identity in an unending cyclical process.

Furthermore, the captives’ voices themselves may have experienced a silencing in the publishing world. In *Rhetorical Drag: Gender Impersonation, Captivity, and the Writing of History*, Lorraine Carroll examines “gender impersonation” in various eighteenth and nineteenth century captivity narratives, or what she refers to as “rhetorical drag” (Carroll 1-2). “Rhetorical drag” occurs when male writers assume “the female captive’s voice” and “encompasses an array of discursive practices that reflect and inflect contemporaneous gender regimes” (Carroll i). Using the queer theory of Judith Butler’s performativity and Michel Foucault’s concept of body/power, this dissertation examines the extent additional writers, editors, or publishers of the three captivity narratives under examination engaged in “rhetorical drag” by impersonating the captives’ voices, how these discursive formations produced the captive-as-subject, and the extent the women-captives’ voices were silenced within their own narratives. For example, Carroll notes, in *Rhetorical Drag*, that while Cotton Mather performs “gender impersonation...by wholly inhabiting the ‘I’ of [Hannah] Swarton’s [captivity] text,” his father, Increase Mather, is believed to be the editor or “sponsor” of Mary Rowlandson’s captivity narrative. Fanny Kelly’s narrative features assorted documents intended to situate her story as the

legitimate version; and she states in the introduction to her narrative, “From memoranda, kept during the period of my captivity, I had completed the work for publication, when the manuscript was purloined and published; but the work was suppressed before it could be placed before the public” (vi). Kelly’s own narrative voice was silenced, and not until she gathered “the scattered fragments” (vi) of various documents was she able to “shape [her] own historical moments” (Carroll 3). For *Hope: A Memoir of Survival in Cleveland*, Amanda Berry kept as detailed a journal as she could throughout her captivity. From the inside of discarded burger wrappers to found bits of paper, Berry jotted down her experiences and reflections. Gina DeJesus wrote her sections of their jointly authored narrative after she gained freedom. However, *Hope*, Berry’s and DeJesus’ narrative, had authorial and editorial help. The question remains, to what extent did Mary Jordan and Kevin Sullivan (listed as co-authors of *Hope*) “inhabit the ‘I’” of Berry and DeJesus? By focusing on the material organization of *Hope*, this dissertation trusts the sections categorized as “Amanda” and “Gina” to be written by the two women. For example, the sections that begin with dates and “Amanda” signal those sections as the discourse of Amanda Berry. The same strategy is applied to the sections labeled “Gina.” Furthermore, the sections thusly entitled with the women’s names engage an informal tone, use first person point of view, employ shorter sentences, and engage in the narrative strategies of dialogue, imagery, emotionally-driven language, and reflection. However, the sections written by Mary Jordan and Kevin Sullivan are not labeled by their names. Instead, these sections are subtitled “January 26, 2004: Cops at the Door” and “April 2004: Searching for Gina,” among other such subtitles. As a result, beginning with the subtitles for these

sections, the reportorial, matter-of-fact tone, the use of third person, and the objective information only these sections offer—information to which neither Berry nor DeJesus had access—indicate they are the discourse of Jordan and Sullivan. While the sections penned by Jordan and Sullivan are used to contextualize Berry’s and DeJesus’ captivities, this dissertation analyzes only the rhetoric practiced by the two captive women.

Women’s bodies have historically been written about. Their status is constantly negotiated and, consequently, the meaning of woman—and captive—vis-à-vis her body seems always to be in a state of flux. From contemporary public comments about women’s bodies to political legislation enacted to control women’s bodies, women and their bodies remain commodities to be negotiated and shaped into others’ messaging. Through analyzing the rhetoric of silence in these three captivity narratives, this dissertation examines the fluid and near constant negotiation of each woman’s status and identity as captive by interrogating the ways each woman’s body is written upon by her captor. In other words, in what way does each woman’s captor exert power and control over the captive’s body, including its embodied identity?

In *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*, Elaine Scarry states that “[p]hysical pain has no voice, but that when it at last finds a voice, it begins to tell a story” (3). Each of the four women captives experienced bodily pain and trauma inflicted upon her body by her captor. From the initial act of being abducted to enduring biting cold weather during her “removes” to enduring chains wrapped around her body as she was raped, each woman’s body was thusly written upon by her captor and commodified by both captor and survivor as they negotiated her compliance and survival.

This dissertation examines such commodification and negotiation by investigating the intersections of bodily pain and silence.

In *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*, Cheryl Glenn argues, “Silence—not the spoken word—is the only phenomenon that is always at our disposal. Silence permeates our every moment, its identity a stretch of time perforated by sound. Thus, silence remains inescapably one form of speech and an element in every dialogue” (Glenn 5). Since at least two of the captives whom this research examines spoke different languages from their captors, the role of silence assumes another layer of nuance within the captor/captive relationship. Mary Rowlandson was held captive by the Narragansetts, and Fanny Kelly was held captive by the Sioux. And while Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus were held captive by the same man, Ariel Castro, who spoke the same language as they, they nevertheless used silence as a rhetorical strategy to stay alive and avoid as much bodily pain as possible. Thus, while words may fail the captives—for whatever reason whether through language barriers, fear, or lack of agency—silence remains constant. Whether these silences are what Cheryl Glenn terms as *purposeful silences*, or strategic silences, “expected silences,” or silences that are expected of women, children, servants, and any others of lesser status, or “unexpected silences,” what Glenn terms paraphrasia, the four women used silence as a rhetorical strategy to endure the physical, psychological, and spiritual trauma to which they were exposed. It is interesting that Glenn uses the word “paraphrasia” as an unexpected silence, for the term itself is a medical term. Paraphrasia is a verbal manifestation in an individual with aphasia who produces words, phrases, or syllables “unintentionally” (Manasco 73). Thus, Glenn's

subtle pathologizing of silence raises new questions, particularly when the use of silence is used as a rhetorical strategy by women. This dissertation examines the three captivity narratives for instances of such expected and unexpected silences. Additionally, the above-mentioned and perhaps unintended coding of silence as pathological is examined, particularly as this strategy intersects with women's rhetoric and women's actions, vocalizations, and thoughts that transgress societal, medical, or religious expectations and that have historically been pathologized.

In *Silences*, Tillie Olsen refers to “*hidden silences: work that is aborted, deferred, denied—hidden by the work which does come to fruition*” (8, italics in original). Using a dual-pronged analysis, this dissertation also examines the three texts for such “hidden” silences or clues that suggest or point to work that was interrupted. Also examined is what each captive “need[ed]...to create” (Olsen 11), the work each captive was required to do by her captor in order to survive, and how that work deferred her own work.

In “Purposeful Silence and Perceptive Listening: Rhetorical Agency for Women in Christine de Pizan’s *The Treasure of the City of Ladies*,” Nancy Myers extends Jenny Redfern’s argument that de Pizan’s *The Treasure of the City of Ladies* is actually a rhetoric because “the [book’s] instruction has the potential to empower women’s speech acts in both public and private matters” (Redfern qtd. in Myers 57). Myers argues that not only does *The Treasure* work “as a systematic set of theories and strategies [that] induce[s] cooperation and persuasion...it [also] operates as an embodied rhetoric that includes both discursive and material components” (57). In other words, de Pizan’s *The Treasure* teaches fifteenth century Frenchwomen how to work within the rigid

parameters of their time but to also push “against the norms and expectations” (Myers 57). This dissertation interrogates each captive’s active “push[ing] against the norms and expectations” of the rigid parameters in which she was expected to contain herself throughout her captivity by analyzing each woman’s use of silence as a rhetorical strategy, her lived experiences of the “hidden” silences, and her negotiation through these multiple silences throughout and within the materiality of the book each woman created.

Chapter Two offers background information on captivity narratives, to include its evolution, its relationship to gender and gendered expectations, its changing foundation from religious ideology to secular ideology, and its framework and conventions. Chapter Two also discusses the nature and purpose of captivity narratives by examining further Richard Slotkin's typology of the New England captivity narrative and the captivity mythology. This chapter also discusses Michelle Burnham’s argument that captivity narratives’ eliciting of tears in readers is part of the process of the “reproduction of the nation” (2). Chapter Two traces the development of the captivity narrative, and contrasts the male captive’s strategy of writing about his own cunning or military might while the female captive writes about experiences that feature their bodies as becoming “tools of economic negotiation and as figures of political and religious significance” (Burnham 11). This chapter also includes a discussion of how the captivity narrative was used as propaganda in a new nationalism and American identity.

Chapter Three examines the prescription of women’s silence by discussing the scholarly contributions in women’s discourse. For example, Joan Gibson argues that Renaissance education for the sexes was based on “sex-stereotyped behavior,

emphasizing chastity, silence, and obedience for women, [and] courageous and active virtue for men” (10), while Nan Johnson notes how “true womanhood equated silence with feminine virtue and enthusiastic vocality in women as [being] true womanhood’s opposite” (221). This chapter discusses how women’s education to be silent proved problematic when the four women practiced their rhetoric. When Mary Rowlandson published her captivity narrative, she initially did so “at the Earnest Desire of Some Friends” (Sayre 132). She also did so anonymously. David Hall notes:

The men who collaborated with Rowlandson and [Anne] Bradstreet in bringing their manuscripts into print may have not wanted to put a woman’s name on the title page, for women were always and everywhere encompassed within the rule of ‘modesty’ that, in principle, kept them from speaking in public. (91)

Further discussing the prescription of silence, chapter three discusses the concepts of the “cult of domesticity” and Republican motherhood. Dana D. Nelson writes of Alexis de Tocqueville’s “The Young [American] Woman as Wife” in his *Democracy in America* by noting his description of the domestic sphere as a “chosen captivity” (38):

“In America, a woman loses her independence forever in the bonds of matrimony. While there is less constraint on girls there than anywhere else, a wife submits to stricter obligations. For the former, her father’s house is a home of freedom and pleasure; for the latter, her husband’s is almost a cloister.” (de Tocqueville qtd. in Nelson 38)

Fanny Kelley states that she was a “member of a small company of emigrants” (v) when her party was attacked. She speaks of her mother’s actions to move “[i]n obedience to his

[Kelley's father's] dying instructions" and her own physical movement once her husband "resolved upon a change of climate" (12). Kelley's narrative certainly supports de Tocqueville's claim above that once a woman marries, she "loses her independence" (qtd. in Nelson 8).

Chapter Three analyzes the rhetoric in the three captivity narratives through the perspective provided by the intersections of public rhetoric, women's private sphere, and women's education toward silence. Finally, Chapter Three analyzes the rhetoric in these narratives through the perspective of Tillie Olsen's "hidden silences," or women's work "that does not come to fruition" (Olsen 8).

Chapter Three also examines the women captives' rhetoric that subverts that prescription on silence. From Christine de Pizan to Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz to the eventual publications of Rowlandson, Kelley, Berry, and DeJesus, women covertly or overtly claimed agency for their intellectual selves. As Redfern argues, de Pizan's *The Treasure of the City of Ladies* instructs women how to operate within the prescriptions of silence in which they are expected to live. Similarly, Julie A. Bokser argues the seventeenth-century Mexican nun, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz "... calls attention to silence as meaningful and purposefully persuasive, especially for women and women's communities" (6). Both Christine de Pizan and Sor Juana take gendered approaches to women's discourse by illuminating how women engage in rhetoric within societal prescriptions of women's silence. Chapter Three also discusses the "time during which women shifted from writing primarily for private audiences [such as Theano's letters and the earliest Rowlandson text] to writing for a broader public" (Zagarri 19). This shift in

publishing afforded women larger and more expanded roles in public rhetoric. While women's authorial voices became amplified in the public sphere, a significant reason for women's learning remained within essentialist parameters. During revolutionary America, what was considered to be the proper role of women centered on the "ideology of Republican motherhood" (Vietto 75), an ideology with complex functions ranging from "instill[ing] civic interest and virtue in their [women's] children,...offer[ing] women influence over their husbands...[and] authorizing publication to the extent that it was...easily reconciled with ideas about 'woman's sphere'" (Vietto 7).

Chapter Three continues its examination of silence as a rhetorical strategy by drawing on Cheryl Glenn's *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*, Glenn and Krista Ratcliffe's edited edition of *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts*, and Glenn's "Silence: A Rhetorical Art for Resisting Discipline(s)" by examining "who speaks, who is silent, who is allowed (or not allowed) to speak, who is listening (or not), and what those listeners might do" (Glenn, "Resisting Discipline(s)" 262). Because silence and speech have historically been gendered, Chapter Three discusses the contested perspectives of silence and the perspectives' relationship with gender by performing a rhetorical analysis of the women's captivity narratives and how they simultaneously engage in and subvert prescriptive silence.

Chapter Four examines each woman's material body and its intersecting with bodily pain and silence. By examining each captive woman's physical pain and the resulting relationship to silence, Chapter Four examines the political and/or ideological uses of bodily pain and the consequences of such use. In the beginning of her narrative,

Amanda Berry notes that “the more [the sexual assault] hurts [her], the more [Ariel Castro] likes it” (16). Thus, she learns not to fight so that the assault ends more quickly. Mary Rowlandson describes how a Lancaster resident was “knock’d ... on the head, stripped ... naked,” and whose “Bowels” were “split open” (Rowlandson 12). Elaine Scarry argues that torture converts actual pain to a regime of power. Being held captive, having one’s body no longer at one’s command, having one’s body forced to perform undesirable and unwanted acts, and being forced to view the agency of the torture (whips, fists, canes, etc.) are “the repeated acts of display [intended to produce] a fantastic illusion of power” (Scarry 28). Chapter Four examines how the “fantastic illusion of power” was wrought by the captors and how each woman, in turn, negotiates this “illusion of power” through her use of silence, both during active captivity and throughout the delivery of each narrative. Chapter Four also discusses the relocation of ethos to what Karen Burke LeFevre and Kate Ronald position as ethos being within the “betweens” (Reynolds 333), specifically the liminal space between a text and reader rather than the Aristotelian space between orator and audience.

The concluding chapter in this dissertation ties together the multi-pronged approach of the rhetorical analyses of these captivity narratives. Examining the intersections of bodily pain and silence within the captivity narratives, this dissertation unpacks the multi-layered and nuanced meanings of silence. Furthermore, this dissertation provides an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary benefit, particularly for those in rhetorical studies, literary studies, women's studies, gender studies, and trauma studies by providing a rhetorical perspective into works written by women about their

own traumatic experiences of captivity. Finally, by examining the rhetorical strategy of silence in texts, this dissertation adds to the current research in silence as rhetoric by challenging the expectations and expanding the understanding of silence in rhetoric.

CHAPTER II

THE AMERICAN CAPTIVITY NARRATIVE AND ITS EVOLUTION

“North America is a land of encounters” (xv), so says June Namias in *White Captives*. Focusing on geographical, cultural, and gender encounters, captivity narratives shine an unforgiving light on a multitude of belief systems, from both the captor’s and the captive’s perspective. Put in another way, Michelle Burnham says in *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861*, “[C]aptivity literature constructs and reinforces a binary division between captive and captor that is based on cultural, national, or racial difference” (2). In *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860*, Richard Slotkin suggests an almost accidental birth of the captivity narrative by stating that the “captivity narratives...grew out of the fact that many pious and literate New Englanders were continually falling into the hands of the Indians” (20). As a result, when producing their narratives, New England captives sought to “emphasize their Englishness by setting their civilization against Indian barbarism” (Slotkin 21). The captives’ emphasis on their identity created a new American mythology “in which the hero was the captive or victim of devilish American savages and in which his (or her) heroic quest was for religious conversion and salvation” (Slotkin 21). Further arguing her premise that the “fate of these [captive female] figures is nothing less than the reproduction of the nation” (Burnham 2) by “provoking their readers to cry for their captive heroines” (3), Michelle Burnham states during Revolutionary America ambivalent attitudes toward the “practice of female agency” (68)

became evident in the “rhetoric of the revolution and its trope of female captivity” (68) notably within the “link between American national identity and the maternal” (Burnham 68). This ambivalence resulted in an increasingly “private and passive formulation” (68) of women’s virtue although the concept of America itself was “paradoxically, [sic] constructed in the image of a woman” (Burnham 69).

Furthering Burnham’s argument of nation building via captivity narratives, Molly Varley states in *Americans Recaptured: Progressive Era Memory of Frontier Captivity* that “captivity narratives established standard cultural interpretations of nationhood and identity, while at the same time allowing both readers and narrators to break away from restrictive cultural norms and imagine a different way of living” (9). Thus, whether following Biblical exegetical tropes in early American narratives or being used as a means to define a new American nationalism both during Revolutionary America and at the end of the frontier, captivity narratives served pragmatic functions in the New World.

Noting the irony, Michelle Burnham states that “what may have been the first example of escape literature in America was a narrative about captivity” (14). Going one step further by focusing on women’s contribution to captivity narratives, Katherine Zabelle Derounian-Stodola states, “Indeed, the Indian captivity narrative is arguably the first American literary form dominated by women’s experiences as captives, storytellers, writers, and readers” (Introduction xi). Derounian-Stodola also states that “some critics believe that the Indian captivity narrative functions as *the* archetype of American culture, or its foundation text, in which initial contact between Europeans and Native Americans inevitably evolved into conflict and finally colonial conquest” (Introduction xi). Noting

the inherent ambivalence in Puritan texts, Ivy Schweitzer argues that while traditional readings of Puritan literature have emphasized the “intellectual, rather than an emotional phenomenon” (3), new critical approaches to Puritan literature, especially sermons, reveal ambivalence in male leaders. Of David Leverenz’s psychoanalytic analysis of Puritan sermons, Schweitzer states:

The mixed expectations that resulted from Puritan modes of child-rearing, and that were exacerbated by the contradictory demands of Puritan religious doctrine and social practice, produced a profound ambivalence, especially in sons. David Leverenz’s nuanced reading of Puritan sermon rhetoric shows this ambivalence generating and being satisfied by a fantasy of submission and feminization, which veils deep-seated feelings of rage, frustration, vulnerability and anger at the father/God who demands such humiliation. (Schweitzer 25-26)

Schweitzer also finds evidence of ambivalence in Puritan male leaders in her analysis of Puritan lyric poetry. In *The Work of Self-Representation*, she examines the rigid Puritan hierarchy and its inherent tensions that contribute to ambivalence in male Puritans. Schweitzer states:

The colonial Puritans’ translation of spirit into religious and social practice reproduced Paul’s sexual hierarchy. Men who were judged sufficiently committed to spiritual emasculation were, ironically, rewarded with the perquisites of masculine privilege: social superiority, domination in the home, a voice in the church and community, and a vote in the common wealth... Women were rewarded with a *theoretical* equality [emphasis added] and second class

citizenship. Puritan spirituality offered both men and women the promise of full, undifferentiated subjectivity, but it was subjectivity deferred. (Schweitzer 29)

Schweitzer further identifies this “undifferentiated subjectivity” (29) as a site of “resistance and struggle” (30) wherein Puritans became “vigilant in policing their own souls and behavior” (Schweitzer 30). As a result, Puritans readily engaged in “passing judgment upon the souls and behavior of family and neighbors” (30).

The Puritan practice of passing judgment, or “vigilant policing” (Schweitzer 30), is evident in both the practice and production of the public testimony of conversion and captivity narratives. Richard Slotkin writes:

Since the “community of Saints” [the Elect] was made up by the gathering together of converted individuals, the Puritan emigrants paid careful attention to the religious experiences of individual members of the transplanted community in order to discern the positive and negative effects of emigration. This concern created a view of the individual experience as community experience in microcosm; and the community’s development in the New World was seen primarily...in terms of a psychological and spiritual quest, a quest for salvation in the wilderness of the human mind and soul. (39)

Thus, the practice of public testimony, whether by conversion or captivity narrative, functioned within the Puritan typology of seeking salvation. But because the setting of the Puritans’ physical world was filled with new and wholly unfamiliar challenges to the Puritans, the wilderness found in this physical world mirrored the “wilderness of the [Puritan] human mind and soul” (Slotkin 39). The captivity narratives

additionally functioned as a communal support network that allowed Puritans to examine and reflect on the dangers and joys—both material/physical and spiritual—of emigrating to the New World.

In *The Captive's Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity, and Royal Authority in Colonial New England*, Teresa Toulouse extends the idea of ambivalence in Puritan male leaders by contextualizing early American captivity narratives within the physical hardships of the New World and the physical distance between the New World and Europe. Toulouse argues that captivity narratives can be read by analyzing “the multiple identificatory positions toward a variety of objects which representations of female captivity both displayed and allowed to particular men, and to interpreting these positions in relation to a range of changing outer events” (14). In other words, captivity narratives, particularly those which featured a female captive, allowed Puritan men to examine their own ambivalence in their desire to continue their English Puritan fathers’ edicts while negotiating the necessarily changing power dynamics between English colonists and Native Americans, both of whom must co-exist on the same land. Whereas Schweitzer applies a feminist reading by identifying conflicting expectations of gender within Puritan texts, thereby creating ambivalence in male Puritans, Toulouse locates male Puritan ambivalence in real-world events, such as “King Philip’s War,” a war so-named by the victorious colonists and who later used this war as a “contest for meaning” (Lepore xvi).

Whether the captivity narrative is America’s first escapist literature or the archetype of American culture, there remains the central premise: contact between

opposing forces, the powerful captor and the powerless captive. Yet if power resides in economic wealth, martial or physical strength, racial/ethnic majority, or cultural privilege, whether of gender or class and their concomitant expectations, the captivity narrative details the initial encounter and subsequent power dynamics between two cultures negotiating their existence and meaning within what Mary Louise Pratt calls the “contact zone” or “space of colonial encounters” (qtd. in Burnham 3). Gloria Anzaldúa defines this contact space as where the “struggle has always been inner, and is played out in the outer terrains” (109). In her Introduction to the second edition of Anzaldúa’s *Borderlands/La Frontera*, Sonia Saldívar-Hull says of Anzaldúa’s essay, “The Homeland, Aztlán/*El otro México*,” the reader is introduced to a “topography of displacement...[where] the border, politically and ideologically, ... [is] an ‘unnatural boundary’ and hence posts a destabilizing potential in ...cartography” (2). While Saldívar-Hull specifically refers to twentieth century Chicana history, the idea of the destabilized cartography can be seen in captivity narratives, principally because the geographical borders of the known and unknown, as experienced by both the captives and captors, shift in captivity narratives. Similarly, the *embodied* borders of the captives, or what they are allowed and not allowed to do during their captivities, are likewise in a constant state of flux during and after their captivities. Besides needing to learn how to negotiate their actions, speech, and habits while in captivity, the captives must then learn how to re-enter their communities—and lives—that were interrupted by their captivities.

Michelle Burnham extends Pratt's idea of the contact zone by saying, "These borders invoke the specific and intersecting histories of colonial relations in North America" (3) and introduces Homi Bhaba's theory of interstitiality wherein:

[P]olitical possibilities [are] contained within these sites of colonial contest, for such "'in-between' spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood—singular or communal—that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself" (Bhaba qtd. in Burnham 3).

During and after a captive inhabits this interstitial space, that captive must continually negotiate her identity, the identity of her captor's society, and the identity of her pre-captivity society, a society that has most likely continued moving forward without her. Thus, being caught in this in-between space continuously demands meaning-making from the captive. Both captives and captivity narratives reside in these interstitial spaces and are a result of differing cultures negotiating their identities amidst these shifting borders.

Besides contributing to an American mythos, Richard Slotkin also argues that captivity narratives are the "first coherent myth-literature developed in America for American audiences" (95). In American literature, captivity narratives consist of a readily recognizable typology for the era in which the narratives appear. Furthermore, this typology then serves specific functions that help to reinforce relevant ideologies central to the eras in which the narratives occur.

For example, in early American captivity narratives, when “America” was yet to be a nation, captivity narratives employed specific elements that helped English colonists make sense of their new physical and geographical experiences. Richard Slotkin calls these early American captivity narratives “archetypal drama” (94) wherein these early captivity narratives mirrored Puritan religious ideology. In *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*, Sacvan Bercovitch states the Puritans and Pilgrims “enlisted hermeneutics in support of what amounted to a private typology of current affairs” (113). He further states that the

New England colonist...had to prove the Old World a *second* Babylon; otherwise, his readers might consider it (along with America) to be part of the universal spiritual Babylon. He had to *convince* them of the supernatural quality of the Atlantic...[and] to demonstrate the eschatological import of the New World, to create his distinctive desert-garden *allegoria* from the details of his landscape...through a highly personal inference drawn from secular experience. (Bercovitch 113)

Using the real and physical experience of physically crossing the Atlantic Ocean as a metaphorical baptism (Bercovitch 113) and when facing the dangers in their new environment, the English colonists interpreted these different experiences in a new land, experiences that were vastly different from England, within providential history, that is, history consisting of “providential signs of grace which chart the believer’s embattled course to an otherworldly perfection” (Bercovitch 40). In *Plymouth Plantation*, William Bradford “sees the plantation itself...in terms of common providence” (Bercovitch 44).

