The Flesh and the Spirit: The Female Subject and the Body in the Spiritual Autobiographies of Anne Hutchinson, Anne Bradstreet and Mary Rowlandson.

Mary Clare Carruth
*Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

**Recommended Citation**
https://repository.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/6776
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6” x 9” black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700  800/521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT:
THE FEMALE SUBJECT AND THE BODY
IN THE SPIRITUAL AUTOBIOGRAPHIES OF ANNE HUTCHINSON, ANNE
BRADSTREET AND MARY ROWLANDSON

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of English

by

Mary Clare Carruth
B.A., Centre College, 1977
M.A., Louisiana State University, 1981
December 1998
©Copyright 1998
Mary Clare Carruth
All rights reserved.
DEDICATION

To my mother, Mary Clare Lansden Carruth,
whose life-long creativity continues to inspire me,

and

In memory of my father, Walter Kent Carruth,
whose support of my education has taken me this far
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge the long-standing patience and valuable feedback of my dissertation director, Rick Moreland. Much gratitude to my mother, Clare Carruth, my sister, Roberta Carruth, my brother-in-law, Paul Taylor, for their support during my doctoral studies and to my new niece, Grace Kennon Carruth-Taylor, for reminding me that blessings happen. I also acknowledge the contributions of Julian Carruth, Helen Kennon, and Aaron Nitzkin. Special thanks to Chris Bobel and to the following friends who gave me support during the writing stage: Mary Katherine Politz, Sue Josephson, Susan Talbot, Srimati Mukherjee, Melissa Wiedenfeld.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................ iv

ABSTRACT .............................................. vi

INTRODUCTION ........................................... 1

CHAPTER 1
Female Embodiment and Autobiographical Practice in the
Seventeenth-Century Massachusetts Bay Colony ............. 7

CHAPTER 2
The Flesh and the Spirit: Puritan Autobiographical
Conventions in Anne Hutchinson, Anne Bradstreet, and Mary
Rowlandson ............................................. 34

CHAPTER 3
Renunciation or Re-inscription: Anne Hutchinson's and Anne
Bradstreet's Representations of the Body. ................. 75
Anne Hutchinson's Renunciation of Language and Body. . 81
Anne Bradstreet's Re-inscription of the Maternal Body 107

CHAPTER 4
Representing the Abject Body: Mary Rowlandson's
Destabilization of the Conversion Model ................... 122