As Bercovitch states, “[A]s a Separatist he [Bradford] expects no more from his own congregation than that it should hold fast to the principles of spiritual Israel; and as historian (not church historian) of Plymouth, he chronicles the fate of a wholly temporal venture” (45). Bradford, other Pilgrims, and Puritans found themselves surrounded by “the mutable things of this unstable world” (Bradford qtd. in Bercovitch 45). Bradford further describes the new land’s “weatherbeaten face” and “savage hue” (Bradford qtd. in Bercovitch 45), which Sacvan Bercovitch notes became “an emblem of [their] fallen state” (Bercovitch 45). While Bradford regarded the new world as necessary for the believer’s path to redemption, he nevertheless was able to see the fate of Plymouth Plantation in temporal terms.

Even though William Bradford was a Puritan Separatist, he, like the Pilgrim John Smith, simultaneously viewed the new world within both temporal and providential histories rather than the spiritual history of the *figura*, or the “*imitatio* of Saints’ lives” (Bercovitch 36). Figural history was used by the Puritans to navigate and “make sense of a perplexing variety of circumstance and character” (Bercovitch 45) by applying Biblical hermeneutics to the new land’s different and dangerous landscape with which the English colonists now were forced to contend. Through the use of captivity narratives, and other jeremiads, the colonists attempted to align their new and harsh physical reality with the Puritan eschatology of Millenarianism, a rigid belief of judgment, heaven, and hell, and one that emphasizes the redemption of the soul.

Therefore, when analyzing tensions within early American captivity narratives, tensions created from the ambiguity inherent in negotiating beliefs in figural,

providential, and temporal histories and that arise in the covenantal dialectic found in John Winthrop's foundational text, *A Model of Christian Charity*, insight into the complex Puritan mind becomes clearer. Aboard the *Arbella*, Winthrop states that the colonists' traveling to the new land was based on a covenant made with God. In order for the English pilgrims to succeed in creating this "city upon the hill" (Winthrop 177), they must adhere to their rather complex side in this dialectical covenant:

We are entered into covenant with Him for this work [migrating to and establishing the "city upon the hill" in the new land]. We have taken out a commission, the Lord hath given us leave to draw our own articles.... Now if the Lord shall please to hear us, and bring us in peace to the place we desire, then hath He ratified his covenant and sealed our commission, [and] will expect a strict performance of the articles which are the ends we have propounded, and, dissembling, with our God, shall fall to embrace this present world and prosecute our carnal intentions, seeking great things for ourselves and our posterity, the Lord will surely break out in wrath against us; be revenged of such a perjured people and make us know the price of the breach of such a covenant. (Winthrop 176)

Winthrop clearly states that for the Puritans aboard the *Arbella* to adhere to the covenant made with God, they must renounce personal gain in favor of the community. The promises made by the English did not include self-glory or accumulation of wealth for self or their offspring. Rather, the pilgrims promised God they would adhere to the strict Puritan world view, a world view founded on the belief in humanity's natural

depravity that constantly demands redemption. Threatening terrifying destruction on the Atlantic Ocean should the emigrating English fail to adhere to their covenant, Winthrop promises that “the only way to avoid this shipwreck, and to provide for our posterity, is to ...do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly with our God” (176). Utilizing the feminine domestic imagery of knitting, Winthrop further exhorts that his fellow Puritans must “be knit together in this work as one man” (176) by:

...entertain[ing] each other in brotherly affection, ...be willing to abridge ourselves of our superfluities, for the supply of other’s necessities...uphold[ing] a familiar commerce together in all meekness, gentleness, patience, and liberality...delight[ing] in each other, mak[ing] other’s conditions our own, rejoic[ing] together, mourn[ing] together, labor[ing] and suffer[ing] together, [and] always having before our eyes our commission and community in the work, our community as members of the same body. (176)

Deftly weaving together the domestic imagery of knitting and the traditional expectations of the “submissive and obedient role of [the] wife” (Schweitzer 5) when he calls for his fellow *Arbella* shipmates to come “together in all meekness, gentleness, [and] patience” as they embrace self-sacrifice in order to “make other’s conditions our own” (Winthrop 176), John Winthrop’s rhetoric suggests the roots of the Puritan male ambivalence, which both Ivy Schweitzer and Teresa Toulouse analyze.

In addition to examining early captivity narratives by how the narratives reflected Puritan male ambivalence in both their gendered roles and their physical reality existing on contested lands, captivity narratives can also be examined for insight into salvation

and redemption. It becomes evident then that the purpose of the early American captivity narrative is to serve simultaneously as a public testimony of the captive's trials and restoration of faith while symbolically reminding the community of their trials and possible redemption. Thus, the early American captivity narrative fits within the framework of what Sacvan Bercovitch, in *The Puritan Origins of the American Self*, calls "soteriology [which is] the mode of identifying the individual, the community, or the event in question within the scheme of salvation" (43). The inherent tensions within Puritan eschatology arise from the belief in natural sin—and its attendant depravity—and Millenarianism, or Judgment Day when a limited number of pre-ordained "elect...members of the *communio prædestinarum*" (Miller 43) will reside in Heaven. Winthrop exhorts his fellow English pilgrims by promising God's wrath should the Puritans "dissemble" before God and give in to their naturally depraved state. In sum, the stakes are high for the Puritans, and so the captive woman becomes one of the last symbolic reminders for the community's possible redemption.

In early American captivity narratives, the captive frequently was a woman who represented the "chastened body of Puritan society" (Slotkin 94), a woman who was held in temporary and physical bondage that served a dual paradigm. One paradigm maintained the bondage of the Puritan woman's body represented the bondage of the soul to the worldly flesh and its temptations; and the second paradigm maintained the captive woman's physical bondage represented the self-exile of "English Israel" to the wilderness in the new world (Slotkin 94).

By using the new land's geographical foreignness as a metaphor for the Puritan belief of their emigration to America as an "errand into the wilderness," the Puritans attempted to apply exegetical hermeneutics to their own real-world experiences. Early American captivity narratives, then, served as a Biblical-like exegesis that revealed God's "acts of wonder" (John Beadle qtd. in Bercovitch 40) that were seen as "acts of mercy and privilege extend[ed] to the elect alone" (Bercovitch 41). However, and perhaps because of the inherent tensions within Puritan eschatology, in "Errand Into the Wilderness," Perry Miller points to the complexities of early American captivity narratives and foreshadows the changing typology of American captivity narratives:

The literature of self-condemnation must be read for meanings far below the surface, for meanings of which, we may be so rash as to surmise, the authors were not fully conscious, but by which they were troubled and goaded. They looked in vain to history for an explanation of themselves; more and more it appeared that the meaning was not to be found in theology, even with the help of the covenantal dialectic. Thereupon, these citizens found that they had no other place to search but within themselves, even though, at first sight, that repository appeared to be nothing but a sink of iniquity. Their errand having failed in the first sense of the term, they were left with the second, and required to fill it with meaning by themselves and out of themselves. Having failed to rivet the eyes of the world upon their city on the hill, they were left alone with America. (Miller 19)

In *The American Jeremiad*, Bercovitch notes the tension in the "dichotomy of fact and rhetoric" (10), the fact the Puritans now faced more land and its concomitant promise

of “national development” (10) and the rhetoric of punishment and suffering with the promise of redemption within early American captivity narratives. While early American captivity narratives initially served as a symbol for possible community redemption through the captive woman’s body, the reality of the encroaching colonists onto Native American lands and the resulting battles and skirmishes point to the changing nature of the Puritans’ quotidian existence. No longer were the Puritans afforded the ability to pursue their spiritual goals promised by the Protestant Reformation in the familiar setting of their homeland. Now as they attempted to seek redemption, the Puritans had to contend with a foreign landscape and unknown bodies—those belonging to the Native Americans. In sum, the negotiation of American identity had begun as early as the first American captivity narratives. Or, to put it another way, “[U]nder the guise of this mounting wail of sinfulness, this incessant and never successful cry for repentance, the Puritans launched themselves upon the process of Americanization” (Miller 11).

On the other hand, according to Teresa A. Toulouse, the captivity narratives of the non-Puritan French Jesuit missionaries and Spanish royalty representatives, either religious men or secular explorers, followed an altered typology. Male captives, Toulouse states, told “stories [that] focused largely on Catholic conversions and martyrdoms or male strategies of survival among the Indians and self-promotion in the mother country” (Toulouse 1). Perhaps these differences arise from the original purposes for each country’s colonization goals. The typical belief is that while the Spanish traveled to the Americas in search of material wealth and both the Spanish and French sought to convert Native Americans to Catholicism, the English sought to worship as they wished.

However, this reductive statement neglects additional and more worldly reasons for English emigration: England's "national aggrandizement to counter Spanish imperialism, expansion of the English Protestant faith to contest with Rome for the souls of the American gentiles, and the Renaissance drive for expansion of human knowledge" (Slotkin 32).

While not held captive by the Indians he was subjugating, Christopher Columbus detailed his captivity at the hands of fellow Spaniards in his "Letter to Ferdinand and Isabella Regarding the Fourth Voyage" in a subtly accusatory yet self-aggrandizing tone:

The lands which here obey Your Highnesses are more extensive and richer than all other Christian lands. After I, by the divine will, had placed them under your royal and exalted lordship, and was on the point of securing a very great revenue, suddenly, while I was waiting for ships to come to your high presence with victory and with great news of gold, being very secure and joyful, I was made a prisoner and with my two brothers was thrown into a ship, laden with fetters, stripped to the skin, very ill-treated, and without being tried or condemned.

(Columbus 37)

By detailing his maltreatment while working on behalf of the Spanish king and queen, Columbus's captivity narrative carefully constructs his own martyrdom while simultaneously promoting his loyalty and accomplishments to his royal benefactors, Ferdinand and Isabella. There is cunning in his rhetoric as he later calls for the "restitution of my honor, the reparation of my losses, and the punishment of him who did this" (37) followed with his promise to Ferdinand and Isabella to "spread abroad the fame

of [their] royal nobility” (37). Within these lines, Columbus displays cleverness and self-aggrandizement by promising to speak highly of his benefactors *only* if they restore his honor and lost funds and punish his captors. Likewise, the captivity narratives of English men often featured the typology of surviving and cunning.

John Smith’s captivity narrative, possibly written by Smith himself yet attributed to Thomas Studley (Norton 83 fn 1), regales Smith’s clever ability to impress the King of the Pamunkey Indians so that, while Smith is trussed to a tree facing numerous Indians with bows and arrows aimed at him, the King nevertheless stops the execution by “holding up the Compass [a gewgaw Smith had given the Native Americans] in his hand” to which the Native American warriors “all laid down their bows and arrows, and in a triumphant manner led him [Smith] to [the] Orapak, where he was after their manner kindly feasted” (Smith 88). Nevertheless, while Smith feasted, the text’s rhetoric shows his limited movements and sense of alienness amongst his captors. While Smith is moved to other locations, the narrative tells of Smith’s thoughts on being cannibalized:

Smith they conducted to a long house where thirty or forty tall fellows did guard him, and ere long more bread and venison was brought him than would have served twenty men. I think his stomach at that time was not very good; what he left they put in baskets and tied over his head...and reserved the new [meats] as they had done the other, which made him think they would fat him to eat him.
(Smith 88)

The fear of cannibalism runs through American captivity texts, whether written by male or female captives. Slotkin notes, “Of all the anticipated perils, the threat of Indian

cannibals evoked the strongest emotion” (38). Quoting Eric Cheyfitz, Jeff Berglund states in *Cannibal Fictions: American Explorations of Colonialism, Race, Gender, and Sexuality*:

“[B]eginning with Columbus, the idea of cannibalism developed not as an anthropological fact but as a political fiction that the West employed to justify its exploitation of Native Americans.” One conclusion to draw from this imaginative naming is that cannibalism is often a verbally created reality predicated on false evidence, fanciful imagining, or ideologically inflected logic. The birth of such terminology arises from the logic of binaries. This moment is a classic example of Othering. (Berglund 3)

And as Slotkin states:

The culture and literature we call American was born out of the confrontation between cultures that embodied two distinctly different phases of mythological evolution, two conflicting modes of perception, two antagonistic visions of the nature and destiny of man and the natural wilderness. (25)

Through this binary method of perceiving their surroundings and those whom they encountered, Europeans constructed Native Americans as “monstrous,” “devils,” and, eventually, cannibals. Slotkin writes of Haklyut’s *Principall Navigations* wherein amidst sea battles and commercial treaties, “the English image of the newly discovered lands began to take shape” (32). Descriptions of the “strange shapes of its [America] topography” competed with Martin Frobisher’s account of “‘monstrous’ islands of ice, the ‘huge and monstrous mountains’ promise ‘Earthquakes or thunder’ [and a]n old

woman [who was] captured in one of the battles [and who] is taken for a devil” (Slotkin 32). Only until the sailors stripped off her shoes “to see if she were cloven footed, and for her ougly [sic] hew and deformity” (Slotkin 32) did Frobisher’s sailors release her. Slotkin further states that based on the physical appearance and cultural habits of the Native Americans, they are defined as ““Anthropophagi, or devourers of mans [sic] flesh,’ and thoroughly ‘loathsome”” (Richard Haklyut qtd. in Slotkin 20).

In earlier texts, Spanish explorers describe the Native Americans as property to be “taken” (Columbus “Letter to Luis De Santangel” 36) or paradoxically accomplished while being “barbarous” (Cortés 59). Bartolomé de las Casas, after “participating eagerly in the exploitation of the natives” (Franklin 38), eventually describes the horrific treatment of the Native Americans by the Christian Spanish in *The Very Brief Relation of the Devastation of the Indies*. De las Casas refers to the Indians subjected to mass enslavement, mass rape, and genocide as “souls taken captive” (De Las Casas 41) while Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca humanizes the Native Americans by describing the hardworking women, parents who “love their offspring more than any in the world,” and the “dead [being] lamented” in a year-long mourning followed by symbolic funeral rites (45). Whether being decimated or humanized, the rhetoric used by early European explorers and captives reveals a tension in European perceptions of the Native Americans. This tension extends to the later female captives Mary Rowlandson, who refers to her captors as the “barbarous enemy” (Rowlandson 260), and Fanny Kelly, who uses the term “savage” (Kelley 22) when describing Indians.

The tension in the rhetorical construction of Native Americans as alien carries over to the description of the Indians' appearances and foods. John Smith's fear of being fattened up for possible consumption by his Indian captors foreshadows Mary Rowlandson's narration of cannibalism:

I had not seen my son a pretty while, and here was an Indian of whom I made inquiry after him, and asked him when he saw him. He answered me that such a time his master roasted him, and that himself did eat a piece of him, as big as his two fingers, and that he was very good meat. (Rowlandson 271)

Fanny Kelly similarly describes her fears of cannibalism by the Indians. Kelly describes a scene suggestive of cannibalism and told to her by Mary, the "unwilling wife of a brutal savage" (116):

One day, the Indian went into a house where they found a woman making bread. Her infant child lay in the cradle, unconscious of its fate. Snatching it from its little bed they thrust it into the heated oven, its screams torturing the wretched mother, who was immediately stabbed and cut in many pieces. (Kelly 117)

Thus, part of the American captivity narrative typology is the foreignness or alienness as expressed by the Indian bodies, notably in Indian bodily appearances and Indian foods eaten. As a result, woven throughout the captivity narratives, clothing worn by both the captors and the captives and food ingested become problematic sites of tension. When Cotton Mather writes of Hannah Duston's captivity in *Decennium Luctuosum*, he narrates her killing and scalping of ten of her Native American captors. Teresa Toulouse argues that by doing so, Mather may situate Duston's "triumphant

female body...[as] express[ing] a return to [Puritan social] bodily wholeness” (Toulouse “Hannah Duston’s Bodies” 194). However, Toulouse complicates Mather’s reading of Duston’s captivity by further stating, “Mather’s representations of murdered bodies suggest aggressive fantasies about patriarchal Puritanism from within the Puritan elite” and must thus acknowledge “that these representations express a fear of such desires” (Toulouse 194-95). The conflict that arises within rhetoric of the captive body reflects the tension of what Gloria Anzaldúa calls “*los intersticios*, the spaces between the different worlds [one] inhabits” (Anzaldúa 42). Whereas Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus’ captor was not an early Native American, the women nevertheless describe Ariel Castro’s house as alien in its appearance. They do not suggest cannibalism, but both Berry and DeJesus write of offered “gross little frozen pizza rolls” and a “burger and fries” that, by the time Berry gets the food, had become “cold grease” (Berry 23).

When a captive faces the choice of eating the captor’s food or going hungry, there exists in that seemingly simple decision nuanced complications. According to Claude Fischler, “[A]ll foods have meaning within their particular cultural, culinary systems” (qtd. in Eden 29). With regards to the food choices the English colonists faced in early America, Trudy Eden says:

The scarcity of traditional English foods and the abundance of American foods, particularly Indian corn, shifted the criteria of the valuation of foods and the bodies they produced from “coarse” and “refined” to “English” and “Indian.” However, the distribution of those foods played out the same way over the social hierarchy. People of higher status claimed English foods, by money or force.

Their social inferiors either accepted Indian foods and the consequences of their changed diet or starved. (Eden 33)

Food became a powerful site of class and identity for the English immigrants and for the English captives. Essentially, English foods “guaranteed their [the English] ethnic integrity” (Eden 30). While on one hand the different types of foods found in the new world complicated the English sense of social status, these new food types also complicated the sense of Englishness, of English identity. By equating the American foods with Indians, Indians themselves were situated lower on the hierarchy and as Other. Many English men and women, particularly those who migrated to the North American Chesapeake area, refused to adapt by eating American foods because “they perceived the consumption of the Amerindian diet would produce undesirable physical, mental, and moral changes” (Eden 30). Simply put, if an English individual ate American foods then that English individual would change morally, mentally, and physically. Alice Nash states:

Bodies *shape* our view of the world but also *verify* it as certain things become coded onto the body. Because these codes seem “natural,” it can be discomfoting or frightening to encounter other people whose body codes seem undecipherable, in part because the exchange takes place at a level that cannot always be articulated. (Nash 169)

How one perceives one’s body reflects one’s sense of identity and power or lack thereof. While discussing the dances of Indians and the reality that several captives were forced to dance before various Indian and French audiences, Nash notes that these

“English captives generally experienced these rituals as embodying a loss of social power” (170). The combination of diminished English foods and forced dancing instilled a sense of disorder and lack of power within the English captives and served as a reminder of their changing status. As Eden states, “In a world that accepted constant and chaotic bodily change as a daily event, food served as the instrument of control. In a world that tied the physical body tightly to the mental, moral, and spiritual person, food served as a primary arbiter of identity” (39). In Amanda Berry’s captivity narrative, she writes of being “so hungry” (23) and reflects, “I realize that if he [Castro, her captor] thinks if he feeds me...he’s entitled to do whatever he wants with me” (Berry 23-24). Not only does Berry recognize the control her captor holds over her body and something as primal and intimate as eating, she also negotiates her identity as his captive.

In post-frontier America, captivity narratives were used as a way to construct American identity further. While foods were used to ensure English integrity by casting American foods as inferior in the early American captivity narratives, the captivity narrative itself was used by America to define and view the encroaching modernization of multi-cultural plurality. As Molly Varley states in *Americans Recaptured: Progressive Era Memory of Frontier Captivity*:

Progressive Era Americans used captivity by Indians as a lens through which to view certain “modern” problems: the place of small towns in the increasingly urbanizing society; how conservation could be used as a way to create a national cultural landscape; what role Indians and Indian qualities—which were viewed as primitive—would have in the modern national identity; and how women and men

could and should relate to each other to their society... Captivity narratives, then, were a means of planning for a national future by looking to the national past. They presented a concrete way to define “Americanism” and renew those frontier qualities that many deemed vital to the survival of the nation in the post-frontier world. (Varley 5)

The Progressive Era, roughly 1890 to 1920, signaled the end of the frontier, and moved towards an era of progressive laws and urbanization. In “The Significance of the American Frontier,” a paper read to the American Historical Association conference in 1893 at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago, Frederick Turner stated:

In a recent bulletin of the Superintendent of the Census for 1890 appear these significant words: “Up to and including 1880 the country had a frontier of settlement, but at present the unsettled area has been so broken into by isolated bodies of settlement that there can hardly be said to be a frontier line. In the discussion of its extent, its westward movement, etc., it can not [sic], therefore, any longer have a place in the census reports.” This brief official statement marks the closing of a great historic movement. Up to our own day American history has been in a large degree the history of the colonization of the Great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession, and the advance of American settlement westward, explain American development. (Turner 100)

Iterating the 1890 Census Superintendent, Turner notes the end of the American frontier and posits the establishment of Americanness and democracy in that frontier. With captivities occurring during the frontier and coinciding with Andrew Jackson’s

Manifest Destiny, the frontier, in its danger and colonization, Indian removal, and the belief of underutilized land justifying westward expansion, Progressive Era Americans saw an opportunity to define Americanism by turning back to history. Frontier-era captivities like Fanny Kelley's were romanticized by being viewed through the lens of the American Adam. Succinctly put, the American Adam is the trope of a "native American mythology" beginning at the "start of a new history" (Lewis 1-2), one that encompasses larger ideas of "innocence, novelty, experience, sin, time, evil, hope, the present, memory, the past, [and] tradition" (Lewis 2). In short, the American Adam negotiated and attempted to "define the American character and life worth living" (Lewis 3).

The new American history can be traced to the destruction of the 1890 census, where, as Turner highlighted in his 1893 paper, the Census Superintendent described "unsettled area[s]" that were dotted with "isolated bodies of settlement" (Turner 100). This ending of the frontier coincided with a growing movement towards modernization as evidenced in the reaction to the 1890 census destruction. The call for Washington to build a fire-proof archives, what eventually became the National Archives, reflected the progressive idea of saving history and American documents, like census registries. The desire to save history underscored the growing national focus for preserving memory as a way to document America. Part of this memory preservation was turning to earlier captivity narratives, notably the captivities that occurred in the 1800s frontier. Thus, Progressive Era Americans began to draw upon frontier (and earlier) captivity narratives and simplify complex realities within by equating captives with innocence and captors

with evil. In short, captivity narratives became politicized tools in the construction of American nationalism and American identity.

While captivity narratives from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were used as tools to justify exploitation of Native Americans or colonization of both Native Americans and the land as in Columbus' letters and John Smith's narrative, captivity narratives from the seventeenth century that featured female captives focused on the spiritual truth that was framed within the rigid Puritan ideology of being tested by God in the new wilderness of America. When the nineteenth century approached, however, and the belief in Manifest Destiny and westward expansion ushered pioneers and frontier people onto lands held by Native Americans, the captivity narratives of this time reflected an "anger at the French, the British, and the Indians, who together seemed bent on preventing American westward expansion" (Varley 7). Molly Varley notes:

During this time, narratives appeared more often as part of the national history almanacs or as cheap pamphlets than as free-standing books, thus placing captivity in the broad American story and reflecting a growing sense of national identity. (7)

Appearing more as propaganda than literary texts, early nineteenth century captivity narratives assumed the qualities of the "rising tide of sentimental novels and domestic fiction" (Varley 7). Sentimental fiction, or what Nina Baym refers to as "women's fiction ... formulaic novels of contemporary life by and about American women published between 1820 and 1870" (ix), featured female protagonists who must make their own way after losing financial support from her legal guardians and who often

experience abuse and neglect. While the frontier captivity narrative deploys a main female character who also must survive after losing financial support and who experiences abuse or neglect, the captive must do so far removed from family and community. Thus, the typological feature of the captive being forcefully ripped from her family and identifiable and familiar community and forcibly relocated to a foreign and unfamiliar community remains in the frontier captivity narrative.

In *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America, 1820-1870*, Nina Baym states that, in literature, masculine experiences were privileged over feminine experiences. Thus, “whaling ships rather than the sewing circle [was used] as a symbol of the human community...[and] satires on domineering mothers, shrewish wives, or betraying mistresses rather than tyrannical fathers, abusive husbands, or philandering suitors” (xiii-xiv) formed the bulk of literature. Consequently, pioneer captivity narratives that employed characteristics of sentimental and domestic fiction, characteristics that focused on the female experience especially vis-à-vis domestic material goods and embodied domesticity became popular. Annette Kolodny states, “For what the captivity story provided was a mode of symbolic action crucial to defining the otherwise dangerous or unacknowledged meaning of women’s experience of the dark and enclosing forests around them” (6). Defining—and negotiating—this “dangerous or unacknowledged meaning” of the world outside the woman’s domestic sphere through the captivity narrative is evident in Mary Rowlandson’s 1682 captivity, Fanny Kelley’s 1864 captivity, and Amanda Berry’s and Gina DeJesus’ 2003-2013 captivity. Throughout their captivity narratives, Rowlandson, Kelley, Berry, and DeJesus continuously

negotiate the meaning of their captivities and their forced existence in the foreign and, frequently, hostile worlds of their captors.

Although Puritan captivity narratives were constructed to highlight Puritan ideology of sin and redemption, Mary Rowlandson's narrative can be read through the lens of identifying the "dangerous and unacknowledged meaning" of her physical, mental, and emotional experience. Fanny Kelley's captivity narrative can likewise be read through this lens although the function of her captivity has shifted from the Puritan jeremiad to the defining of the American identity both during westward expansion and at the end of the frontier. According to Varley, the latter half of the nineteenth century saw "increasingly bloody and less reliable" (8) captivity narratives. She continues:

...captivity narratives also began to focus on ethnographical accuracy and historical detail—a shift in focus that was seemingly in conflict with their simultaneous anti-Indian agenda. They [captivity narratives] started to function as laments for, and documentation of, the 'vanishing' 'first Americans.' While the narratives might include 'highly evocative descriptions of Indian brutalities' in order to 'engender as much anti-Indian hostility as possible,' they also included statements by experts attesting to their ethnographical accuracy, and often put the captivity in the context of local or regional history, thus justifying Indian removal while stimulating local pride and nationalism. (Derounian and Levernier qtd. in Varley 8)

Thus, the captivity narrative became weaponized against the First Americans by being transformed into propaganda tracts that highlighted so-called Indian cruelties. This trend

towards leading readers into increasingly anti-Native American hostility served the purpose of growing nationalism, with the racist justification for removing Native Americans through brutal methods.

While the function of Rowlandson's captivity narrative was undeniably to serve as a jeremiad for her Puritan contemporaries, to help in their "discovering the will of God in respect to one's soul, one's election or damnation" (Slotkin 101), David Hall notes that many Puritan writings, especially those by Increase Mather, the *Per Amicum* in Rowlandson's text (Derounian-Stodola "Introduction to Mary Rowlandson" 5), sought to denounce the "Christianized Indians in the wake of King Philip's War, as Mary Rowlandson relished doing in *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God*" (Hall 9). This propagandistic quality extends to frontier captivity narratives, but with the added justification of Indian removal. Also foreshadowing the Progressive Era perspective of reading frontier captivity narratives to define America and create a nationalist identity is what Michelle Burnham calls Mary Rowlandson's "own attempt to negotiate between Puritan and Algonquian cultural practices" in the form of "captive-commodity" (14). Through this tension created by differing cultures, captives and captors found space to negotiate relations, notably within an economic realm. Burnham states:

Captives served as tools of economic negotiation and as figures of political and religious significance as they circulated between the New England tribes and the New England colonists. The body of the captive, exchanged as an unusual sort of commodity between two social and military antagonists, consequently told a

history in which often contradictory economic, cultural, and religious signs were articulated. (Burnham 11)

While a cultural definition of womanhood existed, the notion of the captive female's body being used as part of commodity exchange between the woman's home society and her captor's society highlighted and often revealed differing ideals of womanhood. For example, in Rowlandson's narrative when Rowlandson describes as a "solemn sight...the many Christians lying in their blood" upon the Narrangansett attack of her community, Rowlandson situates such a sight as ghastly and evil. Her English and colonial audience would surely agree. Nevertheless, through the perspective of the Narrangansetts, Nipmucs, and Wampanoags, their retaliatory attack on Rowlandson's village was justified since, prior to the attack, Metacom's War became especially brutal when Puritan forces separated male Native Americans from their village through a red herring strategy and burned alive the women, old men, and children who remained in the village. As the Puritans believed they were anointed by God in their "errand into the wilderness," the Native Americans eventually viewed the Puritans as problematic interlopers. Mary Rowlandson's captivity became a tangible manifestation of these "contradictory economic, cultural, and religious signs" (Burnham 11).

As another example of contradictory signs, while Rowlandson's power was predicated on her marriage to a minister, Weetamoo's (whom Rowlandson calls Wettimore) power was not predicated on any one marriage. Like men in her nation, Weetamoo used marriage as a tool to increasingly gain political power and wealth. Thus, coming from a culture that predicated the male role, Rowlandson cultivated the favor of

Metacom and Quinnapan, the male leader of the Narrangansetts and who became her “master.” However, Weetamoo was the one with the real power. Rowlandson’s cross-cultural misunderstanding resulting from the rather simplistic dichotomy of “savage” Native Americans and the “civilized” Puritans shows evidence of a growing nuanced acceptance of other perspectives based on her experience. This experience centers on Rowlandson’s inhabiting two worlds simultaneously: her identity as Mistress Mary Rowlandson, wife of the Puritan minister of Lancaster, and her status as the non-Indian captive “‘servant’ of a Narragansett ‘master’ and of a Pocasset Wampanoag ‘mistress’” (Salisbury 27). The tensions arising from Rowlandson’s dual identities frankly served to humble her.

The concept of the captive body-as-commodity also exists in Fanny Kelley’s and Amanda Berry’s and Gina DeJesus’s narratives. Kelley’s captive body is continuously negotiated by different tribes, her would-be saviors, and even over her own demeanor and manner of behavior. Berry and DeJesus poignantly negotiate their captive bodies in order to survive. As a strategy to exist with fewer beatings, Berry writes she will “pretend to like” (Berry 106) her captor in order to “get better treatment” (106).

Regardless of the purpose for each epoch’s captivity narrative, there are defined genre conventions that are part of the captivity narrative formula. Readers of captivity narratives expect certain credible features:

descriptions of native life; a credible, sympathetic captive voice and/or an authoritative rendering of the meanings of the captive experience; particular motifs of suffering, such as images of hunger and exposure; detailed renderings of

specific tortures like running the gauntlet...; portrayals of different kinds of death...; the dissolution (and occasional reconstitution) of families and communities; and, as in the earlier texts, a resolution usually achieved by “redemption” and return. (Carroll “Captivity Literature” 157-58)

While earlier captivity narratives focused on spiritual truths and frontier-era captivity narratives centered on politicized nationalism, later captivity narratives, such as the one of Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus, shifted to the sexual. Gender differentiation and issues of race and class in captivity narratives began to integrate with female subjectivity and identity, particularly with the rise of female authorship. As captivity narratives matured as a genre and amidst changing social and cultural privileges and literary, historical, and rhetorical interpretations of these changing privileges, captivity narratives continue to focus on the violent encounters between two opposing forces. What forms as a foundation for these encounters is the idea of power: who holds power and possesses agency in order to kidnap and hold an individual captive and who is perceived, notably by the captor, as lacking power and agency in order to be held captive.

Whether the narrative describes an early American captivity, a frontier captivity, or a contemporary captivity, vulnerability is always at stake. Furthermore, these captivity narratives serve as documentary narratives of the changing roles and expectations of the captives. Through examining the captives’ use of silence as a rhetorical strategy, readers become privy to the captives’ negotiating and maneuvering the many, complex, and, often, conflicting expectations placed on them by their society and their captor.

CHAPTER III
HOW THE CAPTIVES USED (EXPECTED) SILENCE
TO SUBVERT POWER DYNAMICS

While Chapter Two provides a background in captivity narratives, Chapter Three offers a rhetorical analysis on the three books, *Narrative of My Captivity Among the Sioux Indians* (1856) by Fanny Kelly, *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* by Mary Rowlandson, and *Hope: A Memoir of Survival in Cleveland* by Amanda Berry and Gina De Jesus. Since these three books contain multiple layers of meaning, this chapter focuses only on how each captive utilizes silence, including breaking said silence, in order to survive. How each captive navigates through her captor's demands and the societal conventions wherein she was expected to conform are also addressed in this chapter. Concomitant with this analysis is the placing of the rhetoric of silence within the emerging American identity and its interrelationship with race and the Other. In examining the rhetoric of silence, this chapter adapts strategies Alisse Theodore identifies in her essay, "'A Right to Speak on the Subject': The U.S. Women's Antiremoval Petition Campaign, 1829-1831." Expanding upon Theodore's strategies that focus on the political nature of the women's transgressive rhetoric, this chapter also examines the four captives' use of "discourse of domesticity" by using "accepted ideologies of females" within each captive's context (Theodore 602). Carolyn A. Haynes argues nineteenth-century's America's success in wealth, including land, was justified through the use of two symbiotic discourses: the gendered discourse of domesticity and the racialized

discourse of manifest destiny (Pinar 272). According to Haynes, the discourse of domesticity “reassured a restless migrant people...[of] ‘natural’ even divinely decreed differences between men and women” while the discourse of Manifest Destiny served as a “divine basis for [the] expansion of democracy” (qtd. in Pinar 272).

Thus, this chapter identifies and interrogates the four main rhetorical strategies within the discourse of domesticity the women captives deploy in order to enter rhetorically a liminal space between public and private. Although each captive was lodged in what can physically be defined as private space, chiefly the captor’s home, the fact that each captive was unwillingly brought into the captor’s domain—a domain perceived as threatening and foreign by the captive—creates a sort of liminal space for the captive. The captive is no longer in the private space of *her* home, a space known-to-her that, while possibly presenting struggles and hardships, remains her space nonetheless. Instead, her space has been forcefully disrupted by the captor; and she is forced to, and expected to, reside in and accept her captor’s space as her own—often with the expectation of domesticating her captor’s space by imbuing home-like qualities to the space wherein she is held captive. The captive’s forced habitation in this space of liminality creates further problems for her as she can no longer regard the domestic sphere in its traditional sense: a space where she can expect to be protected and safeguarded. Instead, the captive is now expected to domesticate this space for her captor, a step, which, in turn, signals to him her acceptance of her captivity. The levels of protection she is offered by her captor become wholly dependent on her acquiescence to

and accepting of the demands of her that are made by her captor. This chapter, then, examines the following four rhetorical strategies in each of the three books:

1. Unique Situation: The captive must declare her situation's uniqueness, thereby creating room for her to speak out;
2. Use of Gendered Beliefs to Advance Public Speech: The captive must appropriate gendered beliefs to frame her act of speaking out;
3. Narrative Reframing: The captive reframes her narrative to negotiate and integrate her captor's expectations and her time period's expectations of her as a woman while critiquing her situation; and
4. Movement Toward Larger Context: The captive must move beyond her particular situation to a larger context, thereby placing her needs secondary to the larger context of her society and/or culture.

While the category names of two of the four rhetorical strategies listed above (Unique Situation and Use of Gendered Beliefs) are derived from Alisse Theodore's "'A Right to Speak on the Subject': The U.S. Women's Antiremoval Petition Campaign, 1829-1831," the explanation of each of the four categories, including the name of the remaining two rhetorical strategies employed, Narrative Reframing and Movement Toward Larger Context, are unique to this chapter's analytical framework.

Even though the women captives speak out on multiple occasions in the physical home or community of their captors, this chapter analyzes each captive's word choice, imagery, and tone in order to assess how each woman situates herself within public rhetoric. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Carolyn A. Haynes notes that in nineteenth-

century America, there existed the “two separated if interrelated gendered and racialized discourses: manifest destiny and domesticity” (qtd. in Pinar 272). While Rowlandson’s narrative was published in the seventeenth century and Berry’s and DeJesus’s narrative was published in the twenty-first century, Kelly’s narrative, published in the nineteenth century, serves as the ideological linchpin. The purpose for Rowlandson’s narrative to be made public from her private writings was to affirm Puritan ideology, particularly as it emphasized trials and tribulations with the possible outcome of salvation. This religious ideology served as the capstone in the theocracy of Puritan New England and simply morphed into a less rigid, yet still highly gendered and racialized, Protestantism of the nineteenth century and later. All this ultimately contributed to the emerging American identity vis-à-vis divinely-ordained expansion into already-occupied lands. Unfortunately for the indigenous Native Americans, the expansion of Manifest Destiny could only occur through the “removal, acculturation, or containment of nonwhite peoples and, simultaneously, through a careful delineation of sex roles, requiring strict control of white women” (Pinar 272). As a result, women’s rhetoric, particularly the “discourse of domesticity,” becomes interlinked with the public rhetoric of the emerging American identity.

Because the two earlier narratives of Mary Rowlandson and Fanny Kelly obliquely speak to the increasingly hostile relationships between the white colonists of Rowlandson’s experience, the white emigrants of Kelly’s experience, and the indigenous Native peoples, this chapter peers into the rhetorical strategies that enable Rowlandson and Kelly to address the emerging American identity, one that is based on the privileging

of the Eurocentric phenotype in order to justify subjugation and oppression of all others.³ Since Berry's and DeJesus's narrative speaks to their experience in the twenty-first century, the Euro-centric American identity has already been established. Consequently, through a similarly oblique angle that examines their narrative, *Hope*, this chapter addresses the intersecting of race, class, and gender. Each of the four captives uses rhetoric that speaks to such intersectionality.

In the case of Mary Rowlandson, certain wording she uses reads as an oblique critique of the Colonial English patriarchal power structure. Deploying select rhetorical strategies, Rowlandson strategically weaves Puritan feminine ideals throughout her criticism of the Puritan men in her rescue party. While Fanny Kelly also engages in the "discourse of domesticity," her critique is less oblique than Rowlandson's but not as forthright as Amanda Berry's. Kelly suggests that the actions of Generals Sully and Sibley's "expeditions...in 1863" (Kelly v) led to hostility amongst the Sioux Indians who were her captors. Amanda Berry, on the other hand, avoids such oblique criticism but, nevertheless, engages in the "discourse of domesticity" when she rebukes the Cleveland police force for failing to take her mother's intuition seriously.

Furthermore, because each text has been published, the rhetoric employed by each captive points to yet another level of publication: the written word intended for an audience other than the writer herself, an audience that consists of readers who pick up the physical books and read them, often through a voyeuristic lens. While each captive's verbal utterance is placed as public rhetoric, orality is transient and ephemeral. The spoken word momentarily hovers between the speaker and the listener and then vanishes,

leaving only the speaker's intention and the listener's interpretation. On the other hand, the written word—even when transcribed from the spoken—holds more permanence as its form is materially constructed in black ink upon white paper. The inked markings cannot be silenced even if their source is banned or suppressed. The very existence of the words on a page marks their entry into public rhetoric whether or not there is a readership. The printed words' existence on a page contains possibilities, the very least of which promises an audience.

As noted in Chapter Two, silence can be both prescriptive and subversive. When an individual remains silent, that individual's choice may be the product of a constellation of reasons. Some of the reasons may originate from the individual, but it is imperative to recognize the nuances that inform the individual's decision to remain silent. For example, the individual may choose—or automatically default—to remain silent as a result of conditioning and education. Chicana feminist, queer, and cultural theorist, Gloria Anzaldúa notes that many Latinx women are raised with the proverb “[e]n boca cerrada no entran moscas [or f]lies don't enter a closed mouth” (Anzaldúa 76). This particular saying presupposes a painfully misogynistic idea: the female mouth is naturally attractive to flies and, thus, filthy, and that for women to remain clean they must keep their mouths closed.

Besides folkloric sayings, similar messages appear in popular culture. A popular female-empowerment rap anthem for young women in the early 1990s, “U.N.I.T.Y” performed by Queen Latifah, notes that the “real bad [i.e. strong, powerful] girls are the silent type.” Not only is female silence exalted, a girl who rejects Latifah's description of

a powerful woman can face violence. Later in the song, Latifah sings of a girl who has to “wear that [a sliced face] for life” because she did not remain silent. In other words, a non-compliant woman who insists on engaging in public rhetoric can expect to either have flies drawn into her mouth or to be physically punished, according to these sources in popular culture.

In *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England*, Jane Kamensky notes that dating back to Aristotle a woman’s “glory” is her silence “*but not equally the glory of a man*” (Kamensky 25, emphasis added). Men were to be lauded for “moderation of the tongue,” while women were to be praised for having “no voice at all” (Kamensky 25). Thus, men should have a public voice, and women should be silent. Since Aristotle and other similar (male) thought leaders serve as the foundation for Eurocentric education, this privileging of the male voice creates a woefully imbalanced stratification of worth. Because men are to be lauded for engaging in public rhetoric, their voices are presumed to hold weight and gravitas. On the other hand, with women being lauded for remaining silent, the implication is that any public rhetoric engaged in by women is less serious, less worthy, less valid—even *invalid*—and fully suspect in comparison to masculine rhetoric. Therefore, women’s rhetoric is easily dismissed, disregarded, and even seen as untrustworthy.

In an especially poignant passage in Rowlandson’s narrative, Rowlandson notes that while many of her Puritan community members are accusing her of taking credit for not having to endure any type of “unchastity” at the hands of her captors, Rowlandson adamantly “*speak[s] it in the presence of God, and to His glory*” (Rowlandson 113). In

other words, she is aware of the “disapproving voices [who] have indeed claimed that she has spoken (whether orally or in print) to her own ‘credit’ and not to God’s” (Toulouse “Strategies” 655). Thus, Rowlandson addresses those who are regarding her public rhetoric as suspect and invalid. She must not only silence any discourse surrounding potential sexual assault she endured during her captivity—thereby negating her captive body to serve as proxy for her Puritan community and her re-assimilation into that community—but she must also emphasize Puritan ideology by announcing God’s grace is in fact what protected her and not any human intervention, particularly her own intervention.

While women are routinely instructed to remain silent, women have nevertheless used silence as part of their rhetorical repertoire. However, the decision as to whether the use of silence is one born from a default standing (i.e. being educated to be silent) or from a deliberate choice to engage actively in silence is not within the scope of this dissertation. Women’s use of silence as a powerful rhetorical strategy remains. When a woman deliberately engages in silence, said silence is a powerful rhetorical tool and one that is open to interpretation. In *Narrative of My Captivity Amongst the Sioux Indians*, Fanny Kelly writes of the time when she “entreat[s]” her husband to a certain action when her group of emigrants is confronted by a party of “two hundred and fifty Indians, painted and equipped for war, [and] who uttered the wild war-whoop” (Kelly 21) all the while shooting into the air:

Mr. Kelly was ready to stand his ground; but, with all the power I could command, I entreated him to forbear and only attempt conciliation. ‘If you fire

one shot,' I said, 'I feel sure you will seal our fate, as they seem to outnumber us ten to one, and will at once massacre all of us.' (21)

This quote above suggests multiple meanings that offer deeper insight into nineteenth-century women's rhetoric. Perhaps as a nod to the level of formality in nineteenth-century public spaces, Kelly refers to her husband by the honorific of Mister accompanied by his surname. However, it is not unreasonable to think that in such a tense situation as being confronted by probable hostile forces, a wife might call her husband by his given name, or even an affectionate or informal diminutive version of his given name, rather than the more formal Mr. Kelly on the sheer basis of the time required to utter four syllables as opposed to the three syllables in his full given name: Josiah. Readers cannot be certain, though, because what Kelly narrates is precisely what is quoted earlier. Perhaps she crafted this exchange between a terrified woman and her (most likely equally) terrified husband into a more formal exchange by deliberately using the honorific and surname in order to maintain nineteenth-century public speaking conventions.

Historically in white America, women occupied the domestic sphere. While there certainly is female authorship in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such female authorship frequently faced considerable backlash, particularly if that female authorship argued for or displayed any type of learning. Works like Rousseau's 1762 *Emile* argued that "too much education could make women unfeminine and undesirable, [and] poor wives and mothers" (Vietto 21). With the advance of Republican motherhood, the central role for women, particularly with regards to their political role was considerably constrained. The Revolutionary-era Republican motherhood concept is seen by the

historians Linda Kerber and Mary Beth Norton as “an attempt to restrict women’s civil role by confining it within the domestic realm—in essence, yoking women’s civic function to their reproductive function” (Vietto 76). Although Fanny Kelly wrote her narrative in 1856, significantly after the heyday of Republican motherhood and on the cusp of the Civil War, white women’s role in public rhetorical space nevertheless followed the decrees of Republican motherhood insofar as women were expected to inhabit the domestic sphere.

To further contextualize Kelly’s rhetorical strategy of using a formal address when narrating dialogue, Kelly experienced difficulty in publishing her narrative. As she states in her Introduction, her own manuscript, which she carefully worked on during her captivity, “was purloined and published” (Kelly vi). Her voice was effectively stolen from her and attempted to be made public by another individual, Sarah Larimer.⁴ In an interesting (and, perhaps, ironic) twist, her narrative that was appropriated by Larimer was itself suppressed and withheld from publication. From dismissing women’s contributions to politics because women did not have the right to vote to focusing on women’s effect in the domestic economy, thereby treating women’s engagement in politics as a parallel and diminished narrative, women’s engagement with public rhetorical spaces were “limited not by innate feminine characteristics but by society’s customs, habits, and traditions” (Zagarri 4). Unfortunately, society’s customs and traditions placed white women⁵ in an inferior, secondary space, while privileging white men. But because of Manifest Destiny and its ensuing territorial expansion, industrial and

technological advances such as factories and the National Road, the growing abolitionist cause most likely spurred by the 1852 publication of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and even a growing international women's movement,⁶ American culture was experiencing rapid change, which led to a reinvigoration of the long-asked "woman question." This "woman question" attempted to define woman's role and place in society.

If readers examine Kelly's manuscript with this rich and nuanced context in mind, then, Kelly's deliberate choice of using formal salutations when discussing her husband can be read as an example of the delicate rhetorical maneuverings nineteenth-century white women writers engaged in as they worked to enter public rhetorical spaces. Since Kelly experienced her captivity during a radically evolving era, her rhetoric presents insight into such change while also underscoring the so-called "woman question." The precise use of women's rhetorical strategies, within what both Theodor and Haynes call "discourse of domesticity," to include the use of silence, was part of the negotiation between the increasingly blurred private and public rhetorical spaces. Since women's rhetoric was relegated to the domestic sphere, "girls and women in the nineteenth-century" were taught "elocution [as] preparation for a young lady's role in conversation" (Donawerth 105). Women found or developed ways to engage in rhetoric, including public rhetoric.⁷ With nineteenth-century American rhetorical theory being principally a rhetoric of writing and the rapid development of grammar schools that allowed for more education of male children, women nevertheless did find entry into the study of rhetoric,

but often through unconventional means such as the school of Delsartism, which helped women towards their understanding of elocution.

Kelly's *Narrative* was published in 1871, the same time as Delsartean oratorical theory gained a foothold in education. While the Delsartism movement originally aimed at helping male actors develop their expressional craft in the 1870s, traveling male Delsarte scholars came to tutor women with financial means in the arts of oratorical expression, physical presence, posture, balance, the strategic use of silence, and breathing (Glenn and Radcliffe 99). As many rhetorical scholars who have mapped the history of rhetorical theory note, advances in rhetorical theory were made in composition, which flourished in academic settings—the precise setting from which women were originally excluded. Cheryl Glenn notes that this “canonized map ... [which] focused on masculine power” (“Remapping Historical Territory” 63), in turn, allowed the space for further silencing of any rhetorical practices that did not fall within the map of gendered rhetorical theory...such as the Delsarte movement. This movement, which grew in popularity amongst women as a means of gaining education in oratorical expression, soon came to be derided as “histrionics” by rhetorical historian Robert Connors (Glenn and Radcliffe 99). Coincidentally, or simply as part of the growing turbulence centering on the “woman question” and women’s place in society, the growing derision of Delsartism coincided with the growing number of women gaining entrance to university.⁸

As Donawerth notes in *Conversational Rhetoric: The Rise and Fall of Women’s Tradition, 1600-1900*, women soon “reimagined women’s bodies not as weak and soft, but as strong and powerful” (105) through the study of elocution and public performance.

Rhetoric in public space allowed for this reframing of the highly gendered and conventional perspective of women's bodies as sentimental and soft. As a result, women's training in elocution—to include the physical training in the Delsarte movement—not only provided the way for women to enter the public rhetorical sphere but to also “counter the passivity of nineteenth-century ideal of delicate femininity” (Donawerth 105).