CONCLUSION ............................................. 180

BIBLIOGRAPHY ............................................ 186

VITA .................................................... 194
ABSTRACT

This dissertation approaches Anne Hutchinson's trial transcripts (1637-1638), Anne Bradstreet's "To My Dear Children" (1656), and Mary Rowlandson's "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" (1682) from the perspectives of autobiographical scholarship and feminist theory. It places these writers within a subversive matrilineal autobiographical tradition. It analyzes how seventeenth-century American Puritan women engender the conversion genre, which many scholars have assumed to be gender-neutral. In particular, it considers how Hutchinson, Bradstreet, and Rowlandson negotiate cultural inscriptions of the female body as they construct subjectivities and assert spiritual authority within hegemonic religious discourse. This dissertation traces a progression in these writers' resistances to Puritanism's construction of women as embodied others. Hutchinson refuses the body as a founding identification of her subjectivity, privileging spirit over flesh and retreating into inner mystical experience. Bradstreet parallels flesh and spirit, equating her autobiographical act and her assertion of spiritual authority to childbirth. Thus, she re-writes the maternal body, culturally constructed as the source of the soul's fleshly nature, as a transmitter of grace. Finally, Rowlandson foregrounds the culturally inscribed abject female body in
her descriptions of her transgressive eating and in her
colonialist representations of Native American women, to whom
she unconsiously compares herself. Her narrative
destabilizes the rationalist model of conversion on which the
Puritan theocracy relied for the consolidation of control and
the enforcement of cultural cohesion.
As I bring this study of early American women's autobiographies to a close, a controversy ensues among American feminists sparked by Time Magazine's June 29, 1998 cover story, "Who Put the 'Me' in Feminism?" This article and the feminist outrage it has provoked foreground the issues of American women's representations in culture that my dissertation addresses. The magazine's startling cover anticipates the disturbing interpretation of the contemporary feminist movement inside of it. Against a shroud-like black background, the four faces of feminism--Susan B. Anthony, Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem, and the careerist Ally McBeal--are lined up as if confronting a firing squad (although they are smiling). The bodies of all four women are blacked out, swallowed up by the darkness of the background, creating a disembodied effect. While the faces of the mothers of the first and second wave of feminism are presented in black and white, the younger face of Ally McBeal is in color, underscored by the question in bold red letters, "Is Feminism Dead?" Inside the issue, the author of the feature, Ginia Bellafante, answers this query by re-defining "feminism," titling her story, "Feminism: It's All About Me! Want to know what today's chic young feminist thinkers care about? Their bodies! Themselves!"
This author's answer to her title's question is a play on the name of the Boston Women's Health Collective's ground-breaking guide, *Our Bodies, Our Selves*, which has undergone several editions since its appearance in the 1970s. *Time*’s apparent parody of the title of this book turns this feminist classic’s vision of helping women reclaim control of their bodies and their health into a frivolous narcissism. Not only is *Time*’s more general association of feminism with self-indulgence disturbing, but also its apparent splitting of female identity from the body, a disassociation undercut by the Boston Collective’s intentional coordination of the nouns “Bodies” and "Selves" in its title. This splitting is the result of the dominant culture’s problematic linkage of women’s subjectivity to their visible sexual difference, a reduction of female identity to corporeality also operating in the seventeenth-century American Puritanism’s ideologies of selfhood that influenced the writers of this study. It is true that *Time*’s inside article on "Girl Power" appears to problematize this self-division, documenting the rise of eating disorders and even quoting Joan Brumberg’s popular new book, *The Body Project*. However, it contradicts this effort in its side-bar on the editorial page of its subsequent July 20 issue. Defending its baffling inclusion of television character Ally McBeal in its "hall of fame" of feminists, it quotes Ottawa's Nasir Islam’s comment: “You asked, "'Is Feminism Dead?"
The obvious answer is 'No,' it has grown old, tired, and ugly. The new faces of feminism, exemplified by Ally McBeal and the Spice Girls, are certainly more attractive and in synch with today's times" (10).

This cover story raises important questions about American women's representations in culture that my dissertation also addresses. How does American culture represent women's lives and historical struggles? How do such representations serve to reinforce the hegemony? How do women transform themselves from their status as silent objects, from their positioning so graphically suggested in the Time cover's line-up of the four faces? (Indeed, Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem were not even interviewed for the story.) How do women reclaim the truths of their representation? How do they represent their bodies, the signs of their sexual difference and often the sources of their cultural objectification and embodiment?

The Time story calls attention to this historical conflict over the truth of woman's representation, a struggle reaching back to the trials of Anne Hutchinson in Massachusetts in the 1630s, the first subject of this study. As I notice the absence of the voices of Steinem and Friedan in the Time article, I am also aware of the elision of Anne Hutchinson's voice in anthologies of American literature, noticeable even in the revisionist The Heath Anthology of American Literature; while it includes unflattering representations of Hutchinson from
the journals of her prosecutor, John Winthrop, it omits her trial transcripts themselves, which preserve her own autobiographical voice and self-representation. Indeed, a more truthful representation of history to our students would publish the excerpts including Hutchinson's voice alongside Winthrop's perceptions.

How do women reclaim their representation, whether in contemporary American culture or in Puritan religious traditions? This is one of the questions my study, "The Flesh and the Spirit: The Female Subject and the Body in the Spiritual Autobiographies of Anne Hutchinson, Anne Bradstreet, and Mary Rowlandson," attempts to answer. They "talk back," as bell hooks replies (5), a figure of speech Sidonie Smith, in turn, borrows to explain the personal and socio-political function of women's autobiographical acts (20).

As my dissertation suggests, this history of American women's autobiographical "back talk" has its origins in Puritan genres. As Margo Culley observes in her introduction to her 1992 collection, American Women's Autobiography: Fea(s)ts of Memory, "the dominant tradition of American women's autobiography has roots in Puritan beliefs about the self and the Puritan practice of conversion narratives...even in periods when autobiography has become a thoroughly secular enterprise...." (10). While these "roots," as Culley intends to suggest, are the Puritan habits of introspection and preoccupation with the
self, my dissertation goes a step further to uncover how even in its earliest forms, the Euro-American women's life-writing tradition contains gendered narrative. I analyze how Puritan women engender the conversion genre, which most scholars have assumed to be gender-neutral. I go to the source of the difference informing women's expressions: their sexual difference, signified in their bodies. I consider how Puritanism linked women's identities to their corporeality and how they negotiated this embodiment as they attempted to assert selves and spiritual authority in hegemonic religious discourses. As the recent Time article demonstrates, their self-representations reflect the ongoing processes engaged in by American women throughout history and continuing up to the turn of this century: the struggle to reclaim the truth of women's representation and to interrogate the cultural meanings ascribed to their bodies and identities.