Although Kelly's *Narrative* was published less than a decade before the explosion of women's oratorical growth via the Delsarte Movement, one can read the phenomenon of women pursuing public oratory as capturing the zeitgeist of the latter nineteenth-century. Women's growing demand for education in oratory and rhetoric in public spaces soon followed the publication of Kelly's narrative. The fact that her own story was stolen from her, with an attempt to be published by another, yet even then silenced vis-à-vis lack of publication, points to the difficulty women experienced in pursuing and inhabiting public rhetorical spaces in the nineteenth century. Furthermore, Kelly further steps into public rhetorical space of politics by offering input in geo-political policy as she observes the “subsequent chastisements inflicted by the expeditions under Generals Sully and Sibley in 1863” (Kelly v). Chastisements, Kelly posits, eventually led to her capture. She effectively situates herself and her text in public rhetorical space by declaring the simultaneous singularity of her captivity and the potential for future emigrants to experience what she and her fellow emigrants are experiencing. Furthermore, using such wording as “fresh outrages,” “overwhelming force of hostile Sioux,” and her own “horrible captivity of five months' duration” (Introductory v-vi), Kelly continues to insert

herself in public rhetoric by reframing the narrative in moral terms. Expected women's rhetorical topos in the nineteenth century included conversations held in the home on family, the education of children, religion, and piety. Kelly uses the word "family" approximately thirty-seven times in her narrative, with it often juxtaposed against powerful imagery that evokes a sense of empathy in the reader. At the beginning of her narrative, Kelly asserts

[o]ld substantial farmers, surrounded apparently by all the comforts that heart could wish, sacrificed the homes wherein their families had been reared for generations, and, with all their worldly possessions, turned their faces toward the setting sun. And with what high hopes! Alas! how few, comparatively, met their realization. (Kelly 11)

Contrasting this image of hope from families who have resided in their homes "for generations" against the reality that few of these families successfully emigrated portends despair. In one particularly moving passage, Kelly juxtaposes the quotidian life of a pioneer mother and the horrors faced in frontier living:

One day, the Indians went into a house where they found a woman making bread. Her infant child lay in the cradle, unconscious of its fate. Snatching it from its little bed they thrust it into the heated oven, its screams torturing the wretched mother, who was immediately after stabbed and cut in many pieces. Taking the suffering little creature from the oven, they then dashed out its brains against the walls of the house. (Kelly 117)

By using powerfully evocative terms as “fresh outrages” and by contrasting the quotidian against the horrific, Kelly not only calls for her readers to judge her experience as against the natural order of things but also she moves her experience—and her fellow emigrants’ experiences—toward a larger context, a context that she establishes wherein fellow white emigrants may potentially be affected. If she were to describe only her experience and exclude her observations of her fellow emigrants’ experiences, her audience might classify her narrative as exceptional insofar as what she endured, while being unfortunate, was not representative of emigrant experiences. But by including her observations of her fellow emigrants’ experiences—particularly those of children and women, Kelly suggests to her readers that these dangers are very possible and that they destroy the sanctity of family, a conventional topic of women's rhetoric. Thus, by initially introducing her readers to the length of her captivity and then, throughout the course of her book, choosing and describing select events that support her captivity experience and the experiences of fellow white pioneers as “horrible,” Kelly navigates her prescribed silence by warning her white audience of the dangers presented by the “savages,”⁹ a highly problematic term in her racialized discourse of Manifest Destiny that Carolyn A. Haynes identifies (Pinar 272).

Reading Kelly’s word choice through a historical lens offers insight into her oblique critique of the two generals who, in their conflation of the Sioux Indians with the Dakota (in which the two generals regarded the varying Native Americans as one large monolith), held all Indians responsible for the killing of a doctor in Sibley’s army. Consequently, Sibley and Sully led a military charge against multiple Native American

tribes¹⁰ prior to Kelly's journey, thus helping create the hostility of the Sioux toward the white European emigrants in Kelly's caravan. Kelly's oblique criticism almost parallels Rowlandson's critique of the English army, an army presumably trained and who, nevertheless, could not traverse the frozen river:

God did not give them courage or activity to go over after us; we were not ready for so great a mercy as victory and deliverance; if we had been, God would have found out a way for the English to have passed this River as well as for the Indians with their Squaws and Children, and all their Luggage. (Rowlandson 80)

While Rowlandson's criticism is benign on the surface level, with its gentle exculpation of the English army by attributing their lack of success to God's will, her criticism is a sharp rebuke nonetheless. Not only is Rowlandson critiquing the military might, when read through the lens of "discourse of domesticity," one can see Rowlandson critiquing the very masculinity and worthiness of the English army, particularly the worthiness in God's eyes within the Puritan belief system. Rowlandson was persuaded to write of her experience by Puritan elders, specifically Increase Mather, so that her narrative would be a metaphor of the Puritan belief in Divine Providence. Puritan ideology maintains that the Christian, who so readily falls into complacency, must experience "pains and trials, [which bring] a forced end to comforts and pleasures" of which the Christian must "love it [the trials and pain], accept it, and be saved; or to rail against it and perish" (Slotkin 104). The Puritan captivity narrative, particularly Rowlandson's narrative, serves as an exemplar for her fellow Puritans. By using Biblical exegesis, Rowlandson constructs what Richard Slotkin defines as an "archetype [that creates] a paradigm of personal and

collective history” for the Puritans and in later American narratives (102). Since the Puritans believed the soul was always in danger and existentially quite fragile, Rowlandson’s rhetorical strategies rooted in Biblical scripture serve as a powerful analogy to Jonathan Edwards’ sermon, “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God.” Both Rowlandson’s narrative and Edwards’ sermon seek to overwhelm the audience with a type of sensory terror that would thus carry them toward the “emotional crisis of religious conversion” (Slotkin 103). Yet Rowlandson steps outside her narrative’s ascribed purpose and delivers a powerful and oblique rebuke of the English army. Couched within her vivid descriptions of her captivity experience, Rowlandson engages in conventionally “discourse of domesticity” rhetorical topics of children, family, and home woven throughout her steady evocations of scriptural passages. Interestingly, she seems also to question God’s providence, which serves to further reframe her religious narrative into a type of moral existentialism. Leading up to the day the English army lacked the wherewithal to follow the fleeing “Barbarous Creatures” (Rowlandson 70), Rowlandson narrates her eventual eating of the Indians’ “filthy trash” (79) in her third week of captivity. In the early days of her captivity, she refuses to eat the food offered her as a result of her Puritan indoctrination for regarding the Native Americans as inferior and, therefore, “had difficulty consciously admitting a certain respect and even liking for her Indian captors” (Derounian-Stodola *Indian Captivity Narrative* 92). Nevertheless, hunger finally wore her down so that, when Rowlandson ate “such things,” (Rowlandson 79) she found the food “sweet and savory to my [her] taste” (79).

Although Rowlandson eventually grows to prefer Indian food, she continues to employ rhetoric that reminds her audience of the savagery of her captors. Later in her narrative, she realizes the day was Sabbath and requests the day free to rest. Rowlandson tells her readers that her captors “bade me [her] go to work” and that they would “break my [her] face” (79). After her group has forded a freezing river, in a tone that suggests wonderment, Rowlandson reflects:

And here I cannot but take notice of the strange providence of God in preserving the heathen; They were many hundreds, old and young, some sick, and some lame, many had Papooses at their backs, the greater number at this time with us, were Squaws, and they travelled with all they had, bag and baggage, and yet they got over this River aforesaid (79).

Taking the time and using space in which to describe the large group of Indian travelers, Rowlandson points out that many of these travelers were old, sick, injured, and infants. She also emphasizes that a large number of the Native American travelers were women loaded down with material possessions. Thus when she later states that the pursuing English army was unable to cross the frozen river while the “many hundreds” of Indians could, Rowlandson smoothly merges discourse of domesticity into public rhetorical space by effectively critiquing the English army's inability to cross the very same river the “many hundreds” of those perceived as weaker successfully crossed. Yet by attributing the English army's lack of fortitude to God's will, Rowlandson simultaneously softens her critique and engages in discourse of domesticity: religion. Although her critique serves to shame publicly the English army, her rhetorical strategy of imbuing Divine

intervention onto English military movement successfully and obliquely critiques both the military and Puritan patriarchal structure. Since “Ter Amicam,” believed to be Increase Mather, notes in the preface that Rowlandson’s narrative is a “pious scope which deserves both commendation and *imitation*” (Rowlandson 65, emphasis added), Rowlandson’s captivity narrative can be regarded as an exemplar learning tool by its audience so that “God might have his due glory and others benefit by it as well as herself” (Rowlandson 66). Despite Rowlandson’s “modesty” (66) and unwillingness to publish her narrative, her narrative found a foothold within public rhetorical space nonetheless. David D. Hall notes that as a method of control, women “were not supposed to cross the line between the private and the public” (12). By noting Rowlandson’s modesty-induced hesitation in entering public rhetorical space, Ter Amicam’s foreword serves the purpose of validating and authorizing Rowlandson so that she may move beyond her allocated sphere of the home, which allows her experience to offer fellow Puritans hope or to simply “explain or justify...a course of action they [English colonists and Puritans] had taken or their right to possess land; or simply [to serve as] an attempt to persuade potential European settlers of the beauties and wealth of the strange new world” (Slotkin 18).

Rowlandson’s contemporary readers were not supposed to notice any disturbance, like a critique, and instead were expected to accept the “view of reality” (Bizzell 51) Rowlandson’s narrative—and through Increase Mather’s encouragement of Rowlandson in an effort to further convey Puritan ideology—put forth. Yet when one considers the deliberate use of silence as a rhetorical strategy, one may engage in “resisting read[ing]”

(Bizzell 51) and notice the slight disturbances that come through a text when conventional and expected layers are peeled back.

Continuing to apply a perspective of resisting reading to Rowlandson's text by examining her use of silence as she reframes the narrative of religious belief into a personal self-examination, readers witness Rowlandson's spiritual questioning. While rooted in Puritan ideology is the idea of humanity's fragile soul that can be strengthened only through trials and pain, Rowlandson's musing over God's "strange providence" bestowed upon the Indians serves as a powerful rhetorical strategy of situating her personal, religious self in public rhetorical space. Rowlandson subversively questions Puritan belief in the covenant between God and the Puritans by subtly questioning God's act of "preserving the heathen" (79) while the English army continue to struggle. Therein lies Rowlandson's critique of the army and, by extension, of the privileging of masculinity within the Puritan hierarchy. By emphasizing the women, children, and babies who successfully crossed the frozen river while carrying their material belongings, Rowlandson utilizes the rhetorical strategy of antithesis by drawing the distinction between the assumed might and strength of the masculine army against the assumed weakness of women and children and of the indigenous "heathen."

Similarly, Kelly challenges the patriarchal American army by criticizing two generals, Sully and Sibley. In her Introduction, Kelly names these two men and obliquely lays blame for her captivity at their feet when she makes it a point to describe the two generals' treatment of the Native Americans as "subsequent chastisements inflicted by the[ir] expeditions" that led to "the great emigrant trails to Idaho and Montana

[becoming] the scene of fresh outrages” (Kelly v). At the start of her narrative, Kelly puts responsibility for the “fresh outrages” experienced by the white emigrants not necessarily on the Native Americans themselves but on the 1863 decisions made by the two generals, Sully and Sibley. This is not to say that Kelly refrains from castigating her Native American captors. Rather, through her introductory piece, Kelly contextualizes her captivity experience by addressing military decisions that resulted in geopolitical consequences that affected women, children, and families. Thus does Kelly insert herself into public rhetoric by simultaneously speaking on the traditionally domestic discursive topic of family while speaking on military decisions and actions. Doing so Kelly moves from the female rhetorical space of family to the masculine rhetorical space of politics.

Elsewhere in her narrative, Kelly writes of General Sully’s pursuit of her party to the extent that the Native Americans’ “desperate and reckless desire to save themselves” became so strong that they disposed of everything that might slow them down. In an antithetical description to the Native Americans leaving virtually everything behind in an effort to travel lighter and faster, Kelly then describes how General Sully and his “whole troop stopped to destroy the property [material goods, including lodging, the Native Americans left behind]” (Kelly 103). General Sully’s decision to stop and destroy gave the fleeing Native Americans “an opportunity to escape, which *saved us* from falling into his hands, as otherwise *we* inevitably would have done” (Kelly 103, emphasis added). Not only does Kelly point out the contrasting behaviors of the white Army and the Native Americans, Kelly’s word choice of “saved us” and “we” is thought provoking at the least.

Although Kelly was not a transculturated captive, there are fleeting moments in her narrative wherein she regards her captors in a more nuanced light than perhaps expected. Derounian-Stodola states that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, “white audiences...appear to have had little desire to read accounts of Indian culture that went counter to the negative image of Indians that an expansionistic white society created to dispossess them of their Western properties” (74). It is safe to argue that Kelly and her fellow emigrants subscribed to that “expansionistic white society” since they participated in westward migration in hope of helping restore the failing health of Kelly’s husband, Josiah Kelly, “with high-wrought hopes and pleasant anticipations of a romantic and delightful journey across the plains, and a confident expectation of future prosperity among the golden hills of Idaho” (Kelly 13). Kelly’s idyllic description of their plan is that of a journey with no expectation other than to appreciate the land unfolding before the emigrants as they mosey along to Idaho. Furthermore, there exists an underlying assumption that that “pleasant anticipation of a romantic and delightful journey” is warranted and perfectly normal.

Kelly’s rhetoric embodies that of a privileged white woman who does not recognize, much less expect, any potential dangers she may encounter on her journey. Her saccharine description serves another purpose, though. She effectively draws the white audiences of her time, those very same readers whom Derounian-Stodola notes in the earlier passage, into sympathizing with her expectation of a bucolic adventure. After her audience has sympathized with her in her plans of a lovely journey westward, they are then ready to empathize with her as she narrates her experience in “terror and

privation” (Kelly vi). Through this warning, Kelly places herself into the space of public rhetoric. She has successfully moved from the discourse of domesticity of worrying over her husband’s health and hoping to enjoy a “romantic and delightful journey” to public rhetoric by engaging in oblique critiques of military decisions and actions and descriptions of “fresh outrages” that concretize geopolitical realities of white emigrant families.

By pointing out the decision made by Sully to stop and destroy, Kelly invites her readers to sympathize with her frustration as “[o]ne day was consumed in collecting and burning the Indian lodges, blankets, provisions, etc., and that day was used advantageously in getting beyond his reach” (Kelly 104). But for that decision, Kelly and her fellow captives could have been rescued. Without explicitly condemning Sully’s actions, she obliquely criticizes his decision and his “whole troop” who complied with this act. Since by this time, Kelly has already witnessed and experienced horrors in her captivity, her rhetorical decision to use two paragraphs to describe this one event augments her criticism of this military decision and action. Compounding her criticism is her following reflection on the Indians’ fortitude: “They travel constantly in time of war, ranging over vast tracts of country, and prosecuting their battles, or skirmishes, with a quiet determination *unknown to the whites*” (Kelly 104, emphasis added). Through this single observation, Kelly inserts herself into the public rhetorical space of warfare and politics. Furthermore, with her final comment on the Indians’ strength that is “unknown to the whites,” Kelly not only enters public rhetorical space, she charges in by judging the American army’s lack of intelligence into Indian martial skill.

Kelly finalizes this particular critique with, perhaps, an even harsher rebuke against Sully by matter-of-factly stating, “A few days’ pursuit after Indians is generally enough to wear and tire out the ardor of the white man” (104). While Rowlandson slyly shifts the English army’s lack of success in their pursuit to God’s will, Kelly forthrightly states the white man lacks the stamina.

Both Kelly and Rowlandson insert themselves into the public rhetoric of military movements and geopolitics by *obliquely* criticizing military decisions and actions, domains far removed from the expected understanding of women’s ken. But because both women emphasize the real-world effects of the decisions made by Sully, Sibley, and the English army by discussing the consequences felt by women, children, and families—all expected domains of women’s ken—Kelly and Rowlandson have powerfully reframed geopolitical rhetoric into moral terms. And since both women speak to the experiences of children and families, they have effectively situated their voices into public rhetorical space through their use of a decidedly gendered argument.

Besides the silencing Kelly experiences at the hands of one or more individuals via her purloined and suppressed narrative, she also strategically silences herself through her construction of a distinct wall of etiquette framed by her referencing her husband as Mr. Kelly. She further frames this wall when she writes of her attempts in “entreating” him to “forbear and only attempt conciliation” (Kelly 21). Framing her argument in this type of gendered language, one that’s often based on etiquette, Kelly further writes that her “[l]ove for the trembling little girl at [her] side” and her love for her husband and friends “made [her] strong to protest against any thing [sic] that would lessen [their]

chance for escape with [their] lives” (Kelly 21). Her love is what gives her strength and, specifically, her love for her family and children, emboldened her further. Kelly’s evocation of a maternal type of love for a child who was not biologically hers places her language firmly within gendered language and discourse of domesticity. Doing so also firmly situates her self in public rhetorical space. She is effectively expected (and allowed) to speak publicly of her captivity experience through a domestic lens. Placing her worries as secondary to the child Mary’s “trembling” as Kelly’s primary concern, Kelly engages the rhetoric of motherhood. Consequently, she embraces the role of mother as she simultaneously speaks of her geopolitical experience of captivity at the hands of the Sioux. By appealing to her role as a mother figure, Kelly skillfully moves beyond her conventionally-ascribed role that historically has “constrain[ed] the political power of women’s discourse by redirecting women to rhetorical roles in the home and complicating their access to the public rhetorical spaces where the fate of the nation was debated” (Johnson 2).

By vividly describing a particularly gruesome event, Kelly does not spare her readers. In this particular event, Kelly describes to her readers a “woman making bread” in her own house, which the Indians then violate by coming inside unannounced and uninvited. This mundane experience, of a woman in her own home making bread, presumably for her family, sets up the following events rather shockingly. The baby who was in its cradle “unconscious of its fate” is horrifically “thrust ... into the heated oven” that has been prepared for the bread dough while the woman, now identified as a “wretched mother,” is forced to hear her child’s painful screams before she is soon

“stabbed and cut in many pieces” (Kelly 117). In this short and vivid description, Kelly forcefully appeals to her audience’s notions of womanhood and motherhood while simultaneously contrasting the brutality of the Other, the Native Americans. Nowhere in Kelly’s or Rowlandson’s narratives do the authors describe or comment upon any similarly brutal act inflicted on the Indians by the white armies or even the white colonists and settlers, including the institution of slavery.¹¹

While Kelly couches some of her language within a wall of etiquette, Rowlandson does not. However, Rowlandson also embraces the rhetoric of motherhood by similarly situating herself and her captivity experience within the female domestic space of family. Using great detail, Rowlandson describes the death of her daughter, Sarah, in her arms and being separated from her two other children, Mary and Joseph Jr. Of Sarah, Rowlandson writes:

Thus nine days I sat upon my knees, with my Babe in my lap, till my flesh was raw again; my Child being even ready to depart this sorrowful world, they bade me carry it out to another Wigwam (I suppose because they would not be troubled with such spectacles) Whither I went with a very heavy heart, and down I sat with the picture of death in my lap. About two houres [sic] in the night, my sweet Babe, like a lamb departed this life, on Feb. 18. 1675, It being about six *yeares* [sic], and *five months* old [sic]. (Rowlandson 74-75)

Using vivid imagery Rowlandson mourns the death of her young daughter while simultaneously putting up a wall—perhaps in a self-protective mode—by referring to her daughter as “it.” The tension inherent in her choice of pronoun contrasting against her

loving memorializing by including Sarah's precise age and the date of her death allows Rowlandson to enter public rhetoric. The simultaneous use of such an impersonal pronoun within memorializing allows her to enter public rhetorical space¹² principally because she uses the female space of family to subtly warn her readers of the "Indian barbarism" (Slotkin 21) against which colonial Americans faced and also must persevere.

While the existence of captivities surely was common knowledge amongst the English Puritans and nineteenth-century white emigrants, both Rowlandson's and Kelly's narratives furthered the emerging white American identity by situating their decidedly female voices in public rhetorical spaces. Doing so conveyed the dangers white families faced within the geopolitical reality of colonization and westward expansion. Whether or not Rowlandson and Kelly deliberately utilized this strategy in order to critique geopolitical decisions is moot. The end result remains the same: when reading these two captives' narratives through the lens of silence as a rhetorical strategy, both women's statements are critiques nonetheless.

In *Hope*, Amanda Berry likewise critiques a historically masculine institution: the police force. At the end of Berry's and DeJesus' memoir, *Hope: A Memoir of Survival in Cleveland*, Berry ventures into public rhetorical space in a way similar to Rowlandson and Kelly. While both Rowlandson and Kelly critique the armies of their respective times using decorous and feminine discourse, Berry forthrightly challenges the Cleveland police by stating that "when a mother says her kid is in trouble, the police should listen and not tell her they know better" (Berry 314). Her criticism of authority, particularly one constructed as masculine (despite the number of women now in the force), is a powerful

rhetorical statement, both on the surface and what it implies. While Rowlandson's and Kelly's captivity experiences occurred during actual military skirmishes between colonizing and emigrating forces and indigenous people, Berry's and DeJesus's captivity experience occurred during another form of skirmish: that between men and women.

Berry and DeJesus published *Hope* in 2015. Women publishing books and engaging in public rhetoric were no longer the anomaly that they once were during the time of Rowlandson and Kelly. By the time *Hope* was published, women authors were publishing on a regular basis. While Rowlandson and Kelly experienced more rigid parameters for their narratives, thus necessitating a softer approach in their criticism, Berry felt no less rigidity, if any. And while Rowlandson and Kelly's narratives provide insight into an emerging American identity, one that is based on race, Berry's narrative, and, perhaps, to a lesser extent, DeJesus's narrative, provides insight into an American identity based on economics and social status. However, this is not to say that race no longer factors into the equation of American identity. The concept of race and its role in including and excluding certain peoples is deeply rooted in America's systems of law, medicine, and education, which, in turn, inform the socio-economics and status of groups of people.

Regarding the captivity narratives of Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus, similarities in rhetoric appear. While Rowlandson and Kelly's narratives appeared in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, respectively, Berry's and DeJesus's joint narrative appeared in the twenty-first century. The American identity being argued for and created in Rowlandson's and Kelly's narratives is now assumed to be the dominant, foundational

American identity in the 2000s. However, while Rowlandson's and Kelly's narratives warn of the dangers presented by the Native Americans, Berry's and DeJesus's narrative warns of the dangers presented by men. A parallel warning runs throughout Berry's and DeJesus's narrative as well: victims inhabiting the lower socio-economic strata are easily dismissed or, more disturbingly, *disappeared*¹³ from public notice beyond the communities affected, itself a form of erasure and silencing.

Both Berry and DeJesus employ pathos-driven rhetoric as each author frequently discusses her mother, father, siblings, and, in Berry's case, her daughter. While one can expect a captive to miss her family and, thus, to write about such longing, because of gendered language expectations, when women, especially young women and girls, evoke such longing for family and the home, the pathos inherent in such rhetoric becomes rooted in the female captives' disruption and removal from the gendered private sphere: the home.

Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus were both kidnapped by Ariel Castro and forced to live in his boarded-up home for ten years, nine for DeJesus. Both girls were chained in his basement, starved, beaten, and raped by Castro. One of the rapes Berry endured resulted in her child, who, while allowed to leave with Castro on rare expeditions outside the house, nevertheless experienced her first nearly six years in captivity alongside Berry and DeJesus. The physical, mental, and emotional abuse experienced by Berry and DeJesus will be discussed further in the next chapter, particularly as such abuse relates to torture and the embodiment of pain.

The jointly-written *Hope* is a two-pronged captivity narrative written by Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus. The book's structure then allows for each woman to voice her experience in alternating segments with an intermittent third point of view presented by the reporters, Mary Jordan and Kevin Sullivan.

In the Preface to *Hope*, Berry describes the moment she learns her captor, Ariel Castro, has committed suicide only one month into his sentence of life in prison with an added one thousand years. Berry does not mince words, and instead forces her readers to confront the degradation, pain, and trauma her captivity forced upon her: "He [Castro] kidnapped me, chained me like a dog in his house, and raped me over and over. Because of him, my mother died without knowing if I was dead or alive" (Berry vii). Using simple sentences, powerful verbs, and no metaphor or other imagistic language, Berry bluntly and succinctly informs her readers of her experience. As a result, her anger is palpable when she asks, "How dare he do this? How dare he?" (vii) On the other hand, DeJesus describes a sense of numbness when she learns of Castro's death: "I don't feel anything, but only stare at the TV, numb" (viii). DeJesus is at home with family and as the breaking news chyron flashes the information that Ariel Castro is dead, silence falls in the living room. Amidst this silence sits DeJesus cloaked in impassivity. Yet buried within is a streak of skepticism. Whereas Berry was angry and disbelieving, DeJesus posits that the prison officials might be claiming Castro's death because Berry's and her story "has been nonstop bad news for Cleveland" (Berry viii). These two approaches to Castro's suicide offer readers a hint to the tones within the parallel captivity narratives. Berry regularly fights against Castro during her captivity, often verbally challenging him and

recriminating herself, while DeJesus remains quiet. When readers are introduced to DeJesus, she states that while she loves the “fun we [her family] have in our busy house,... [she] also love[s] peace. [she] like[s] things quiet” (Berry 61). Nevertheless, readers witness a quiet rage within DeJesus, one that often highlights her suicide ideation during her captivity. During her captivity, DeJesus exhibits the reflective thinking of an introvert. She notes that she is treated better than Berry and Michelle Knight, the third young woman Castro held captive:

He seems to treat me better than the other girls. I have the nicer room, and he [Castro] brings me downstairs more often than them. He lets me eat first, so when he brings home a pizza that has ten slices, I can take four, and the other two girls get three each. I feel guilty about having more, but I’m hungry all the time, and it’s hard to wait for hours and hours to eat. I wonder if he’s kinder to me because I’m the new girl, and I wonder what happens when I’m not new anymore. (Berry 101)

The observation made in the above passage suggests an introverted nature, one that is quiet, observant, and thoughtful.

Throughout her narrative, readers begin to see how overwhelmingly painful DeJesus’s captivity is for her. Describing one event in August 2004, DeJesus narrates her suicide attempt and Castro’s seeming amusement. She has told him she wants to kill herself; and he has offered to help, even bringing in a rope with which she can hang herself. She notes that when “he first kidnapped me, all I cared about was staying alive...[b]ut now I feel hollowed out” (Berry 103). After putting the rope around her neck with Castro standing there “watching me [DeJesus]” she asks what he will do with her

body. He replies that he'll simply bury her in the backyard and that "[n]obody will ever know" (Berry 103). Only then does she realize she cannot continue with suicide because her "parents will never know Arlene's [her school friend] dad did this" and that she doesn't "want him to get away with this" (Berry 103). Yet while she continues to live physically, she is being broken as she no longer watches television and spends "days at a time, [sic] barely moving" while she lies down "staring at the ceiling" (Berry 103). The heady joy that is typical and expected of a fourteen-year-old girl's life has been interrupted by Castro's captivity of her.

Further reflecting her introspective character, DeJesus, upon learning of Castro's suicide, tells Berry, "I didn't want him to die this way—nobody should. I wanted him to be in prison like we were...I wanted him to be locked up and left with his thoughts because his thoughts would eat him alive" (ix). Her use of the metaphor "eat him alive" suggests a building rage that gives DeJesus strength to continue. During captivity, DeJesus rarely watched television while Berry voraciously viewed the news, paying special attention to the stories featuring her mother, Louwana Berry, as she continued to raise awareness of Berry's abduction. Because of the mother's insistence on entering public rhetorical spaces, Berry states, "I get my strength from knowing that my mom is fighting for me. If she gives up, I'll feel like I don't exist" (Berry 111). This lack of existence outside the mother's perspective suggests the disturbing erasure and silencing of Berry and DeJesus within and by society. In two particularly frustrating passages narrated by the journalists, one passage describes the dismissiveness of the police when DeJesus's mother informs an officer she's flagged down of her missing daughter. The

police officer simply comments, “Oh, your daughter is at that age...she’s probably with her boyfriend” (Berry 72). The second passage describes an event when Castro’s older daughter, Angie, and her husband were left a disturbing voice mail that featured, at first, “muffled sounds” and then the “voice of a young woman, sounding terrified, screaming, ‘Get away from me!’” (Berry 88). Frustratingly, the police dismissed the phone call as a “prank call” (88). These two episodes make Berry’s criticism of the police powerful. As stated earlier in this chapter, Berry forcefully enters public rhetorical space by challenging the police to listen to the very people whom the institution frequently dismisses: girls and women, especially women inhabiting the lower socio-economic stratum.

Throughout her narrative, Berry describes a terrifying discombobulation she experiences at the hands of Castro. In one particularly jarring passage, she uses spare prose when commenting on her rapes: “Being alone is bad, but it is far worse when he comes in, and it always ends with me crying” (43). Readers must read between the lines in order to realize that Castro comes to Berry only to force himself on her. Saying that she believes Castro will most likely read her journal, a “blue diary with flowers on its cover” (Berry 16), he bought for her, Berry engages in a complex form of rhetorical silence. Explaining why she uses coded language in her diary, Berry states:

I won’t use the word “rape” in case he ever reads it. But I need a record of what he is doing to me. I want him someday, somehow, to be held responsible for every single time he steals a piece of me. I can’t let him get away with this. (Berry 22)

As part of her self-silencing, Berry puts a small letter x behind seemingly random numbers. Through this coded language, Berry notes the number of times Castro has raped her that day. Throughout her diary are entries with Berry narrating her day as she watched her mother on the news or was forced to wash Castro's dirty laundry or as she engaged in interactions with DeJesus and the third captive. Berry often closes these entries with small 3xes and 4xes. However, one particular entry's simplicity crystallizes the brutal horror Berry and DeJesus endured during their captivities:

May 13

5x. (Berry 25)

Although Berry marks her experience with her captor that particular day, and not DeJesus's experience, the visual silence that surrounds her date and number serves as a meta silence for Berry herself. But because her date and number are boldly breaking up the visual silence of white space on the page, the typography of her text mirrors her self-insertion into public rhetorical space merging all four of the rhetorical strategies listed earlier in this chapter. Through her paucity of words, Berry simultaneously reframes the narrative by calling to attention his treatment and expectation of her; uses gendered beliefs, particularly as they pertain to the so-called safety of the private, or domestic, sphere; declares her situation unique by identifying the numbers of time her captor sexually assaults her on a daily basis; and ultimately moves toward a larger context by indicating her situation is a potential reality for girls and women across the country.

Thus, knowing Castro may read her diary, Berry cautiously enters a two-fold public rhetorical space: the house wherein she is held captive is not her home and is, thus,

public to her, and her diary, traditionally a private material good, is available to Berry's captor at any time he wishes to view her private thoughts. To add further to her sense of discombobulation, Berry describes when Castro comes to her room, where she is chained, as if he "hasn't done anything wrong, like we [Berry and Castro] are friends" (43). Keeping Berry and DeJesus off balance will be further explored in the next chapter as this form of disruption is a torture strategy. However, this type of interruption in a day even as base a day as Berry's and DeJesus's during their captivities is an attempt by Castro to force his narrative onto the two captives. The fact that they both refuse by writing their own narratives points to Berry and DeJesus reframing Castro's would-be narrative. Not only would Berry write in her diary, the very same one she anticipated Castro would read, she also wrote on any surface by "keep[ing] every scrap of paper [she] can find" (Berry 38), eventually "writing on the napkins [Castro's] brought from fast-food restaurants" when she runs out of paper (Berry 42).

Tillie Olsen, an American author who explored social/political circumstances through a feminist and, often, domestic lens, describes commonplace events and experiences in many women's lives, such as childrearing, as silences: "Kin to these years-long silences are the hidden silences; work aborted, deferred, denied—hidden by the work which does come to fruition" (Olsen 8). A byproduct of such a commonplace experience is the deferment or, even, abortion of promise. When a woman is unable to join the work force because she is responsible for childrearing and/or maintaining the family home, Olsen regards this interruption in a woman's place in the public sphere as silence. As Berry begins describing the mundane lead up to her kidnapping, Berry

portends the aborted promise of her future she will soon face. She describes her ten-minute walk to her first job, a job at Burger King, and why she works there: “I need money because one day I’m going to go to college” (Berry 4). She dreams of making enough money so that she can later support her mother who dropped out of middle school (another example of Olsen’s silences) and was, thus, relegated to low-wage work. Because of Castro’s actions, Berry’s and DeJesus’s plans and life were disrupted and silenced.

During the moment of Berry’s escape, she describes her frantic yelling and pleading for anyone to help her. At one point, an “old lady” admonishes a young man as he “gives the door [behind which Berry is trying to escape] a little pull” (Berry 249). This older woman, unfortunately, successfully scares the would-be helper away by iterating the statement that “Amanda Berry died years ago” (249) while Berry is screaming that she’s still alive. Finally, another man comes by and asks what is causing the commotion. During this passage, there is an interesting switch in Berry’s rhetorical strategy.

Throughout her narrative, her primary rhetorical decision is to quote dialog and follow it with reflection. Frequently the dialog is peppered with raw language that evokes a powerful sense of unease and disgust in the readers:

“You’re so pretty,” he says as he starts pawing me again. “Stand this way, stand that way, put your arms around me, you’re so beautiful,” blah, blah, blah. He has a whole little routine he makes me recite, about how much I love it, how much I want him. If I don’t say it, he’s rougher. (Berry 43)

Berry's tone and diction lack any elegance, both of which serve as a mirror to her experience. What she experiences is not elegant. Her experience is brutal and ugly, and her diction must reflect that. Yet she displays insight and self-awareness, particularly as it pertains to self-preservation. She notices that if she refuses to say what her captor wants her to say, he hurts her. Thus, Berry uses Castro's gendered beliefs of what Berry should feel against him. Frankly, she tells him what he wants to hear in order to survive with a little less pain that particular day. In her book, she could have tempered the ugliness she experienced at his hands and, perhaps, make her less vulnerable to the public audience. But by engaging in authenticity, Berry further reframes the narrative of her captivity by exposing gendered beliefs of femininity and masculinity as she reveals the commonly-used rhetorical strategy women often use to escape or otherwise lessen harm inflicted upon their bodies.

Returning to the moment of her escape, Berry's rhetorical decision is to dispense with self-reflection and to emphasize the dialog. This decision serves to put in stark relief the urgency of her situation and emphasize her state of panic. As the older woman moves from reiterating her refrain that Amanda Berry is dead to actually "wav[ing] her finger at us [Berry and the first man on the porch] saying 'No, no, no,'" Berry continues to scream she is Amanda Berry and intersperses her identity affirmation with pleas for help. This man does move away from her and no longer continues to help. Fortunately, though, "a tall black guy" approaches the older woman and asks what's happening. She repeats the refrain that Amanda Berry is dead. While Berry continues to scream her name, this second man nevertheless comes up to her and "pulls on the door a couple times" (Berry

249). Here, Berry's rhetorical strategy shifts so that she now presents her frustration as a thought and reflection, albeit awkwardly constructed. As the older woman remains telling the two men and members of the growing audience that Amanda Berry is dead, rather than screaming she is very much alive and has been held captive for ten years, Berry reflects, "No! I'm right here. Who cares who I am? Can't they help me?" (249) As presented in her narrative, she no longer says anything but is instead silent. Her switching from public rhetoric to the private rhetorical space of her thoughts creates a helpless tension in the readers, a tension that mirrors Berry's growing fear of her would-be savior's departure and her captor's return.

Nevertheless, the tall black man (Berry makes it a point to highlight his race when she introduces him on page 249), helps her to escape by, first, tugging on the door only to discover it's locked, and, after "closely [looking] at the door from top to bottom...starts to kick at the bottom panel" (Berry 249). However, instead of continuing to kick at the panel, he tells Berry to "[f]inish kicking it out, Mama" (249). In an interesting reflective aside, Berry wonders why he doesn't finish kicking out the panel for her. Instead, Berry bemoans, "Why won't anybody help me?" Perhaps it is her decade of being forced to rely utterly on Castro's whims for her survival and her panic and fear of Castro's impending return that seemingly cause her to mentally construct her situation within a helpless framework. Between the cries for her "Daddy" (Berry 248) by Jocelyn, Berry's daughter by her rapist/captor, and her own frantic feelings, it is reasonable to revert to the ten years of programming Castro enforced on her and DeJesus: utter dependency and reliance on Castro—an individual external to her own self—rather than relying on herself. When

Berry is finally free and is using a cell phone to call the police, her exchange with the police dispatcher is presented in a fast-paced, staccato rhythm of pure dialog. She offers no imagery and no belletristic writing. She does not even offer dialog tags, which gives space to the reader to become easily confused as to who says what. Her rhetorical decision serves to highlight the very sense of agitation Berry experiences.

Although women have historically been educated to remain silent and submissive, women nevertheless have subverted societal and cultural assumptions and proscriptions and inserted themselves into public rhetorical spaces. Doing so involves a level of resistance and an awareness of power. In “Silence: A Rhetorical Art for Resisting Disciplines,” Cheryl Glenn states that silence can come from a place of power:

Silence is not, in itself, necessarily a sign of powerlessness or emptiness; it is not the same as absence; and silencing for that matter, [sic] is not the same as erasing... (263).

Silence and erasure are often conflated. Those in power, specifically those holding the traditional concept of power in the form of wealth, prestige, and position, often conflate silence and erasure. Born from a Eurocentric foundation, power and silence are thusly defined through a white male perspective, which leads to the erroneous assumption that silence is synonymous with lack of power vis-à-vis lack of agency. Lack is an operative word in this perspective. However, when one defines silence through such narrow parameters, such as the lack of physical and/or verbal presence in traditionally-defined spaces of power (the professoriate, politics, and media to name a few), then it is understandable to assume such lack equates erasure. However, this idea of lack of

presence is itself narrowly prescribed. Women, people of color, the LGBTQ community, and other marginalized voices certainly have and continue to maintain a presence, both physical and verbal. Communities are built, events are attended, and stories are told. Thus, it becomes a matter of what to look for, what to listen to, and how to see. Witnessing this presence is a matter of readjusting the visual and auditory framework so that narratives like Mary Rowlandson's, Fanny Kelly's, Amanda Berry's, and Gina DeJesus's can be further mapped onto women's rhetoric.

The next chapter will continue examining rhetorical strategies used by these women writers as they describe their physical and lived experiences during their captivities. As such, Chapter Four examines each woman's rhetorical strategies when describing her embodiment of pain and any torture, whether experienced or perceived, she experiences during her captivity.

CHAPTER IV
ETHOS RE-EXAMINED AND THE RHETORICS OF TORTURE
AND EMBODIED TRAUMA

There is a growing awareness of toxic masculinity and rape culture in America and, particularly, within contemporary America. With civil rights activist Tarana Burke's 2006 #MeToo movement, wherein she highlighted gross sexual abuse and assault committed against women, and other movements intended to raise awareness of inequity between the sexes, casual sexism and benevolent sexism as tenets of misogyny are at the forefront of discussion in America. Yet many people have become numb to the ubiquity of misogyny. The sexualized violence against women, unfortunately, appears to be the norm in American culture. From movies like *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* (2010, and itself derived from Stieg Larsson's 2008 bestselling novel) to television shows like *Law and Order: Special Victims Unit*, violence—especially sexualized violence—against women is often treated as a simple plot device. While viewers are often encouraged to be horrified at such violence, the fact that sexualized violence is so ubiquitous in mainstream entertainment should raise questions. Because of this ubiquity, gendered violence is disturbingly normalized. Furthermore, a component of this disturbing normalization is the widespread commodification of women's bodies.

A tangential thread that runs alongside the commodification of women's bodies is the realization that for women's bodies to be commodified, there are active and passive

consumers of women's bodies. Within this idea of the consumption (and often it is a public consumption) of women's bodies is yet another concept, that of valuation. In other words, a woman's body is assessed and given value insofar as her body can and will be consumed. Another way to approach this issue is to realize that if the woman's body is deemed desirable enough for consumption by the viewer, then that woman's body is assessed as valuable. And if her body is not regarded as desirable enough for consumption, her body—and she—has no valuation or worth. Her body is commodified so that her body—and what it may offer to the viewer—becomes an object to be bartered, bought, and sold. From the obvious commodity-exchange crucial to sex work and the economic benefits resulting from unpaid domestic labor, within this spectrum exists a form of commodity exchange rooted in unpaid labor, such as work Mary Rowlandson, Fanny Kelly, Amanda Berry, and Gina DeJesus were expected to perform within their own captivity experiences. While money may not be exchanged, other items of value, both material and nonmaterial goods, are indeed exchanged or withheld. Items like food and sleep and bodily autonomy become topos for negotiation for the women captives. Within the women's captivities, there exists a nascent form of commodification of the women's bodies by their captors. Their bodies' valuation then exists within the space of their captivities, whether that space encompasses a larger geographical area, such as with Rowlandson and Kelly's forced migrations, or a smaller, more contained private domestic area, such as the house which Berry and DeJesus inhabited. As captivity continues, the commodification becomes more deeply entrenched within the captivity experience and even becomes a tool with which the captives negotiate with their captors.

This realization, in turn, informs each captive's rhetoric when expressing embodied pain or, in the cases of Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus, outright torture.

Putting aside the unsettling popularity of sexualized violence in pornography, mainstream movies, television shows, books, comics, and music frequently conflate the bodily torture of women with sexual pleasure of, typically, the heterosexual male. The end result of this skewed approach is normalized media intended for the heterosexual male gaze. In "Naming Sexual Trauma: On the Political Necessity of Nuance in Rape and Sex Offender Discourses," Breanne Fahs questions the reason for the popularity of entertainment that features sexualized violence against women by focusing on the book and the film versions of *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo*: "Could this suggest that sexual violence is so deeply engrained in the American psyche that people uncritically digest Lisbeth's [the protagonist] suffering or, more troubling, find it amusing?" (61) Fahs situates the normalization of sexual violence towards women within the penchant for binary thinking and the pathologizing of sexuality that is regarded as falling outside the default heterosexuality that privileges straight male heterosexuality. The violence inflicted on women's bodies, particularly if it is strategically done so (i.e. rape as a tool in war and genocide or rape or its threat as tools used in silencing, behavioral control, or punishment) is sadly commonplace.

At the foundation of misogyny and its quieter, yet palpable, nonetheless, sibling sexism is power. From benevolent and casual sexism to the misogynistic physical and/or sexualized violence against women, power and its lack are at the root for holders of such

beliefs and doers of accompanying actions. Unfortunately, and predictably, the naturalizing of power and its lack is a major tenet of a patriarchal system. Nevertheless, within the patriarchal system, feminist scholars rebel and repurpose the normalized *lack* into an active space for power. In the essay, “Changing Audience, Changing Ethos,” Beth Daniell and Letizia Guglielmo examine the “concept of ethos and its troubled relations with women speakers” by arguing for a “new, though...temporary, concept of women’s ethos, one that is multifocal, [and] grounded in lived—and shared—experience...[that is] directed at a different audience” (89-90). While Daniell and Guglielmo integrate social media into their argument, this chapter does not take such modern media into account. Instead, this chapter uses their idea of “different audience[s]” when exploring the ethos and audiences of Mary Rowlandson’s, Fanny Kelly’s, and Amanda Berry’s and Gina DeJesus’s lived traumatic experiences visible within their captivity narratives. Depending on each narrative’s publication time frame, the audience for each narrative holds certain expectations for the narrative, expectations that align with each author’s purpose in producing her narrative. As previously mentioned in this dissertation, Mary Rowlandson’s Puritan audience expected levels of moral doctrine in her narrative and an affirmation of Puritan ideology. Fanny Kelly’s audience expected affirmation of westward migration and a form of absolution of the American colonists’ treatment of the indigenous peoples. On the other hand, the audience for Amanda Berry’s and Gina DeJesus’s jointly-written captivity narrative seems to inhabit a painfully personal space. There is no affirmation of any kind of ideology, nor is there a sense of justification for external actions occurring during the narrative’s sociocultural or political landscape.

Rather, the narrative is comprised of the voices of two young women and are grounded in a shared and utterly painful experience which possessed a haunting tone that questions a seemingly cruel randomness to their captivities. Of course, this assertion is not to say that Hope is devoid of any kind of political or sociocultural suasion. The narrative most assuredly critiques (and even condemns) the Cleveland police department and, to a larger extent, a culture of misogyny that allows such cruelty against girls and women to exist and become normalized. With Berry's and DeJesus's narrative, one cannot help but think of the *au courant* term: speak one's truth that comes from one's lived experience. While all four women certainly speak of their lived experiences, Berry's and DeJesus's captivity narrative rings more urgent. Their truths are frighteningly accessible to their readers if they are female readers or male readers who know and love girls and women. In essence, the bogeyman of the savage or devilish Indian has been replaced by the bogeyman of the man next door.

Since the captives are remembering and recollecting their traumas, which means the material texts of their narratives occur chronologically after the reality of their captivities, it becomes important to analyze the language each captive uses when describing traumas they experience. For the sake of clarity, this chapter examines only the traumas that are situated in and on the body, that is beatings, sexual assaults, or sexualized violence. Furthermore, this chapter also examines how the captives describe the threats of these types of traumas. While the threats of violence certainly invoke psychological trauma, the only forms of trauma that are examined in this chapter are

actual physical traumas situated in and on the body and those that derive from threats of bodily harm to the captives. While attention may be paid to the psychological distress experienced by the captives, such attention is secondary to the focus this chapter pays to the language each captive utilizes when describing physical trauma, particularly with regards to each captive's reframed ethos.

The rhetoric Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus utilize shows how they remember and recollect the sexualized trauma visited upon their bodies and how the rhetoric they engage may be informed by power and their social identities of race and class. Furthermore, their embodiments of debased power may also be sites of resistance vis-a-vis their chosen rhetorical strategies. With regards to Mary Rowlandson and Fanny Kelly, the rhetorical strategies they engage in as they remember and recollect trauma they experienced, including deprivation, is informed by their social identities of race and class and may be sites of resistance.

Among the three captivity narratives being examined in this dissertation, one narrative, in particular, painfully delves into the lived tortured experiences of the captives Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus. Mary Rowlandson and Fanny Kelly do not write about any experienced torture in the form of the deliberate infliction of specific bodily pain on a random and incoherent basis as do Berry and DeJesus. While traumatic, the experiences of Rowlandson and Kelly reflect a certain logic since the Indians who held the two women captive pursued violent events due to mercy or pragmatism. For example, the Indians who kidnapped Rowlandson killed her nephew out of mercy once his leg was

broken. On the other hand, Kelly's captors threatened her out of justice as a result of her cavalier ignorance. However, Rowlandson and Kelly experienced their own form of bodily and psychological trauma resulting from their captivities. The pain Rowlandson and Kelly faced, although distressing to the white colonists' societal framework, were logical consequences of transgressions Rowlandson and Kelly committed in the eyes of their Indian captors or were cause and effects of their captivity experience. Thus, this chapter examines the rhetoric of torture as experienced by Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus and the perceived torture as experienced by Mary Rowlandson and Fanny Kelly. The rhetoric of embodied pain as experienced by the four captives is also examined in the three narratives.

Since the language of embodied pain, trauma, and torture is vast and complex, this chapter narrows the scope of examination of the rhetorics of torture and embodied pain by focusing on two rhetorical elements within the captivity narratives under examination:

1. Audience: how audience, particularly one that is reframed, factors into each of the captives' explanations and descriptions of her perception of embodied trauma, pain, and/or torture, and
2. Ethos: how each captive may inhabit or move away from the Aristotelian concept of ethos that resides in the rhetor's words and which is comprised of "good sense, virtue, and goodwill" (Aristotle 171).

In addition to examining the two rhetorical elements above within the three captivity narratives, this chapter centers on revised questions raised by Breanne Fahs in her essay “Naming Sexual Trauma” when examining the four captives’ narratives of embodied pain and torture, whether actual or perceived. Thus, grounding questions applied throughout the analysis conducted in this chapter are:

1. What language is used by the captives when remembering and recollecting their traumas, particularly if their traumas are situated in and on the body (i.e. sexual assault, beatings, and/or sexualized violence)?
2. How are the captives’ naming and witnessing their own or others’ traumas informed by power and social identities (race, class, sexual identity, etc.)?
3. How are the narratives and captives’ identifications and naming of experienced and/or embodied traumas forms of “debased power”¹⁴ and also sites of resistance? Consequently, this chapter assumes power in naming, thereby inversely paralleling the power in silence examined in chapter three.

Using these three questions as foundational tools for analyzing the rhetoric of torture and embodied pain in the three captivity narratives helps readers approach an incredibly miasmatic subject, the steady and ongoing debasement of women. Approaching such a distressing subject through these questions vis-à-vis an oblique relationship to Aristotelian ethos sheds light on this chapter’s argument that the captives’ deliberate naming of their debasement is, in fact, a powerful site of resistance that occurs in tandem with a reframed audience and ethos.

In *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*, Elaine Scarry states, “Torture inflicts bodily pain that is itself language destroying, but torture also mimes (objectifies in the external environment) this language-destroying capacity in its interrogation, the purpose of which is not to elicit needed information but *visibly to deconstruct the prisoner’s voice*” (Scarry 20, emphasis added). Simply put, the purpose of torture is to chisel and hammer away the voice of the individual who is being tortured toward the end result of the tortured individual’s voice occupying a state of nothingness. Keeping in mind an individual’s voice is both an audio manifestation and a metaphorical representation of that individual’s experiences, perspectives, and essence (or soul) of the individual’s being, to demolish that voice means to demolish that individual’s state of being. It means to destroy that individual’s *existence*. It means to destroy that individual’s soul. Thus, this deconstruction is aimed with a singular and frightening precision: the silencing and erasure of an individual’s humanity. By deconstructing an individual’s voice, the torturer is, in effect, deconstructing a human being. With voice serving as a metaphor for identity and all that makes that individual unique, when the voice is taken apart and dissected to nothing in an embodied obverse interpretation of one of Derrida’s deconstruction tenets, namely that there exists an inherent instability of texts due to the intrinsic and irreconcilably contradictory meanings of words, a similar application can be made to the torturer and tortured. How the tortured thinks of the self with regards to language and since language is simply words that refer to more words, these words that attempt to define the tortured’s self have no inherent stability. Thus, the identity of the individual whose voice is actively being deconstructed by the torturer essentially is made

unsubstantial via the torture process. Consequently, the tortured individual, who is now unsubstantial and void of substance, can no longer contain an essence. This is the grotesquery and insidiousness of dehumanization—the sought-after by product of torture by the torturer.