With Mary Rowlandson's 1682 Indian captivity tale as its final and primary focus, this dissertation unfolds as follows. Chapter One, "Female Embodiment and Autobiographical Practice in the Seventeenth-century Massachusetts Colony," relates Sidonie Smith's theoretical model of discourses of embodiment and women's autobiography to the authorships of Puritan women in mid-seventeenth-century Massachusetts. Chapter Two, "The Flesh and the Spirit: Puritan Autobiographical Conventions in
Anne Hutchinson, Anne Bradstreet, and Mary Rowlandson," introduces the conventions of the conversion tradition in which Anne Hutchinson, Anne Bradstreet, and Mary Rowlandson wrote as well as information on the historical realities of their lives. Chapter Three, "Renunciation or Reinscription: Anne Hutchinson's and Anne Bradstreet's Representations of the Body," focuses on Hutchinson's and Bradstreet's autobiographical resistances to a specific kind of embodiment, the abjecting of the mother, a phenomenon in subjective experience illuminated by Julia Kristeva's psycholinguistic paradigm. Finally, Chapter Four, "Representing the Abject Body: Mary Rowlandson's Destabilization of the Conversion Model" illustrates how Rowlandson's figuring of herself as the embodied other serves as a subversive vehicle in her autobiographical practice.
CHAPTER 1

FEMALE EMBODIMENT AND AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL PRACTICE IN THE SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

Despite its inclusion in a variety of bibliographies of American autobiography, few specialists in autobiography have placed and evaluated the 1682 captivity tale, "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," within a life-writing tradition. While early Americanists have studied Rowlandson's treatment of the captivity and conversion genres from increasingly diverse critical perspectives, few scholars of life-writing have recognized her deserved importance as an autobiographer. Indeed, it is this text's hybrid mixture of conversion allegory and captivity tale--the very characteristic that appears to exclude it from the normative category of autobiography--that makes it a significant contribution to the Puritan self-writing tradition. Auspiciously, the current vitality of Rowlandson scholarship coincides with burgeoning critical activity on autobiography, especially on women's self-writing, allowing for a promising convergence of these two fields of study. Indeed, a critical re-vision of Rowlandson's tale through the lens of autobiographical theory reciprocally enriches both Rowlandson criticism and life-writing scholarship. What
Rowlandson's text lends to criticism of self-writing is not only a diversification of the genre and the canon of American autobiography, but also more specifically, a testing, revising, and historicizing of feminist theories of what Domna Stanton calls the "female autograph" (15), especially those configuring the relationship of the female subject to her body. Conversely, what autobiographical scholarship contributes to Rowlandson studies is a re-examination of the Puritan concept of "self" enacted in the narrative, together with its relationship to gendered identity, and in turn, a reconception of the place and the significance of the tale in the American literary canon.

Central to this critical re-casting of Rowlandson's text is an understanding of the definition of "autobiography," a concept that in simplest terms, means "a retrospective account of a person's life told by the author herself," but whose meaning in the last forty years has changed in conjunction with the progression of critical theory from historical, biographical, and formalistic emphases to structuralist, poststructuralist, and deconstructionist approaches. In the early twentieth-century, scholars of Euro-American life-writing began to expand the definition of "autobiography" as they recuperated the genre from the subcategory of biography. Preoccupied with such issues as the truthfulness of the self-representation, which they assumed to be synonymous
with biographical facticity, and with formal structure, these early critics trusted the authority of the author, the referentiality between author and narrator, and the determinacy of textual meaning. Since then, influenced by structuralist and post-structuralist theories, most contemporary critics maintain a skepticism about notions of narrative authority, referentiality, truth, meaning, and generic integrity. Less interested in the bios or life of the author than in the autos and graphe, they see the autobiographical act as an invention of a self, created by memory and imagination and composed, in part, from the discourses of identity available to the author during her historical period. It is these ideologies of identity that most feminist critics now take as their scholarly focus, investigating the way in which autobiographers negotiate the fictions of male and female selfhood that construct them in their cultures and by which they perceive and write about themselves.