Further complicating the insidious dehumanization of the tortured individual is the cyclical nature of the torture process. As the torturer silences the voice and erases the individuality of the person being tortured, the tortured individual's very identity then becomes dependent on the torturer himself. Thus, if the torturer refuses to recognize the humanity of the tortured individual, the tortured individual no longer sees the humanity in herself or himself. This powerful and cyclical act of dehumanizing the victim seeks to eradicate the humanity of the victim and thingify¹⁵ the one being tortured.

The torturer also has at his or her disposal an arsenal of tools, or torture devices, with which to accomplish the dehumanization. These torture devices serve a particular function. Whether they are belts, chairs, hands, or sexualized violent acts such as rape, the torture devices become the “framing event” themselves (Scarry 20). In other words, in addition to defining oneself according to the torturer's perception of the tortured individual, the torture devices serve as obscene markers in the tortured individual's increasingly misshapen self narrative. Thus, the torture endured by the captives includes the perspective that the devices themselves become essential to understanding how the individuals, who are being tortured, act and react according to the devices or the threat of

the devices, and how they may regard the devices as “framing events” for their own lived experiences and narratives.

In one particularly painful scene, Berry narrates in astonishingly plain prose an event wherein she accidentally cuts a bald spot into the back of her captor’s hair. While DeJesus is usually responsible for cutting his hair, this particular time, their captor, Castro, demands Berry to cut his hair. His demand of her and her forced acquiescence are examples of the material economy in which Berry and DeJesus exist and must perform. In order to survive, Berry and DeJesus must do what their captor and torturer says even if what he demands is something as mundane as a hair cut. In fact, the mundanity of this event lends a particular cruelty to the traumatic event. Harkening to Hannah Arendt’s¹⁶ concept of the “banality of evil,” the ordinariness of hair cutting is now tinged with trauma.

Berry is forced to cut his hair with “tiny kiddie scissors we [Berry, DeJesus, and Berry’s daughter, Jocelyn] have for [their] artwork—nothing sharp enough to hurt him” (194). Because her captor is lying on his stomach with his head angled upward and because she is forced to use children’s rounded scissors, she is nervous. She accidentally cuts his hair too close to his scalp, leaving a small “bare spot” (Berry 194). Not only is Castro an abuser and a rapist, he is a vain man, an aging man who is “obsessed with his appearance, [and who is] always primping in the mirror” (Berry 193). Nevertheless, Berry tells her readers that she understands Castro will seek revenge on her for her mistake and she “know[s] he’s going to come back and do something to me, because

that's the way he is" (194). She also notes that Castro is "always unpredictable when he gets this mad" (194), effectively reminding her readers of the precariousness of her captivity and her survival strategy of reading, interpreting, and understanding Castro's moods and actions. Berry's and DeJesus's growing survival skill at reading their captor's moods and understanding his thought processes is a manifestation of their growing dependence on him for their existence. In order to survive as unscathed as possible, both Berry and DeJesus must be able to read, interpret, and understand their captor in order to placate him when necessary. When that effect fails, they must understand how to endure him without angering him so that they can avoid further trauma or the brunt of trauma at the least. Their identities and the will to exist are becoming necessarily dependent on him. Although Berry is situating her experience within the parameters of the unknown (she does not know what Castro will do to her; she only knows he *will* do something to her) that parallels the larger construct of her captivity, Berry's subjectivity challenges the dominant discourse on ethos and credibility. By narrating her story in the way she does, Berry subverts the Aristotelian concept of ethos as being based on "good sense, virtue, and goodwill" (Aristotle 171). In fact, to varying degrees all of the captives engage in this form of subversion as they challenge the somewhat static positionality of ethos by powerfully centering their own subjectivities as the basis for their ethos rather than relying on "a single site, [one that is] an unchanging vantage point on the margins" (Reynolds 332). Rowlandson positions her ethos firmly within Puritan ideology as evidenced by her continuous placement of biblical Scripture throughout her narrative. Furthermore, Rowlandson recognizes the need to balance her audience's predisposition

toward judging her for engaging in public rhetorical space as a Puritan woman with exemplifying the *Judea Capta* for her Puritan community. She attempts such balance by emphasizing God's grace as protecting her from any "least abuse of unchastity" while being in "the midst of those roaring Lyons, and Salvage Bears, that feared neither God, nor Man, nor the Devil" (Rowlandson 113-4).

While Kelly positions her ethos as terrified white woman caught up in geopolitical landmines between the American army and the Indigenous Americans, Kelly reveals herself to move beyond the trite cliché of white woman at the mercy of the enemy Indians to a place of simultaneously appreciating the strengths of her captors while fearing them and the geopolitical reasons for her party's capture. This is not to say that Kelly was not frightened of her captors. She was. There is a richness to her self-portrayal in her captivity narrative as there is likewise a nuanced self presentation in Rowlandson's narrative. To varying degrees, both Rowlandson and Kelly, as they recollect the trauma inflicted on their bodies, are nevertheless witnessing their traumas while balancing their specific societal expectations and prescriptions of gendered positions within their communities.

Returning to Berry and her captor, when Castro finally enacts his revenge on Berry, he does so by inflicting physical and emotional torture onto her. Using "a big pair of metal scissors with black handles" as a torture weapon, Castro frames this particular event with a common household item, scissors, and a commonplace event, a haircut. After first ordering his daughter, a product of his raping Berry, to "look over there,"

Castro then “grabs [Berry] and cuts a big bald spot on the top of [her] head, right in front” (Berry 194). Later when Berry kicks out at him after he has “jab[bed] the scissors into her hair” yet again, he warns her, “I’ll punch you” and “hold[s] up his fist” (195). In addition to the scissors and the haircut, Castro’s fist now serves as yet another “framing event” that shapes Berry’s narrative as captive. Scarry explains that “pain and imagining are the ‘framing events’ within whose boundaries all other perceptual, somatic, and emotional events occur” (Scarry 164). In this particular situation, Berry shapes her perception and bodily and emotional responses to Castro based on his brandishing of the scissors and his raised fist. Berry admits that she is “humiliated” and repeatedly tries to “comb [her] hair over the bald spot again”(195). Jocelyn is scared and tries to comfort her mother by hugging her. After all, Castro is also Jocelyn’s father and while he dotes on the girl he does not hide his terrorizing and torturing of her mother beyond dictating she look away. It is not until DeJesus, Castro’s other captive, enters the bedroom that is littered with butchered hair and provides strength to Berry with the simple act of sitting next to her and offering advice evoking what Berry’s mother would tell her.

In DeJesus’s section that immediately follows, she describes the same event through her perspective. She also observes Castro’s vanity and states:

He thinks he’s so attractive. Dude, you’re old. And fat and nasty and hairy.

Looking in the mirror’s not going to help! I wish I could say that to him, but I don’t want to get smacked. (Berry 196)

Although the haircutting event has yet to occur, DeJesus has already learned to navigate within the parameters provided by the framing events of Castro's threats and torture. Her verb choice of "smacked" indicates she has been hit before or, at the least, has witnessed someone else in her captivity experience being hit by the captor. Both she and Berry have been chained, both in the downstairs, windowless basement and against the same pole (at different times); and they have been chained in bed during Castro's sexual assaults. Besides being physically unable to move because of the chains, both captives are malnourished and perpetually "hungry" (Berry 14, 20, 23, 41, 64, 70, 77, 101, etc.). They lack energy and muscle mass because of their malnourishment and lack of exercise.¹⁷ Consequently, DeJesus has learned to negotiate her survival by the time of the haircutting event.

On the power of torture, Scarry notes:

The more a habitual form of perception is experienced as itself rather than its external object, the closer it lies to pain; conversely, the more completely a state is experienced as its object, the closer it lies to imaginative self-transformation.

(Scarry 165)

In other words, because both Berry and DeJesus have experienced through habituation of physical and sexualized abuse at Castro's hands, the more readily Berry and DeJesus are able to imagine the associative pain. Similarly, the more readily they are able to imagine associative pain, the more they constrain and transform themselves so that they are able to maneuver with as little inflicted trauma on their bodies as they can.

Consequently, both women must continue to monitor and navigate their movements and reactions to Castro as a result. Such continuous need for self monitoring and self containment creates yet another element of embodied trauma as their mental and somatic experiences are under continuous stress.

In addition to material torture devices, the physical or geographic location of the torture and trauma inflicted upon the bodies of the captives serve a crucial function in the framing of the torture experienced by the four women whose experiences are under examination in this dissertation. Torture usually occurs in one room or a set of rooms. Frequently, these rooms are given the nomenclature of civility, such as “guest rooms” or “safe houses” (Scarry 40). Besides being the setting for torture, the room itself frequently becomes an instrument of torture, further complicating and muddying what is regarded as a torture device. Doors are slammed jarringly loud or are closed so silently as to become unnerving for the ones being tortured. Captives are forbidden from looking out windows, or the windows themselves are boarded up to prevent outsiders from seeing within and captives from seeing without. In the case of Berry and DeJesus, the domestic and private space becomes weaponized against them. Each is literally chained to a post in the basement, a depressingly cluttered room devoid of any windows, with limited movement before being brought upstairs and chained in their respective rooms with boarded windows that effectively limit any sense of belonging to a wider world.

On the other hand, the corporeal experiences endured by Rowlandson and Kelly do not parallel the torture that Berry and DeJesus experience principally because

Rowlandson and Kelly were always on the move and their captivities were premised on a terrifying logic. However, in common with Berry and DeJesus, Rowlandson and Kelly were physically removed, also against their will, from the ordinariness of their known space, such as neighborhoods and familiar faces. Yet Rowlandson, in particular, was physically taken from her own private domestic space, her home, and thrust into the public space of land and nature that her Indian captors knew well while she and members of her party did not. While Rowlandson and Kelly were not confined to a single room or a set of rooms, they were nonetheless confined to a specific geographical setting dictated by their Indian captors. Whereas the domestic private space of the home was weaponized against Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus, the public space of nature and geography were weaponized against Rowlandson and Kelly as their constant moves created discordant interruptions in their daily lives. The weaponized domestic space and weaponized public space highlight the embodied pain experienced by the four women.

Reflecting on Scarry's definition of torture serving as a means to "deconstruct the [captive's] voice" (Scarry 20), readers can see how the torture experienced by Berry and DeJesus at the hands of their captor serves to thingify further the two women while objectifying the disappearance of the ordinary and the mundane. Thus, when Castro uses ordinary and mundane speech that is typically reserved for use between lovers, the deliberate obfuscation of sweet talk within the brutal depths of his actions against both Berry and DeJesus transforms into the torture of Berry and DeJesus (for she is also raped by Castro on a regular basis). The conversion of sweet talk into the mental bludgeon

Castro uses against Berry and DeJesus before and during his sexually assaulting them effectively objectifies the disappearance of ordinary sweet talk amongst lovers that Berry may have experienced with her boyfriend before her abduction.¹⁸ Berry describes how Castro uses lover-like mundane speech in one particularly sad scene:

“You’re so pretty,” he says as he starts pawing me again. “Stand this way, stand that way, put your arms around me, you’re so beautiful,” blah, blah, blah. He has a whole little routine he makes me recite, about how much I love it, how much I want him. If I don’t say it, he’s rougher...He’s always touching me like he owns me. He talks about the different parts of my body and says they’re his, that they belong to him. He says we are “together.” (Berry 43)

It is nine months into her ten-year captivity, and Castro has steadily been using such language toward and against Berry. It is this very transition of ordinary sweet talk that is typically acceptable and expected within the parameters of a loving relationship to weaponized language used by Berry's captor as a verbal and emotional bludgeon that causes Berry pain (Scarry 41). Noting that the room in which she is imprisoned is “always dark,” Berry states that “[b]eing alone is bad, but it is far worse when he [Castro] comes in, and it always ends with me crying” (Berry 43). In this particular passage dated November 23, 2003, Berry does not state whether Castro has raped her. However, in other passages Berry uses the code of x to represent sexual assault. When a number is next to the letter x, that indicates the number of sexual assaults per that specific day. In one particularly haunting entry for May 13, Berry writes only “5x,” which indicates she

was raped five times on that one day. In the days prior to the thirteenth, Berry's entries are plainly presented, meaning she refrains from using *copia*, Erasmus' dictum of abundant speech in the form of figurative language and multitudinous patterns for delivery. Frankly, there is no complexity or nuance in Berry's writing. As a result of this lack of *copia* and amplification, the content of her entries is excruciating. Berry does not offer any space for her readers to hide behind her language; nor does she offer her readers a chance to second-guess Berry's message. In her spare language and razor-sharp tone, Berry effectively reframes her audience's experience of her words and presents her embodied trauma openly and without shame. Essentially, Berry challenges her audience to bear witness to the physical, mental, and emotional torture she endured. Employing these rhetorical strategies forces readers to recognize the unvarnished reality of Berry's debasement at the hands of her captor while she simultaneously uses her debasement as an active site of her resistance. She does not run from her truth. She does not pretend like it did not happen. By owning her own debasement *vis-à-vis* her unadorned language, Berry announces to her audience that what she experienced no longer has any power over her.

What further makes her descriptions of her torture powerfully harrowing is how she juxtaposes the mundane with the horrific. Documenting one such mundane event that many take for granted—the act of brushing one's teeth—Berry, on May 7, notes that she has “just brushed [her] teeth, for the first time in three days” (Berry 25). While the aberration of this statement is the number of days between her teeth brushing, there is a

deeper layer of significance to that statement. Keeping in mind, the purpose of torture is to break down the tortured, to erase the tortured's sense of self, her or his very identity as a human being, Berry's inability to brush her teeth for three days is a steady chipping away at her humanity. The simple act of self-maintenance in the form of teeth brushing is denied her. Her teeth-brushing observation is followed immediately by "4x" and her childlike statement, "In my diary, I draw my heart with a dagger through it" (Berry 25). In the passage earlier mentioned, Berry's use of elision when she omits stating the likelihood of Castro raping her when he comes into her room while acknowledging his visits "always end with [her] crying" leads readers to realize, through deduction, that Castro is in fact raping and torturing Berry virtually each time he comes to her. Berry's use of coded language, from her using 3x, 4x, and 5x as a tallying method for the number of rapes she endures on a daily basis to her use of elision and to her unvarnished rhetoric inversely parallels the power in the rhetoric of silence examined in the previous chapter of this dissertation. Berry insists on naming her embodied trauma even via coded language and including all that encompasses said trauma. She, thereby assumes power over what was done to her body and over her captor.

In another passage, Berry writes of her captor and torturer:

He controls when I eat, what I see, what I hear. But he cannot control what I think, so I am going to take my mind somewhere else when he climbs on me.

(Berry 17)

Berry's awareness and non-sentimental recognition of her new reality that encompasses her lack of bodily autonomy becomes painfully evident. By using unadorned language and, particularly, the rhythmic pattern of interrogative/first-person subject/verb in the opening line of this paragraph, Berry lulls her audience through the softly lilting rhythm of the opening line before shifting tempo when she transitions to a complex sentence that abruptly ends with the traumatic banality of her rape. The last word, "me," creates a tension that creeps under the audience's skin as a result of the word's open-ended sound. The ē sound in "me" does not end and, instead continues into the foreseeable future—as long as there exists breath to give it sound. The subtlety of Berry's rhetorical decision to end this sentence with the word "me" allows her audience to draw parallels with the word's sound and the unending bodily trauma she is forced to endure at the hands of her captor. If she had ended her sentence with a word that has an unvoiced, hard stop, like the letter t in it, or, even, a word with a glottal stop, like button, the finiteness of that stop would subconsciously mirror an ending to Berry's forced bodily trauma. Thus, her audience may subconsciously feel a frisson of relief at the implied ending. Of course, on an intellectual level the audience is aware of the ending of her ordeal; they are, after all, reading her book. Nevertheless, on a more primal, emotional level, Berry's use of the ē sound in her final word from that passage evokes a painful continuation with which her audience may subconsciously connect.

With regards to perceived pain, Rowlandson and Kelly do not explicitly write about any sexual assaults, although Rowlandson does seem to allude to it as mentioned

earlier in this chapter. Nevertheless, they both experience pain in a variety of manifestations that can be constructed as tortuous. For example, in the passage where Kelly unthinkingly threw out the chief's pipe, she writes of the terror she experiences while certain of her impending death by first describing the increasing perceived animosity she experiences at the hands of her Indian captors. She notes how at the start of her captivity, "three fierce warriors sat near [her] with drawn tomahawks" as she slept (Kelly 52). Kelly describes how later she met a fellow white captive who later disappeared, leaving Kelly with "terrible sense of isolation clos[ing] around [her]" (Kelly 55). Kelly becomes even more fearful, though, when she realizes she made a mistake by throwing out the chief's three-foot long pipe she accidentally broke as she was forced to carry so many items on the journey. After her captors discover Kelly no longer has the pipe, they begin to "regard [her] with a suspicious aversion, and were not so kind as before" (Kelly 56). Kelly's growing awareness of her captors' distrust of her marks her growing embodied trauma.

After confessing that she remembered she failed to recognize the pipe's value as a peace offering, Kelly writes:

The chief declared that I should die for having caused the loss of his pipe. Helpless, and almost dying with terror at my situation, I sank on a rocky seat in their midst. They were all armed, and anxiously awaited the signal. They had pistols, bows, and spears; and I noticed some stoop, and raise blazing fire-brands to frighten the pawing beast that was to bear me to death. (Kelly 57)

Using florid language, Kelly paints a vivid passage describing her increasing terror and embodied trauma. Kelly's "helpless" form as she sinks to a half sitting position as she is "almost dying with terror" (57) evokes in her readers an image of a helpless woman at the mercy of villainous hands. As she appears to see her life flash before her eyes, Kelly writes:

In an instant a life-time of thought condensed itself into my mind, and I could see my old home and hear my mother's voice; and the contrast between the love I had been so ruthlessly torn from, and the hundreds of savage faces, gleaming with ferocity and excitement around me, seemed like the lights and shadows of some weird picture. But I was to die.... (Kelly 58)

The use of imagery that invokes maternal love and juxtaposes that imagery against the harsh imagery of "savage faces" (Kelly 57) reminds her readers of the frightening Otherness of, specifically, her Indian captors and, generally, of Indians as a whole.

Furthermore, she then notes her loss of voice as she tells her readers that she is in "speechless agony" as she offers her soul to God. While none of her captors were physically torturing her, Kelly's rhetorical decision to engage in epexegetis, or explication, by adding powerful phrases to clarify further her position of embodied terror. Throughout this passage encompassing several pages of textual description, Kelly paints for her readers her growing fear resulting from her mistake:

Night had begun to darken heavily over me, and I stood trembling and horror struck, not knowing but that the flame the savages capered about was destined to consume my tortured form. (Kelly 56)

By directly referring to her own body as “tortured” as she waits to be burned alive by the hands of her captors and emphasizing her later self-description of “helpless,” Kelly is again suggesting nineteenth-century white womanhood in the context of Manifest Destiny and the American government’s steady removal of Indigenous peoples from their land. While Kelly's experience is traumatic, it is not the same as those experienced by Berry and DeJesus wherein the latter two were undeniably tortured. In Kelly’s case, there is the fear of torture. In the cases of Berry and DeJesus, there is documented repeated torture.

When examining the language used by each of the four captives as they recollect their traumatic experiences (for this chapter assumes the active verb use of “recollect” since each of the four women narrates her text from memory in varying degrees), readers will come to recognize the necessity of reframing the ethos of each captive.

In “Changing Audience, Changing Ethos,” Beth Daniell and Letizia Guglielmo trace the history of ethos by situating ethos within the gendered and privileged positions and places afforded to the well-positioned in sex, race, and class. Thus, those who historically have been afforded or granted trusted ethos have been men who hold traditional senses of power: wealth, whiteness, and heterosexuality. Although the rise of science in the sixteenth- and seventeenth centuries helped to expand the concept of ethos as including

expertise, this expansion of ethos nevertheless continued to disregard the marginalized voices of women, the poor and working class, people of color, and non-normative sexualities (i.e. homosexuality, transsexuality, and bisexuality to name but three). As noted in the preceding chapter, women, the poor, and people of color were excluded from the very institutions that would garner them the much-lauded expertise. Consequently, the question of ethos continued to remain outside their purview within rhetorical theory.

Daniell and Guglielmo argue two key shifts in the contemporary expansion of ethos occurred, notably in 1960s America and later. The first shift occurred when women began to reconstruct the concept of ethos by actively “insert[ing] themselves within” public rhetorical spaces. These actions coincided with women rhetors moving away from arguing the right to speak derives from a divine right¹⁹ to arguing the right to speak derives from a civil right (Daniell and Guglielmo 95). The second shift occurred when women “dar[ed] to publish the realities of [their] lives in texts,” thereby informing their audience of “where they [women were] coming from[,]” which “challenged the dominant discourse[as] a way of challenging the pretense that authority comes from on high or from the printed page itself” (Daniell and Guglielmo 96, Reynolds 332). One such method for this public insertion was by creating collaborative spaces for “collective discussion and exchange,” like 1960s-era consciousness-raising meetings. Another successful method of insertion into public rhetorical spaces was mass protests wherein large numbers of women physically occupied spaces in order to “amplify their voices” (Daniell and Guglielmo 95). From the 1960s-era protest of the Miss America pageant to

the 2017 Women's March across the globe, the occupation of physical spaces by large numbers of women and their allies remains a powerful challenge to and disruption of mainstream discourse.

The powerful reframing of the fundamental question of who, and by what authority, has the right to speak and the attendant authority to speak helps women to achieve rhetorical authority despite the heretofore limiting concept of Aristotelian ethos as experienced by or applied to marginalized rhetors. As a result, previously disregarded, dismissed, or diminished rhetors, by insisting on their right to engage in public rhetorical spaces, were not only engaging in public rhetoric but were also engaging in previously silenced topos. One such previously silenced topos is embodied trauma as experienced by women and the accompanying material effects on women's bodies. While the area of cultural studies has begun to address the concept of generational trauma, particularly as it relates to survivors of systemic racist systems originating with the commodification of black bodies vis-à-vis enslavement and its economic and educational repercussions experienced by the enslaved and by descendants of the enslaved, this chapter touches upon generational trauma as experienced by survivors of systemic misogyny, which is, unfortunately, also concomitant with the commodification of women's bodies. Full exploration into such a far-reaching and crucial topic must be reserved for future research and discussion.

Another interesting perspective of ethos is the locating of ethos as a liminal state. Writers in rhetoric and composition, Karen Burke LeFevre and Kate Ronald, position the

construction of authority, or ethos, in the “betweens” (Reynolds 333). Noting that ethos has historically been regarded as a physical gathering place of speaker and audience such as that which occurred during Aristotle’s era, the ever-increasing use of written text must necessarily supplant physical meeting spaces that emphasize corporeal presence. Thus, as argued by LeFevre and Ronald, the liminal—or in between—space between written text and reader now houses ethos. LeFevre argues:

In written composition, the social matrix of necessary others who form community and audience are less obvious, but nevertheless present. Ethos, we might say, appears in that socially created space, in the ‘between,’ the point of intersection between speaker or writer and listener or reader. (qtd. in Reynolds 333)

The three captivity texts under examination in this chapter pose intriguing suggestions for each woman’s ethos, particularly as each woman falls outside the Aristotelian concept of ethos, which historically marginalizes women. Particularly with Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus who inhabit the lower socioeconomic sphere within their community, ethos would be regarded as something beyond their ken. Since both Berry and DeJesus come from the working poor area in Cleveland, Ohio, their voices were discounted by authority. In fact, their sudden absences initially were met with dismissal as seen in the first interaction between a police officer and Nancy, Gina DeJesus’s mother, when she reported her daughter missing: “‘Oh, your daughter is at that age,’ the officer said. ‘She’s probably with her boyfriend’” (Berry 72). She was fourteen years old. The fact that this

police officer already ascribed a boyfriend to a fourteen year-old girl strongly suggests a disturbing hypersexualization of DeJesus, something that girls and women of Latinx and Black heritages frequently must navigate. That reality itself serves as a silencing tool and ethos-dismissing strategy.