Acknowledging that Rowlandson studies have developed along similar lines as autobiographical criticism, progressing from traditional, formalistic, and generic

---


2 For a placement of feminist criticism within a history of autobiographical scholarship, see Sidonie Smith's A Poetics of Women's Autobiography: Marginality and the Fictions of Self-Representation, 3-19.
readings to post-structuralist and feminist ones, this project illuminates the autobiographical performance of Rowlandson's tale through a synthesis of insights from autobiographical, feminist, and to a lesser degree, post-colonial theories. It argues that her narrative's significance derives not only from its recollection of an extraordinary lived experience, but more profoundly, from its appropriation, yet interrogation of the ideology of selfhood that governed the "design and truth" of seventeenth-century Puritan spiritual self-writings. Rowlandson's forced culture-crossing destabilizes her sense of personal and cultural identity and serves as a catalyst to her later authorship, by which she attempts to regain psychic and cultural integration; in turn, her narrative-crossing of the generic boundaries of conversion allegory and captivity narrative permits her to destabilize the model of selfhood on which the Puritan hegemony relied for the consolidation of control and the enforcement of cultural cohesion. Significantly, as Rowlandson symbolizes her captivity as the unregenerate soul's bondage to flesh--a formulaic trope in seventeenth-century New England conversion stories--she gives expression to the repressed body at the core of the Puritans' rationalist ideology of selfhood. Such an expression creates not only psychological, but also socio-political and rhetorical ramifications: for her disclosure of the repressed body exposes the problem in Puritan
ideology of what Sidonie Smith calls the "cultural embodiment" of women and people of color, caused by the privileged disembodied subject's projection of his denied feelings and bodily experiences onto sexual or racial "others" (*Subjectivity* 9). In turn, her representation of the body dramatizes the problem of embodiment encumbering the woman autobiographer: her discursive problem of forging a subjectivity within phallogocentric languages that position her as the silent unrepresentable object, or as feminist Luce Irigaray calls the "opaque matter which...does not know herself" (133). In particular, her foregrounding of the female body problematizes the dualization of body and soul in Puritan religious discourse, a polarity that impeded female self-writers' assertion of spiritual authority more than men's because of the biblical and cultural discourses that inscribed their identities with an essentialized nature.

Unfortunately, because autobiographical scholarship on Rowlandson's narrative has been scant, it has failed to develop this link between her captivity, female subjectivity, and contemporary feminist theories of the body. In *The Tradition of Women's Autobiography: From Antiquity to the Present* (1986), the first feminist book-length study of women's life-writings, Estelle Jelinek recognizes Rowlandson's work as the first captivity tale written by a woman in the seventeenth-century and praises the author's narrative skill (65); yet her overall
evaluation is marred by out-dated information and factual inaccuracy. For example, she assumes that Rowlandson's publication was posthumous, a myth dispelled by later scholarship, and she mistakenly describes Rowlandson, who, like many Puritan women of her class, was highly literate, as not very educated. Robert F. Sayre includes the entirety of the narrative in his collection, *American Lives: An Anthology of Autobiographical Writing* (1994), but hardly distinguishes its significance from that of other captivity tales, which, he argues, functioned as discursive testing grounds for the definition of the nascent American identity (24). Finally, in his brief, suggestive essay, "The Prehistory of American Autobiography" (1991), Daniel B. Shea, Jr. recovers Rowlandson from the generic bonds of the captivity genre and assigns her a place within an American women's life-writing tradition, one that succeeds from the autobiographical fragment of Anne Hutchinson traceable in the records of her 1637-38 heresy trials. As Shea suggests, Hutchinson's doctrinal reliance on divine revelation empowers her with the "autonomous, self-authorizing voice" that is the "daring hypothesis" of "any autobiography" (35). He continues:

That voice was banished from Massachusetts Bay less for what it had said than for what it might be imagined to say. The interdicted 'I' of Anne Hutchinson was therefore prophetic of women whose autobiographical writing, having been driven or exiled to some margin or frontier,
While Shea credits Hutchinson's literary heirs with relocating the origins of the autobiographical voice, he also acknowledges their interrogation of culturally constructed truths and their surpassing of generic limitations. In contrast to men's life writings of the period, in which, he argues, the "I" is confident that it speaks from the center of the real world," he concludes:

...in the autobiographical succession from Anne Hutchinson, the 'I,' finding itself set out at an apparent margin, disputes the given real and invents a text that acknowledges a journeying rather than a fixed center. (37)

Shea's topographic trope for these transgressive texts evolves from not only the language of poststructuralism but also the spatial metaphors with which contemporary western feminist theories have evoked the cultural positions of women writers and their discursive subjectivities. Although he refrains from developing a full-fledged comparison of Hutchinson's and Rowlandson's narratives or specifically, of their different treatments of the body and identity, his identification of Rowlandson with this subversive matrilineal tradition opens up new possibilities for reading her text and for appraising it as the most important autobiographical expression by an American woman in the seventeenth-century.

Such an evaluation of Rowlandson's work within a matrilineal tradition, however, cannot be done without the
addition of her second literary predecessor, Anne Bradstreet, as a preliminary subject of this study. Shea's omission of Bradstreet from his category of women who write autobiographically from the margins seems appropriate, for although Bradstreet voices rebellion against male domination in art and culture, most noticeably in her poems "The Prologue" and "In Honour of That High and Mighty Princess Queen Elizabeth of Happy Memory," she refrains from interrogating the Puritan ideology of selfhood, whose "auto-machia," or "war within the self" (Bercovitch 19), she dramatizes conventionally in her allegory, "The Flesh and the Spirit." Indeed, in his classic book-length study, Spiritual Autobiography in Early America, published twenty-three years before his "The Pre-history of American Autobiography," Shea treats Bradstreet's prose address, "To My Dear Children" (1656), as a traditional Puritan autobiography, which he defines as an argument proving divine favoritism in the author's life, although he qualifies that her narrative lacks the comfortable balance between spiritual despondency and faith achieved in similar works (117). While Bradstreet's prose piece does not appear to deviate from the ontological and theological "fixed center" of Puritan conversion, it explores with similar interest as the "journeying" texts of Rowlandson and Hutchinson, the relationship between the interlocking constituents of the Puritan self--the body and the soul. While the body is
depicted as the battleground for the soul's struggle for salvation in most Puritan writings regardless of the authors' genders, the ideology of the universal subject challenged the autobiographical projects of Bradstreet, Hutchinson, and Rowlandson more than those of men because of its implication in the embodiment of women's identities by religious and socio-political languages that link their minds, natures and social roles to their bodies, in short, to biological essentialism. These "discourses of embodiment" enable a patriarchy, in this case, the Puritan theocracy, to naturalize the upper-class white male as the universal subject by projecting its denied feelings, sensations, and desires onto women and people of color, whom it consequently positions as "others" in a binary opposition (Smith Subjectivity 10).

Read in juxtaposition, Bradstreet's 1656 "To My Dear Children," Hutchinson's 1637-38 trial transcripts, and Rowlandson's 1682 "The Sovereignty and Goodness of God" reveal a progression in these autobiographers' attempts to deflect the alterity imposed on them by Puritan discourses of embodiment and to claim the authority of the subject. Their self-constructions are affected by the challenge facing the woman writer, as described most notably by contemporary French feminists, especially Luce Irigaray and Helene Cixous: that by attempting to resemble the privileged subject, the woman writer may deny her body, consequently disassociating herself from its potential
empowerment, and perpetuate rather than interrogate the binary ideologies that encumber her; or she may inscribe, rather than erase, her body, disempowering the cultural essentialism that embodies her by reclaiming it in her own language.\(^3\)

This classic feminist configuration of the female subject has provided a basis for the theories of many scholars of women's autobiography as they delineate a women's life-writing tradition, critical models that contribute to an understanding of the relationship of identity to body in the self-writings of Bradstreet, Hutchinson, and Rowlandson.

Critic Domna Stanton, although she does not focus exclusively on the representation of the body, extends French literary theory's observations about the female subject to what she refers to as the "female autograph" in women's life-writing. Shifting the question posed by earlier feminist scholars from "How is the female autograph different from the male?" to "Is it different?" Stanton, wary of reinforcing essentialist notions of gender, proposes that any perceived distinction between the male and female "signature" results from the influence of cultural norms and the status of the female subject as object and other in the phallogocentric system (15).