As described in a section written by Mary Jordan and Kevin Sullivan, the Pulitzer Prize winning journalists who wrote the expository sections of *Hope*, both mothers of the missing girls faced a lack of belief from the police officers when the women tried to file missing children reports. When Louwana Miller, Amanda Berry's mother, reported her daughter missing, her concerns were dismissed by the attending police officer when he assumed Berry was "probably just with her boyfriend somewhere" because "teenage girls ran away all the time and almost always came back in a day or two" (Berry 27). Even when Miller logically counters the police officer with the argument that "[k]ids don't run away in Burger King uniforms on their birthday and leave all their cash at home! Somebody must have taken her!" (Berry 27), the responding police officers continue to dismiss Miller. As Jordan and Sullivan write:

The officers stood in the living room making notes, but Louwana and Beth [Amanda's sister] felt they weren't taking Amanda's case seriously. They clearly thought she was yet another runaway whose mother was overreacting and wasting their time. (Berry 27-28)

Similarly, Nancy DeJesus, Gina DeJesus's mother, emphasizes to the police officer who has responded to her missing-daughter call and who has assumed Gina was with her

boyfriend that Gina “doesn’t have a boyfriend...She’s fourteen. I’m telling you, she would call me. Something happened to her” (Berry 72). Even when Nancy asked for an Amber Alert to be issued, the police officer refuses on the grounds the police were not certain there actually was an abduction as they did not have a description of either an abductor or a vehicle. His offered reasons frustratingly resonate as dismissals. He further dismisses her when he tells the mother of a missing child, “Don’t worry, she’ll show up” (Berry 72). His parting comment egregiously dismisses her growing fear and panic. Simply put, he dismisses her.

The Aristotelian concept of ethos of both mothers was virtually nonexistent according to the police officers’ points of view. Aristotle notes that in order for the “orator to produce conviction,” said orator must demonstrate “good sense, virtue, and goodwill” to the audience (Aristotle 171). The ease with which the police dismissed the teen girls’ disappearances even as the mothers sought the police’s help indicates the police’s automatic judgment of what they regard as the lack of good sense and virtue in the two mothers. As an oblique embrasure of the Freudian-Lacanian idea of the father’s guilt being visited upon the son, Louwana Miller’s and Nancy DeJesus’s lack of Aristotelian ethos is similarly visited upon their daughters, Amanda and Gina. Thus, as the two older women sought to reframe their daughters’ lived experiences (by arguing one is too young for a boyfriend and the other would not run away in her minimum-wage job uniform) and as they inserted themselves within the public sphere by not only calling

the police but adamantly insisting on the validity of their knowledge, so, too, do their daughters with the very narratives they write and eventually publish.

While Mary Rowlandson does not face the dilemma of her mother's lack of Aristotelian ethos being visited upon her, Rowlandson's own ethos is granted insofar as Mather vouches for her. Since Puritan ideology precluded women from speaking in public, Rowlandson, by means of Mather's endorsement vis-à-vis his preface to her narrative, is "excuse[d as] she come[s] thus into publick" so that readers may "see an instance of the Sovereignty [sic] of God" (Salisbury 67). Because Rowlandson frames her captivity experience within the Puritan typology of redeemed captive, her narrative also embodies the changed ethos about which Daniell and Guglielmo write. Thus, Rowlandson's ethos is grounded in her "lived—and shared—experience" that reflects not only Puritan fears of damnation but also Puritan women's existential vulnerabilities. Rowlandson's own existential vulnerability as a Puritan woman can be seen in the passage where she affirms to her audience that "by night and day, alone and in company: sleeping all sorts together" (Salisbury 113), no attempts on her chastity, in either word or action, were made toward her by her captors.

In *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God by Mary Rowlandson*, Rowlandson begins her narrative by calmly and matter-of-factly describing a rather terrifying ordeal her fellow English colonists experience at the hands of the Native Americans:

On the tenth of February 1675, Came the Indians with great numbers upon
Lancaster: Their first coming was about Sun-rising; hearing the noise of some

Guns, we looked out; several Houses were burning, and the Smoke ascending to Heaven. There were five persons taken in one house, the Father, and the Mother and a sucking Child, they knockt on the head; the other two they took and carried away alive. (Salisbury 68)

As if describing an uneventful start of day, Rowlandson begins her description by noting the precise date: February 1675. Immediately following she notes the arrival of the Indians as being of “great numbers” soon followed by the time of day: sunrise. So far, nothing is untoward, which makes the following portion consisting of the “noise of some Guns” as somewhat jarring. Midway through her opening paragraph, Rowlandson then describes the burning houses and rising smoke and only then informs her readers of the torment experienced by a family in peril, complete with a nursing baby being knocked on the head. This deceptively slow introduction coalesces into a swiftly occurring litany of terrors she and her fellow English colonists experience. The juxtaposition of slow introduction with the fast-paced litany effectively parallels the ordinary, quotidian life of the Puritan colonists with the deliberate and seemingly casual cruelty the Indians inflict upon the colonists. This approach most likely created a jarring effect on Rowlandson’s contemporary readers and their own contemplation of the state of their souls. As Mather states in his Preface, Rowlandson’s readers are exhorted to remember that “God is in the Heavens, and doth whatever pleases him” (Salisbury 67). In other words, if God so chooses to inflict “the most heart-breaking tryals [sic]” that “gives nothing but sorrow,” it is wholly up to God to do such (Salisbury 67). Rowlandson’s contemporaries knew this belief as a fundamental tenet to Puritanism. With this fact in mind, reading Rowlandson’s

captivity narrative through the perspective of torture would find a lack of traction since, according to Scarry, torture's purpose is to "deconstruct the prisoner's voice" (Salisbury 20). Puritan women, in particular, were not supposed to have a voice in public and those who were allowed to have a voice, Puritan men, particularly the elders, were not to use their voice in any way that can be seen as questioning God's will.

While the events experienced by Rowlandson and her fellow Puritans certainly can be described as torturous, the experiences in and of themselves do not constitute torture as the purpose for Indian raids centered on revenge, anger, or replenishing lost members of a Native American community. In this regard, then, the white women and children who were brought into Native American communities possessed some degree of value. Their bodies and what these bodies might bring to the Native American community were thusly commodified. That said, when Rowlandson and, later, Kelly describe harrowing experiences, what they describe is torturous and traumatic, but not necessarily intentional torture itself.

Throughout *Sovereignty and Goodness*, Rowlandson maintains a tone that bespeaks an interesting intellectual distance married to spiritual horror. As previously noted, when Rowlandson describes the onset of her impending captivity, the tone she employs mirrors that of a casual observer. There are no exclamations, not even when she describes the gruesome disemboweling of a fellow colonist: "[T]hey [the Indians] would not hearken to him but knockt him in head, and stript him naked, and split open his Bowels" (Salisbury 68). Besides telling her readers that this day was the "dolefullest day that ever mine

[Rowlandson's] eyes ever saw" Rowlandson's language has yet to become emotive, particularly with all that she is witnessing and experiencing (68). In fact, her language is neutrally descriptive. Where her fear and trauma come through, however, is through her deliberate and strategic deployment of Biblical scripture. Rowlandson's scriptural deployment serves like a veil through which this Puritan "gentlewoman" is permitted to express her fears and terror during her captivity to an audience, an audience that expects some kind of authorization for this woman to speak since women who spoke too much were regarded as scolds (Kamensky 20). Perhaps resulting or simply accompanying the repercussions of Anne Hutchinson's outspokenness in the mid-1630s, Rowlandson's narrative is published despite a particular form of control of speech that was directed toward women, namely the edict that declared women were not "supposed to cross the line between the private and the public" (Hall 12). Although Increase Mather bestows his sign of approval and even encouragement of Rowlandson's narrative in the Preface, Rowlandson must continue to balance her foray into public rhetorical space with being a devout Puritan woman. By using scripture, then, Rowlandson is able to express her terror, fear, and trauma obliquely, similar to her rhetorical strategies of obliquely criticizing the English army's failure to cross the frozen river at the end of the Fifth Remove.

Throughout her narrative, Rowlandson is aware of her status as the wife of a Puritan minister and a woman who can command respect in her community. Her identity as a Puritan saint, in addition to being mistress of her Lancaster household and who nonetheless "seems ... [to have] sought to participate in the debates" of whether the

devastation by the hands of the Native Americans was a show of God's anger with the Puritans for abandoning strict Calvinism or simply a sign of changing times, creates tension in her narrative as Rowlandson now inhabits a diminished role in the Native American community and her servile role to Weetamoo, her powerful Native American mistress (Salisbury 41). This tension Rowlandson experiences undoubtedly helps to inform her embodied trauma, trauma that results from the death of her children to her access to food and the accompanying growing hunger.

Describing her first remove with her captors, Rowlandson clearly situates her trauma on the captives' bodies: "Now away we must go with those Barbarous Creatures, with our bodies wounded and bleeding, and our hearts no less than our bodies" (Salisbury 70). Yet Rowlandson uses first person plural, which serves to call attention to the trauma of all of the captives rather than solely on her. Not until she reflects on the domesticity she has lost does Rowlandson use first person singular point of view. Doing so, she ties her identity to her husband, her house (brought to her by her husband), and her children:

[M]y thoughts ran upon my losses and sad bereaved condition. All was gone, my Husband gone (at least separated from me, he being in the Bay; and to add to my grief, the Indians told me they would kill him as he came homeward) my Children gone, my Relations and Friends gone, our House and home and all our comforts within door, and without, all was gone, (except my life) and I knew not but the next moment that might go too. There remained nothing to me but one poor wounded Babe, and it seemed at present worse than death that it was in such a

pitiful condition, bespeaking Compassion, and I had no refreshing for it, nor suitable things to revive it. (Salisbury 71)

The trauma Rowlandson experiences centers on her domestic body as it were. She speaks of her missing husband, her house, her friends and family, and all children but one. Nowhere in this passage does Rowlandson describe physical wounds inflicted upon her body or wounds as a byproduct of her forced travel and captivity.

Readers may question how the commodification of women's bodies, redefined ethos, and the rhetorics of torture and embodied pain are united. There exists an intersection of these three ideas, along with other ideas such as identity, socio-economic status, race and ethnic grouping, that serves to interrupt the discourse of power. Put another way, the discourse employed by the four women captives as they negotiate their entry into public rhetorics by simply narrating their lived experiences, experiences that historically have been marginalized and/or dismissed, function as demands of audiences to acknowledge the very places, or topos, from which they each speak. Consequently, this chapter examines the larger web of commodification of women's bodies, redefined ethos, and the rhetorics of torture and embodied pain as expressed by Mary Rowlandson, Fanny Kelly, Amanda Berry, and Gina DeJesus and challenges the static and traditional concept of Aristotelian ethos by moving beyond its limitations.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This dissertation offers an approach to research on the rhetoric of silence and promises new insights by, firstly, arguing that there is an array of intersections that connect the rhetorics of silence, embodied trauma, and torture, and, secondly, by examining those intersections. Further, this dissertation investigates the roles of gender, race, and class within both the intersections of the rhetorics noted above and examines how these various roles inform Rowlandson's, Kelly's, Berry's, and DeJesus's experiences of captivity and their recollections and remembrances of those experiences.

Thus, this dissertation posits that, in order to gain a deeper understanding than what is currently understood about any type of rhetoric, multiple contexts in which the rhetorics are engaged must be taken into consideration. Acknowledgment of the significance of the captives' identities with regards to their respective and prescribed societal roles as women and the social-economic status they each inhabit likewise must be examined in order to gain a full picture of each woman's rhetorical decisions made as they entered public rhetorical spaces. Whereas Rowlandson and Kelly inhabited elevated positions of privilege based on how their race intersected Puritan religious ideology and geopolitical belief of Manifest Destiny, and, in Rowlandson's case, her marriage to a respected Puritan minister, Berry and DeJesus were not afforded the privileges of

elevated social status. Although Berry benefited from the attributed privilege of white skin, especially when situated within the systemic framework of white supremacy, her working-poor status effectively removed significant amounts of privilege her race offered.

It is not this dissertation's purpose, however, to determine to what extent Berry benefited from white privilege during and surrounding her captivity; nevertheless, the conflicting realities of the resistance of police in believing Berry's mother on one hand while, on the other hand, the media's producing stories of both Berry's and DeJesus's disappearances serve to highlight the complexity of their situations. Furthermore, the complex relationship between their races and socio-economic statuses informed their recollection of their narratives and the narratives themselves. To truly understand the impact Berry's and, to a lesser degree, DeJesus's non-black skins helped frame the media coverage of their disappearances, either a rigorous statistical, quantitative analysis or an exhaustive qualitative analysis comparing Cleveland, Ohio, media reports of missing girls and women based on their races during the time frame comparable to Berry's and DeJesus's disappearances must be conducted. That, however, is not the aim of this dissertation.

Instead of offering a focus on the particulars of language and how the language is used by the four women captives, this dissertation sheds light both into and onto the webs of rhetorics Rowlandson, Kelly, Berry, and DeJesus engage in as they recollect and

narrate their stories while transforming their debasement at the hands of others into topos, or sites, of resistance.

Other books, such as Susannah Mintz's *Hurt and Pain: Literature and the Suffering Body* (2013) and David Morris's *The Culture of Pain* (1991), likewise examine pain in various literary or nonfiction texts in an effort at making meaning out of and from pain. However, these, and the texts used in this dissertation, including Scarry's *The Body in Pain*, examine pain as literary motifs or as the (in)expressibility of pain and its embeddedness with political and perceptual complications arising from that (in)expressibility. With an expansion on Scarry's examination of pain while integrating a revisited definition of ethos, this dissertation provides an examination of embodied pain as topos, specifically as sites of resistance.

Historically women have been silenced in an attempt to define a woman who is well bred or a "good girl." Much scholarship exists on the role of and expectations put on women, particularly with regards to public oration. From Wittengenstein's dictum that the unspeakable must be passed over in silence to Robert L. Scott's consequential classification of silence as a "mystery," the concept of silence has been regarded as otherworldly and, thus, impossible to know on this plane of existence. Yet more contemporary scholars, particularly those who have historically been marginalized, such as women and scholars of color, note that silence is a powerful tool in their rhetorical toolbox. Silence, then, is used as a linguistic negotiation tool during conversations involving "profound disagreements" (Ferguson 113). Along similar lines, silence is used

as a self-negotiating tool after it has been culturally enforced upon individuals. Gloria Anzaldúa, the grandame of borderlands theory, examines how particularly Mexican and Mexican-American women negotiate their own borders with respect to silence and cultural expectations of women's orality. Thus, silence and the ability—and permission—to speak publicly is a highly gendered construct. Regardless of the approach taken towards silence, agency is suggested. Consequently, rhetorics, including rhetoric of silence, is an act, and one that is often conditioned on education. Since women's education has historically been centered within the domestic sphere, women's rhetoric has likewise been located within the domestic sphere. Since the domestic sphere includes spirituality or religion, women's rhetoric frequently found an outlet within spirituality and mysticism and included producing texts from letter writing to preaching to rhetoric style books. Yet because of gender, women continued to lack authority, and the ideal of the silent woman continued to prevail with the few exceptions of women rhetors' gaining authority through male intervention. Male intervention, whether as prefaces or by writing in "rhetorical drag" (Carroll 3), that is, by assuming a woman's voice and perspective and thereby shaping authorial voice, have contributed to women's bodies being commodified and used toward a narrative other than what women often have in mind.

Despite America's being constructed in the image of a woman, as captivity narrative scholar Michelle Burnham states, the captivity narrative, which frequently employed the female captive trope, was used as a tool either to highlight acceptable feminine behavior or to justify the growing eradication of Indigenous Americans. As a

result, captivity narratives tend to create and reinforce binary divisions. The binary divisions occurred between captor and captive, which, in turn, lead to binary thinking about the foundations for these divisions: racial, cultural, and national differences. Additionally, sex and gender also factor into captivity literature. The added factors of sex and gender further add a layer of complexity onto the divisions constructed vis-à-vis captivity literature.

Burnham argues that the trope of the female New England captive's fate "reproduces" the nation (2) whereas Richard Slotkin argues that the New England captivity narratives effectively establish the captives and their communities as English by contrasting the English sensibility against "Indian barbarism" (Slotkin 21). Thus begins a new American mythology, one that continues onward to the nineteenth century that saw captivity literature used as a propagandistic strategy in the argument for westward expansion and Manifest Destiny. At the root of the emerging American mythology is the singular Othering of those who do not conform to the English identity. Early American captivity narratives have always held a complicated relationship with racism as early white colonists possessed and acted upon a sense of superiority over the Indigenous Americans.

Further complicating the relationship with racism and propaganda is the role of the woman's body, particularly the maternal body. Using the female body as representative of the Puritan community body, captivity narratives also speak to religious concepts of salvation and redemption. Through the female captive's trials and tribulations

and her eventual release or salvation from Indian captivity, Puritans recognized the Puritan community must also undergo its own trials and tribulations in order to achieve salvation. As the captive is redeemed, so is the Puritan community. A salient feature of captivity narratives, the female body is commodified vis-à-vis the emphasis on the captive's state of motherhood. If a female captive was not a biological mother, some, like Kelly, made it a point to note their mother-like qualities (usually love) for a child who was also a captive. Mary Rowlandson's motherhood is a central feature of her captivity narrative as she mourns over her dead or missing children. Fanny Kelly, while not a mother, clearly states the fellow captive girl child, Mary, is like a daughter to Kelly. And Amanda Berry becomes a mother during her captivity. On the other hand, Gina DeJesus is not a mother, but her youth is emphasized. Thus, DeJesus, as one barely out of her childhood at fourteen years of age, becomes the extension to the maternal-body-held-captive. A woman cannot be a mother without a child, after all.

Symbolism of the captive woman-cum-mother begins to include the concepts of nationhood and identity. Molly Varley notes that captivity narratives not only begin to establish American nationhood in the 1800s, the narratives also provide a means of escape. Readers came to enjoy captivity narratives, particularly if they were lurid, as avenues for imagining life different than the readers' own lives. In effect, captivity narratives morphed into fantasy or escapist literature with the female captive's body bearing the traumatic weight so that readers could be entertained. With captivity narratives, American literature was dominated by women's experiences and even became

“*the* archetype of American culture,” according to Katherine Derounian-Stodola (Introduction xi).

Adding yet another layer of nuance to the impact of American captivity literature, Ivy Schweitzer notes the “contradictory demands of Puritan religious doctrine and social practice” that eventually led to a “profound ambivalence” in younger male members of Puritan communities (Schweitzer 25). Puritan men were, however, allowed to negotiate changing power dynamics between Indigenous Americans and English colonists through captivity narratives that featured a female captive. After all, the female captive’s body came to symbolize the nascent national identity by examining the relationship of the captive and her geographical and spiritual surroundings. By using a female captive’s body as the negotiating tool, Puritan men were able to examine their own ambivalence in male Puritan leaders (Toulouse 14).

Regardless of whether the American captivity narrative is categorized as America’s first escapist literature or as an archetypal narrative in American culture, the main idea of contact between opposing forces remains. No matter what constitutes opposing forces—captor and captive, English colonists and Indigenous Americans, the economically privileged and the economically depressed, or men and women—power lies at the root of all opposing forces, particularly when forces come into contact with each other. With contacts between varying and opposing forces and with power at its root, the borders over which these forces meet are not static. Rather the fluid and permeable borders of “intersecting histories” (Burnham 3) are the spaces wherein

opposing forces frequently collide, creating contact that is permeated with conflict, violence, or the threat of violence. From that opposition and resulting confrontation between two cultures and “two antagonistic visions of the nature and destiny of man and the natural wilderness” is birthed the American culture and literature (Slotkin 25). But from this birth of American culture and literature come contestation, conflict, and negotiation.

Since societal, religious, and familial conventions and expectations historically have prized silence in women, women have had to learn the intricacies of negotiating such conventions in order to enter public rhetorical spaces. Further complicating societal expectations for women is the fact that women’s materiality has been written about ad nauseam and, frequently, without women’s input. Included in women’s materiality is her body. From religious to political leaders, women’s bodies historically have been written about, circumscribed, and contained. In this regard, women’s bodies have become commodities to be negotiated, bartered over, and shaped into others’ messaging. Furthermore, this reality is assumed to be accepted by women with no questions asked or criticisms extended. Coinciding with the commodification of women’s bodies and the messaging of women’s bodies by others is the categorizing of silence as prescriptive and subversive.

Historically, women have been educated to remain silent and submissive, ensuring a prescriptive silence. From Aristotle teaching woman’s “glory” is her silence (Kamensky 25) to the highly gendered discourse of domesticity that emphasized the

“divinely decreed differences between men and women” (qtd. in Pinar 272), particularly within the racialized discourse of Manifest Destiny, women have existed and been forced to maneuver within contained parameters of behavior, including when and how to engage in rhetoric.

This is not to say that women have remained within their prescribed containment as a homogenous and silent group while accepting others’ dictums for their rhetorical behavior. Women have understood rhetoric to be action and that rhetoric, particularly, public rhetoric, to be a space for political power and a shaper of public and cultural opinion. Thus, women have engaged in rhetoric, whether in public rhetorical spaces or discourses of domesticity, and have understood that, by subverting rhetorical expectations, they have moved beyond societal and cultural expectations of their silence.

Whether using what Cheryl Glenn terms as “purposeful silences,” or strategic silences, “expected silences” (60) by remaining silent because that is what is expected of them, or engaging in oblique critiques, women have navigated through gendered expectations and have used silence as a form of effective communication. This rhetorical decision entails subversive silence. Even when women have simply been at a loss for words, women’s rhetorical strategies engage in the nuances of silence, deploying the most effective strategy for a given situation. When moving beyond silence to enter “public rhetorical spaces” (Johnson 175), women have done so thoughtfully and, often, quite purposefully. For example, Christine de Pizan taught her fellow fifteenth-century French women how to utilize silence as a rhetorical strategy in order to simultaneously

engage in a two-fold act: working within the rigid parameters of their existence and pushing against those same parameters. Others, such as members in the U.S. Women's Antiremoval Petition Campaign of 1829-1831, have explicitly identified and categorized occasions for engaging in public rhetorical space, while other women, like Mary Rowlandson, have entered public rhetorical spaces courtesy of a well-esteemed man adding to her ethos by granting his masculine authority to her via a written preface. Regardless of the avenue taken to achieve credibility, women have established their ethos. Yet this establishment of women's ethos occurs within a patriarchal framework that privileges—and normalizes—male-defined ethos.

As such, silence and speech have historically been gendered, with women learning to navigate such gendered expectations in order to engage in public rhetorical spaces.

As seen in the news, movies, music, video games, and other means of popular culture, toxic masculinity and rape culture are deeply emblematic of American ethos. From casual or benevolent sexism to outright misogynistic violence, women (including transwomen) must navigate public spaces continuously aware of their bodies. If they are not fully aware of how their bodies present in public because they are experiencing joy or are simply exercising in public, they will be made aware. Whether by a catcall or public groping or so-called “concern trolling” where an observer mimics being concerned for the woman's body, a woman who dares to exist in public space will be reminded of her intrusion. As this dissertation acknowledges, rhetoric is an act. Consequently, one can

reverse that concept and consider acts as rhetoric. Thus, a woman who dares to exercise or even walk in public is performing rhetorical acts in public rhetorical spaces.

Since public rhetorical spaces remain highly gendered as masculine, women maneuvering public spaces and public rhetorical spaces are reminded of their outsider status. Such reminders are found in seemingly inconsequential spaces like movies, television shows, advertising, and music—spaces that shape societal and cultural expectations. The commodification of women's bodies in media and elsewhere ensures the consumption of women's bodies and vice versa. When women's bodies are regarded as public objects for easy valuation and ready consumption by those other than the owners of those bodies, women's bodies inhabit the space of bartering and commodity-exchange, frequently unwillingly so.

The commodification of women's bodies easily lends to the thingification of women's bodies. If women's bodies are merely things meant to be consumed, women's humanity is gradually diminished. Barring utter objectification and thingification of a woman's body by a sociopath, for example, society as a whole nevertheless effectively reduces women to such a diminished place that the murder or torture of women's bodies can exist as a simple plot device. Since women's diminished humanity becomes normalized, when a real-life situation of an individual who is holding a woman captive tortures her, the tortured woman's inherent self loses stability, to eventually become unsubstantial, because she has steadily been fighting for her humanity on two fronts: against the systemic dismissal of her humanity at the hands of culture as a whole and

against her torturer. It is truly miraculous for one who endures torture to regain any sense of the stable self.