\(^3\) For summaries of Cixous's and Irigaray's theories, see Toril Moi's Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory, 102-121; 127-147.
Although she similarly does not emphasize the inscription of the body in *A Poetics of Women's Autobiography: Marginality and the Fictions of Self-Representation* (1987), Sidonie Smith develops Stanton's application of French critical theory while at the same time historicising the female subject by defining it as a textual construct of the prevailing discourses—religious, political, philosophical—of a particular historical moment. Especially influenced by Jacques Lacan's psycholinguistic paradigm of the subject's passage from the pre-Oedipal Imaginary Stage to the Symbolic Order of language, Smith argues that composing an autobiography is "an assertion of arrival and embeddedness in the phallic order" (40) and that to avoid woman's signification as absence, lack, and negativity in phallogocentric language, the female life-writer must "negotiate a doubled identification with paternal and maternal narratives" (42). This negotiation engages her in a rhetorical double-bind similar to that of the female subject described by the French feminists. While the paternal identification permits the woman to adopt the posture of the representative man and so to present herself as an authoritative, autonomous subject within the androcentric tradition of public achievement, it requires her erasure of her sexual difference and consequently, her denial of her maternal heritage, which perpetuates the "political, social, and textual disempowerment of mothers and
daughters" (53). On the other hand, her rhetorical alignment with the mother permits her to construct herself as a representative woman through her projection of the culturally-defined feminine characteristics of virtue, self-effacement, and passivity and to return to the maternal origin where she may discover alternative languages, associated with the pre-symbolic realm, that subvert phallogocentrism and inaugurate a woman-centered discourse (59). The disadvantages of her conformity to the ideal of the representative woman are that she may appear undeserving of a readership--unless her relation to powerful political or spiritual foremothers proves her worthy of public attention--and that she may erase her sexuality (55).

Sidonie Smith, shifting her emphasis from the discursive strategies of women's self-representations to their socio-political implications, takes as her exclusive focus in her 1993 Subjectivity, Identity, and the Body: Women's Autobiographical Practices in the Twentieth Century the relationship between the female self and cultural inscriptions of the body, with specific attention to Euro-American women's use of autobiography to destabilize the Western ideology of the universal subject. Because Smith's notion of the universal subject serves to explain the function of the Puritan model of selfhood, her analysis of its dynamics and its effects, through her synthesis of feminist theories and histories of
philosophy, provides a useful tool for understanding the rhetorical challenges faced by Bradstreet, Hutchinson and Rowlandson. As Smith argues, in western ideologies of selfhood, the upper-class white male subject, in order to maintain his position as the universal human and to consolidate his authority, ascribes to women and "racial others" essentialized identities. Similar to the Cartesian ego, this universal subject subordinates emotion, desire, and the experience of the body to rationality, a suppression that is never complete and that often is transformed into the subject's projections of these feelings onto women and marginalized peoples. As a result of his "banishment of the body and its desires to the borders of consciousness," this subject makes those who are culturally labeled as "other" more fully body, that is abject, colorful, exotic, unruly, irrational, uncivilized, even grotesque (9). Among the historical consequences on women of this psychological mechanism of projection--apparent in mid-seventeenth-century Massachusetts--are the yoking of their subjectivities to their anatomy, compelling them to surrender their individuality and agency to the social roles of daughter, wife, and mother that accompany their presumed biological destinies (12). Other effects of discourses of embodiment, which Smith especially attributes to the nineteenth century, include the sexualization of women's souls and the embodiment of their minds to the extent that women who used their
Intellects were considered unwomanly, if not disruptive and grotesque. This embodiment of women's reason, also prominent in mid-seventeenth-century Massachusetts, contaminated their relationship to speech and writing. Identified with the malediction of Eve, women's speech was prohibited in public places through the late nineteenth century, and their access to discourses was confined to those that underwrote the cultural script of feminine propriety, such as the languages of piety and sentiment (16). As Smith concludes, discourses of embodiment influence women to repress the body, denying their desires and individuality, to assume "encumbering identities in service to family, community, and country," and to reverse their negative identification with the body through selflessness and propriety (16). Women who transgress these expectations of the "body politic" by activating their own desires and independence become "cultural grotesques"; for they represent the repressed body, which returns from the margins and then "threatens to disrupt the ... places of consciousness and power" (16).