In two of the captivity narratives examined in this dissertation, Mary Rowlandson and Fanny Kelly did not experience torture the way Amanda Berry and Gina DeJesus did. However, Rowlandson's and Kelly's bodies were nonetheless commodified. While Berry's and DeJesus's captor commodified his two captives for his own sexual and domestic use, the Indians who held Rowlandson and Kelly did so for financial gain, with the captivity originating from retribution. Rowlandson's captors, the Narragansett Indians, utilized Rowlandson's sewing skills as she made clothes for them in return for food. They eventually were paid twenty pounds in ransom for her delivery. Rowlandson, prominent community member and wife of the minister, Joseph Rowlandson, was kidnapped when the Narragansett Indians attacked her village in one of the many skirmishes during King Philip's War. As with Rowlandson's captivity origins, Kelly maintains her captivity originated from ill-fated and botched military excursions led by Union officers Sully and Selby. Her body was also commodified by her captors in that she became the "exclusive property [of] Ottawa, the head chief, a man over seventy-five years of age, and partially blind, yet whose power over the band was absolute" (Kelly 173). Her body also became a bargaining tool upon her release as there had not been "plenty of food in the Indian villages," a fact that thereby necessitated their trip "to Fort Sully to make a treaty" (Kelly 228).

Regardless of the origins or reasons for each woman's captivity, each woman's body was systematically commodified. In this commodification, each woman's material body also intersected with bodily pain, trauma, and silence. Keeping in mind Scarry's argument that torture itself converts actual pain to a regime of power, it is clear that each of the four women captives under examination in this dissertation no longer had her body at her command. Furthermore, as each woman was forced to engage in tasks not of her choosing, often through her captor's use of torture or its threat, each woman was forced to adhere to the "illusion of power" (Scarry 28) her captor's repeated acts produced.

Examining the intersections of bodily pain and silence helps to further reveal the multi-layered and nuanced meanings of women's rhetorical strategies and rhetorical choices. Furthermore, such close examining of women's lived experiences insofar as they result from or exist within the context of embodied trauma reveals one more puzzle piece of the larger picture of women's rhetorical engagement. With action being rhetoric and rhetoric being action, and with identifying, categorizing, and understanding the results or ramifications of women entering public rhetorical spaces linguistically, textually, and bodily, research in this dissertation into the rhetorics of silence, torture, and embodied trauma can enhance the fields of rhetorical studies, women's studies, gender studies, trauma studies, and literary studies, for rhetoric is inherently transdisciplinary. Rhetoric extends across and informs multiple disciplines.

Since critical trauma studies examines the precise discourse used when discussing trauma and the consequences of using said precise vocabulary, integrating the study of

the rhetorics of silence, embodied trauma, and torture further grants space for researchers to understand the intricacies of women's trauma and how women choose to speak about trauma, especially when choosing to speak entails engaging in silence. By working toward understanding rhetorical strategies that utilize purposeful or accidental silences, and by understanding the rhetorical decisions that fuel women's contextualizing and reasoning for entering public rhetorical spaces, especially when already marked as outsider to these spaces, researchers can work in tandem with varying agencies to help nurture marginalized women's voices. In real world practicality, these agencies can work in the fields of immigration, domestic violence, human trafficking, and labor law.

Providing a rhetorical perspective into works written by women about their traumatic experiences of captivity can add to current research on silence as rhetoric by expanding on the rich work of Cheryl Glenn, Nan Johnson, Nancy Myers, and Tillie Olsen. While, few women are held captive, every woman does eventually learn societal and/or cultural ramifications of moving beyond societally-prescribed parameters. Every woman also learns what having and moving a female-presenting body in public spaces and in public rhetorical spaces fully entails, ranging from joy and acceptance to exhaustion and anger. A woman does not have to be physically present and maneuver through physical space in order to face public scrutiny (for example, online publication venues like Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook, to name a few), without being reminded that she is an aberration in gendered male public rhetorical space. Work in understanding women's rhetorical decisions in engaging in silence as a rhetorical strategy could help

many audiences (from female- and male-identifying audiences to audiences who identify non-binary) understand women's rhetoric and, to extend further, the rhetoric of anyone who has been forced to inhabit a position of powerlessness.

By continuing to understand and analyze what is *not* said or what is hidden beneath the layers of talk and, oftentimes, seeming chatter, researchers can move beyond the onslaught of rhetorical noise that seems to increase with each new technological advance that attempts to unite cultures and communities.

This dissertation is a step into challenging the expectations of and expanding the understanding of silence in rhetoric. Like with all research, this dissertation is an important step into the study of silence as a rhetorical decision to employ some form of silence as rhetorical strategy, especially when located within the rhetoric of embodied trauma, pain, and torture. If one regards each piece of research as a puzzle into a larger picture, in this case, a larger picture of rhetoric, this dissertation is a significant puzzle piece that, when put together with other research projects, helps to form that larger picture of rhetoric and create a more expansive understanding of human communication.

Future work will continue the examination and analysis of these rhetorics and will continue to locate their use within texts produced by marginalized people. One major area for future research is the evolving emphasis on women of color in the American and international Latinx and Chicanx communities.

WORKS CITED

- Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands/La Frontera*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987. Print.
- Aristotle. *Art of Rhetoric*. Trans. John Henry Freese. Loeb Classical Library. 2006 ed. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1926. Print.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1984. Print.
- Bauer, Dale M., and Philip Gould. *The Cambridge Companion to Nineteenth-Century American Women's Writing*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- Baym, Nina. *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and About Women in America, 1820-70*. 2nd ed. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993. Print.
- Berglund, Jeff. *Cannibal Fictions American Explorations of Colonialism, Race, Gender and Sexuality*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2006. Ebrary. Web. 26 Jul 2017.
- Berry, Amanda and Gina DeJesus. *Hope: A Memoir of Survival in Cleveland*. Ed. Mary Jordan and Kevin Sullivan. New York: Viking, 2015. Print.
- Bokser, Julie A. "Sor Juana's Rhetoric of Silence." *Rhetoric Review* 25.1 (2006): 5-21. Print.
- Burnham, Michelle. *Captivity and Sentiment: Cultural Exchange in American Literature, 1682-1861*. Hanover: U P of New England, 1997. Print.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.
- Carroll, Lorraine. "Captivity Literature." *The Oxford Handbook of Early American Literature*. Ed. Kevin, J. Hayes. New York: Oxford UP, 2008. 143-68. Print.

- . *Rhetorical Drag: Gender Impersonation, Captivity, and the Writing of History*. Kent: Kent State UP, 2007. Print.
- Columbus, Christopher. "From Letter to Luis De Santangel Regarding the First Voyage. 1493." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 35-36. Print.
- . "From Letter to Ferdinand and Isabella Regarding the Fourth Voyage. 1503." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 36-38. Print.
- Cortés, Hernán. "From Second Letter to the Spanish Crown: Description of Tenochtitlan. 1522." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 54-59. Print.
- Daniell, Beth and Letizia Guglielmo. "Changing Audience, Changing Ethos." *Rethinking Ethos: A Feminist Ecological Approach to Rhetoric*. Ed. Ryan, Kathleen J., Nancy Myers, and Rebecca Jones. Studies in Rhetorics and Feminism. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2016. Print.
- Derounian-Stodola, Kathryn Zabelle. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*. New York: Penguin, 1998. Print.
- . "Introduction to Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative." *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*. New York: Penguin, 1998. 3-6. Print.
- . *The Indian Captivity Narrative, 1550-1900*. Ed. Levernier, James. New York: New York: Twayne, 1987. Print.

---. Introduction. *Women's Indian Captivity Narratives*. New York: Penguin, 1998. xi-xxxv. Print.

Donawerth, Jane. *Conversational Rhetoric: The Rise and Fall of a Women's Tradition, 1600-1900*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012. Print.

Donovan, Josephine. *Women and the Rise of the Novel, 1405-1726*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999. Print.

Eden, Trudy. "Food, Assimilation, and the Malleability of the Human Body in Early Virginia." *A Centre of Wonders: The Body in Early America*. Ed. Janet Moore Lindman and Michele Lise Tarter. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001. 29-42. Print.

Fahs, Breanne. "Naming Sexual Trauma: On the Political Necessity of Nuance in Rape and Sex Offender Discourses." *Critical Trauma Studies: Understanding Violence, Conflict, and Memory in Everyday Life*. Ed. Monica J. Casper and Eric Wertheimer. New York: New York UP, 2016. 61-77. Print.

Ferguson, Kennan. "Silence: A Politics." *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts*. Ed. Cheryl Glenn and Krista Ratcliffe. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2011. 113-29. Print.

Franklin, Wayne. "Bartolomé De Las Casas. Introduction." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 38-39. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "The Eye of Power." *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings: 1972-1977*. Trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980. 146-65. Print.

- Gibson, Joan. "Educating for Silence: Renaissance Women and the Language Arts." *Hypatia* 4.1 (1989): 9-27. Print.
- Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997. Print.
- . "Silence: A Rhetorical Art for Resisting Disciplines." *JAC: A Journal of Composition Theory* 22.2 (2002): 261-91. Print.
- . *Unspoken: A Rhetoric of Silence*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.
- Hall, David D. *Ways of Writing the Practice and Politics of Text-Making in Seventeenth-Century New England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2008. Print.
- Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*. Carbondale, Southern Illinois UP, 2002. Print.
- . "Reigning in the Court of Silence: Women and Rhetorical Space in Postbellum America." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 33.3 (2000): 221-42. Print.
- Kamensky, Jane. *Governing the Tongue: The Politics of Speech in Early New England*. New York: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.
- Kelly, Fanny. *Narrative of My Captivity Among the Sioux Indians*. 1856. Hartford: Mutual, 1871. Kessinger Legacy Reprints. Print.
- Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 1999. 2nd ed. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2003. Print.
- Kolodny, Annette. *The Land before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina Press, 1984. Print.

- Las Casas, Bartolomé de. "From the *Very Brief Relation of the Devastation of the Indies*. 1552." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 39-42. Print.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Vintage Books, 1999. Print.
- Lewis, R. W. B. *The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1959. Print.
- Lindman, Janet Moore and Michele Lise Tarter., ed. *A Centre of Wonders: The Body in Early America*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001. Print.
- Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. 1934. Heptagon. *Kindle eBook*. 2013. Web. 7 June 2017.
- Miller, Perry. "Errand into the Wilderness." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 10.1 (1953): 4-32. Print.
- Myers, Nancy. "Purposeful Silence and Perceptive Listening: Rhetorical Agency for Women in Christine De Pizan's *The Treasure of the City of Ladies*." *Silence and Listening as Rhetorical Arts*. Ed. Cheryl Glenn and Krista Ratcliffe. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2011. 56-74. Print.
- Namias, June. *White Captives: Gender and Ethnicity on the American Frontier*. Chapel Hill: U North Carolina P, 1993. Print.
- Nash, Alice. "'Antic Deportments and Indian Postures': Embodiment in the Seventeenth-Century Algonquian World." *A Centre of Wonders: The Body in Early America*. Ed. Janet Moore Lindman and Michele Lise Tarter. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001. 163-75. Print.

- Nelson, Dana D. "Women in Public." *The Cambridge Companion to Nineteenth-Century American Women's Writing*. Ed. Dale M. Bauer and Philip Gould. New York: Cambridge UP, 2001. 38-68. Print.
- Olsen, Tillie. *Silences*. 2003. 1st ed. CUNY: Feminist Press, 2003. Print.
- Per Amicum [Increase Mather?]. "A True History of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson." The Preface to the Reader. Derounian-Stodola 7-11.
- Petroff, Elizabeth Alvida. *Body & Soul: Essays on Medieval Women and Mysticism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994. Print.
- Pinar, William. "Christian Feminism and the Destabilization of Gender in the Late Nineteenth Century." *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison, Rape, and The Crisis of Masculinity*. *Counterpoints* 163 (2001): 271-320. Print.
- Reynolds, Nedra. "Ethos as Location: New Sites for Understanding Discursive Authority." *Rhetoric Review* 11.2 (Spring) (1993): 325-38. Print.
- Rowlandson, Mary. "A Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson." 1682. Derounian-Stodola 12-51.
- . "A Narrative of the Captivity and Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson. 1682." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 257-88. Print.
- , and Neal Salisbury. *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God, Together with the Faithfulness of His Promises Displayed: Being a Narrative of the Captivity and*

- Restoration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson and Related Documents*. Bedford Series in History and Culture. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1997. Print.
- Saldívar-Hull, Sonia. Introduction. *Borderlands/ La Frontera*. By Gloria Anzaldúa. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999. 1-15. Print.
- Salisbury, Neal, ed. "Introduction." *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God by Mary Rowlandson with Related Documents*. The Bedford Series in History and Culture. New York: Bedford, 1997. 1-60. Print.
- Sayre, Gordon M., ed. *Olaudah Equiano, Mary Rowlandson, and Others, American Captivity Narratives: Selected Narratives with Introductions*. Boston: Cengage, 2000. Print.
- Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985. Print.
- Schweitzer, Ivy. *The Work of Self-Representation: Lyric Poetry in Colonial New England*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991. netLibrary. Web. 15 Jul 2017.
- Scott, Robert L. "Dialectical Tensions of Speaking and Silence." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79.1 (1993): 1-18. Print.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier 1600-1860*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1973. Print.
- Smith, Eunice. *Some Arguments against Worldly-Mindedness, and Needless Care and Trouble: With Other Useful Instructions Represented by Way of a Dialogue or Discourse between Two Called by the Names of Mary and Martha*. 1791. Apple iBook. Web. 31 May 2017.

- Smith, John. "The General History of Virginia, New England, and the Summer Isles. 1622." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 83-99. Print.
- Sophocles. Ajax. 1913. *Sophocles Vol. II*. Trans. F. Storr. 2 vols. Ed. T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H.D. Rouse. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1939. 1-119. Print.
- Staves, Susan. Rev. of *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family*, by Margaret J. M. Ezell. *South Central Review* 5.2 (1988): 90-93. Print.
- Stephen, V. Tracy. *Pericles: A Sourcebook and Reader*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2009. Ebrary. Web. 6 Jul 2017.
- Toulouse, Teresa A. *The Captive's Position: Female Narrative, Male Identity and Royal Authority in Colonial New England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2007. Print.
- . "Hannah Duston's Bodies: Domestic Violence and Colonial Male Identity in Cotton Mather's *Decennium Luctuosum*." *A Centre of Wonders: The Body in Early America*. Eds. Janet Moore Lindman and Michele Lise Tarter. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 193-210. Print.
- . "'My Own Credit': Strategies of (E)Valuation in Mary Rowlandson's Captivity Narrative." *American Literature* 64.4 (1992): 655-76. Print.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*. Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1894. Print.
- Vaca, Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de. "From the *Relation of Álvaro Núñez Cabeza De Vaca: The Malhado Way of Life*. 1542. *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 44-51. Print.

- VanDerBeets, Richard. *The Indian Captivity Narrative: An American Genre*. Lanham: U P of America, 1984. Print.
- Varley, Molly K. *Americans Recaptured: Progressive Era Memory of Frontier Captivity*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2014. Print.
- Winthrop, John. "A Model of Christian Charity. 1630." *The Norton Anthology of American Literature: Beginnings to 1820*. Ed. Nina Baym. Vol. A. 8th ed. New York: Norton, 2012. 166-77. Print.
- Woodard, Maureen L. "Female Captivity and the Deployment of Race in Three Early American Texts." *Papers on Language & Literature* 32.2 (1996): 32. Print.
- Zagarri, Rosemarie. "The Postcolonial Culture of Early American Women's Writing." *The Cambridge Companion to Nineteenth-Century American Women's Writing*. Eds. Bauer, Dale M. and Philip Gould. New York: Cambridge U P, 2001. 19-37. Print.

Notes

1. Known as True Womanhood in the 1800s, contemporary texts, such as *Godey's Lady's Journal*, instructed women on how to achieve this feminine ideal of the “angel of the hearth.”
2. An alternate title of this text is *Some Arguments Against Worldly-Mindedness and Needless Care and Trouble: With Some Other Useful Instructions Represented by Way of a Dialog or Discourse Between Two Called by the Names of Mary and Martha*. The author's name, Eunice Smith (of Ashfield) and the feminine names of the two engaging in didactic dialogue remain prominent in both titles. This seventeen-page pamphlet explores Mary and Martha's thoughts on spirituality and the need for reflection in order to understand “true rest.”
3. In *Race: The History of an Idea in the West*, Ivan Hannaford traces the evolution of the white supremacist construction and classification of races. Hannaford notes that François Bernier in 1684 “proposed four or five ‘espèces ou races’ on the basis of geography, color, and physical traits[:...Europe (excluding Lapland), South Asia, North Africa, and America: people who shared similar climates and complexions[;] Africa proper: people who had thick lips, flat noses, black skin, and a scanty beard[;] Asia proper: people who had white skin, broad shoulders, flat faces, little eyes and no beard[; and] Lapps: people who were ugly, squat, small, and animal-like” (203). Hannaford continues his argument by noting that Carolus Linnaeus adapted Aristotle's ideas of *genus* and *species* and expanded on the original ideas to argue a “general order of primates in which man was no

longer considered to be apart from the animal kingdom [while] operating in a realm of moral principles” (204). Furthermore, Linnaeus’s classification assigned such moral principles to the genera he constructed: “*Homo ferus*: wild, savage, cruel man[;] *Europaeus Albus*: ingenious, white, sanguine, governed by law[;] *Americans rubescus*: happy with his lot, liberty loving, tanned and irascible, governed by custom[;] *Asiaticus luridus*: yellow, melancholy, governed by opinion[; and] *Africa niger*: crafty, lazy, careless, black, governed by the arbitrary will of the master” (204). But as a maxim of science holds that great thinkers stand on the shoulders of giants, Linnaeus is regarded as such a giant in the scientific community. His ideas—and others who came before him and after—constructed the “objective reality” of race (Hannaford 389) and had, therefore, been “exculpated from complicity in all that had been visited upon humanity from 1684 until the [Nazi] death camps” (389). And so the rhetorical shift from race to racism occurred with politics being held culpable for gross discrimination. Hannaford states that although the “Linnaean nomenclature denoting the races of mankind was conceptually bankrupt [in the 1960s], racial divisions incorporated into the race relations model of public administration continue to be used to this day” (390).

4. Katherine Zabelle Derounian-Stodola notes that Sarah Larimer, another captive alongside Kelly, published a 252-page text about her days-long captivity entitled *The Capture and Escape: or, Life among the Sioux (1870)* with a promise to delve deeper into her “sister-in-suffering, Fanny Kelly” (*Indian Captivity Narrative 12*)—until she was stopped by litigation.

5. Women of color were enslaved or regarded as less than. Andrés Reséndez notes that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the New World, “Indian women could be worth up to fifty or sixty percent more than males” because of the potential for “[s]exual exploitation and women’s reproductive capabilities” (6). Similarly, women of African descent were enslaved or sexually exploited in the New World, as well. Consequently, women of color have occupied even lower rungs on the social, economic, and political ladders than white women.

6. In *Joyous Greetings: The First International Women’s Movement, 1830-1860*, Bonnie S. Anderson explores the deep relationships among women in France, England, and America as they steadily fought for women’s right to vote, to “hold political office [...and] the restructuring of society so that all workers made a satisfactory living, all children got a good education, and all the old, sick, and infirm received decent care” (1).

7. One such way women engaged in public rhetoric was through the now-common technology of the bicycle. In *Claiming the Bicycle: Women, Rhetoric, and Technology in Nineteenth-Century America*, Sarah Hallenbeck explores how the “bicycle’s assumed masculinity during the mid-1880s” (2) was challenged and regendered through rhetorical acts by Annie “Londonderry” Kopchovsky and other women cyclists in the late 1890s.

8. In “Living Pictures, Living Memory: Women’s Rhetorical Silence within the American Delsarte Movement,” Lisa Suter argues that besides deriding Delsartism as “histrionics,” Connors also labeled the movement as the “decline of oral discourse teaching in American” education (Glenn and Radcliffe 99). Yet Suter argues her

agreement with Roxanne Mountford who challenged Connors's claim by noting that he focused on traditional, i.e. men's colleges, and ignored the increasing demand for this new type of oratory that actually created more women's colleges in order to accommodate the growing demand.

9. Kelly uses the term "savage" at least eighty-five times throughout her book.

Additionally, she refers to some Native Americans as "friendly savages" (Kelly 21), which suggests her belief in the natural inferiority of the indigenous Native Americans as the term "savages" is her choice of nomenclature for a race of people.

10. In chapter 5, "The Battles of Big Mound, Dead Buffalo Lake, and Stony Lake: 'We Must Fight for Our Children'," from *Columns of Vengeance: Soldiers, Sioux, and the Punitive Expeditions: 1863-1864*, Paul N. Beck describes the tough situation Sibley was in by being in between his soldiers who wanted to fight the Native Americans and his own possible understanding of the Sioux simply wanting to evacuate their families from the impending war between resisters to the Euro-American emigration in the Santees, Wahpetons, and Mdewakantons. According to Beck, as the Euro-American army moved toward lands held by the Santees, the Santees had not taken down their lodging, which suggested they were not anticipating any trouble. Furthermore, the Sioux were not outfitted in their war regalia. However, according to Beck, men under Sibley's command were "anticipat[ing] combat" and even complained that none was forthcoming. Unfortunately, because of a resister's killing of the army's doctor, Sibley allowed himself to be swayed by his men to engage in combat. And by conflating all of the Native

American tribes into one enemy, Sibley provoked the anger of the Sioux who not only served as his scouts but who also were the ones who kidnapped Kelly.

11. Andrés Reséndez notes in *The Other Slavery* that colonial Americans held enslaved Indians along New England, Virginia, and the Carolinas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, when Americans think of slavery, African slavery immediately comes to mind, particularly during the nineteenth-century (FN2 331 Kindle). On the other hand, Kelly makes it a point to comment upon the “two colored men [who] had been slaves among the Cherokees” (Kelly 24). Rowlandson makes no mention of slavery in her brief narrative.

12. Like Nan Johnson in *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Literature, 1866-1910*, I am using the term “public rhetorical space” to indicate the space wherein rhetoric used carries actual political power and shapes cultural opinion. In this chapter, I argue that while Rowlandson, Kelly, Berry, and DeJesus were limited to “discourse of domesticity” in varying degrees the four women captives nevertheless subverted rhetorical expectations placed on them and engaged in rhetoric that had the potential to affect politics and cultural opinion. As Johnson says, “It is important to think of rhetorical space as framing certain kinds of rhetorical opportunities that reflect the ways a culture has defined where significant cultural conversations take place” (*Gender* 175).

13. The word disappeared is deliberately used as a verb in order to convey significant effects. While women in poor communities are not necessarily disappeared in the same vein as perceived threats to authoritarian leaders, whether these leaders are governmental

or cartel, the end result remains the same: the stoking of fear and helplessness among the survivors, along with a sense of abandonment within affected communities. One may even argue that such an event of disappearing certain individuals is a form of stochastic terrorism.

14. Mikhail Bakhtin notes the language of carnival is the language of degradation that speaks of both decay and renewal. Thus, life and death, positive, and negative, share the same space as they are linked and connected (239). Consequently, the contradictory forms the becoming (149).

15. This chapter interprets Georg Lukács's interpretations of the Marxist concepts: reification and thingification. While Lukács reflects on a material economy rooted in class-based consciousness, this chapter takes the approach that, particularly with regards to Berry and DeJesus, the captives' bodies are commodified by their captor and can thus be placed squarely within a material economy. By doing so, Berry and DeJesus's captor effectively forces both captives into a passive capacity whose value lay in what the captives' bodies provide only for the captor. While the material economy relies on/embraces commodities targeted toward mass consumption, the commodification of Berry and DeJesus features only one consumer: their captor. Thus, the products of Berry's and DeJesus's bodies (from enforced sexual work to domestic tasks such as laundry or cleaning) are conflated with the materiality of the captives' bodies. They are reduced to their labor and what they provide for their captor. Thingification of the women's bodies results. A similar process of thingification occurs to the bodies of

Rowlandson and Kelly. However, while thingification and objectification of Berry and DeJesus's bodies result from torture, Rowlandson and Kelly's bodies' commodification lies in the Indians' purpose for holding Rowlandson and Kelly captive: geopolitical revenge enacted on their bodies resulting from the English and American armies' attacks on Indian communities and replacement for lost wives, daughters, and mothers in the attacked Indian communities.

16. Political theorist Hannah Arendt's seminal 1963 *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* explores the ordinariness, or normal, face of evil as represented by Nazi Adolf Eichmann.

17. Eventually, though, Castro makes the captives exercise by "jog[ging] in circles from the living room to the dining room and into the kitchen, over and over for an hour" (229).

18. On the other hand, because DeJesus was excruciatingly young when she was kidnapped, she had not even had a teen crush. Castro remarks on her fourteen years of age by saying, "When we have sex...I'm going to get, like, a hundred points, because you're a virgin" (Berry 92).

19. Mary Rowlandson and Fanny Kelly, it can be argued, exemplify this perspective as they routinely couch their public rhetorics with scriptural passages (Rowlandson) or divine evocations (Kelly).