Smith's observations about women's negotiations of rhetorical identifications and cultural inscriptions of the body, together with Stanton's speculations about the female autograph, help raise questions about the historical realities shaping the compositions of Bradstreet, Hutchinson, and Rowlandson in the mid-seventeenth-century Massachusetts Bay Colony. The first
question is what are the similarities and differences between Smith's notion of the universal subject and the rationalist model of the personality at the basis of the Puritan conversion process? Did Puritan women employ the conversion model differently from men? (In other words, is there a female autograph inscribed in Puritan religious writings?) To what extent were Puritan women's identities, souls, and minds embodied by Puritan religious discourses, and how did their autobiographical acts constitute subjectivities that countered these limiting ideologies of selfhood? Finally, to what extent does the Puritan construction of gender conform to the binary genderic system that Smith's theories assume, how does this construction affect the language of grace by which Puritan men and women evoked their conversion experiences, and how do women use this language differently from men in order to forge their subjectivities?

Since it served to ensure religious and civic solidarity in the fledgling colony, the Puritan conversion's concept of self functioned hegemonically, like Smith's notion of the universal subject, to consolidate the authority of the patriarchal theocracy. As Sacvan Bercovitch explains in The Puritan Origins of the American Self, unlike the later Enlightenment's valorization of an autonomous, transcendent identity, the Puritan attitude perceived selfhood as "a state to be overcome [or even] obliterated" (13). Although the
Puritans' obsession with salvation immersed them in a self-absorption that gave rise to European-American autobiography, it paradoxically compelled them to submit the self, the embodiment of worldly and fleshly desires, to union with the divine (Bercovitch 13). This suppression of the self, achieved by the regulation of reason and by the exercise of the will, corresponded to the Puritans' distrust of difference--of idiosyncrasies in feelings and perceptions that may have been suspected as Antinomian--and to their simultaneous effort to narrate a life that is representative, and not individual. Indeed, their public testimonials, which served the communal function of certifying their membership in churches, in the ministry (if they were male), and more generally, in the community of visible saints, conformed to what Shea describes as a "mechanistic pattern" that valued unique experience only for its emblematic potential to exemplify the soul's progress (Spiritual Autobiography 90). In their private devotional exercises as well, the Puritans structured their reflections according to what Edmund Morgan calls this formulaic "morphology of conversion" (66-69), suppressing extraordinary experiences, heterogeneous beliefs, and the expression of a range of emotions. Especially in the first generation of Massachusetts colonists, the hegemonic purpose of this conversion model to ensure cultural cohesion and the control of the theocracy was most dramatically demonstrated in the
Antinomian Crisis, during which a spiritual enthusiasm already existent in Puritanism was revived by religious individualists, who were labeled as "Antinomian" or as "against the law" by the Massachusetts magistracy, who insisted on the more rationalist, preparationist approach to salvation. This controversy climaxed in the 1637 banishment and 1638 ex-communication of Anne Hutchinson, whose appeal to an interior mystical voice verged dangerously on the brink of extraordinary religious experience and superseded the authority of the Puritan ministry. Attesting to the hegemonic function of the conversion narrative, an increased restriction of women's speech in the First Church in Boston followed Hutchinson's exile, instigated by John Cotton's revised ecclesiastical policy that women tell their stories of grace privately to their ministers rather than publicly in church. Among the practitioners of an unconventional pietistic style who were similarly reprimanded after Hutchinson's banishment was Anne Bradstreet's younger sister, Sarah Dudley Keanye, who was admonished by the First Church in 1647 for her "Irregular Prophesying in mixt Assemblies and for Refusing ordinarily to heare in ye Churches of Christ" and who, shortly afterwards, was ex-communicated (Manuscript Records of First Church in Boston qtd. in White 174).

While the conversion model, through its ideal of corporate rather than individual identity, indirectly reinforced the patriarchal power of the theocracy, it
nonetheless offered several important uses to women who wrote and spoke within its parameters. The first is that although Puritan women were subordinate to male authority in the home, the church, and the state, their souls were considered to be equal to men's in their access to Christ's grace, although not in their capacity to resist temptation. Until after the banishment of Hutchinson, women's tales of grace to congregations comprised the only public discourse in which they were allowed to participate. Because conversion discourse spanned private and public spheres and so did not entirely privilege male participation in public affairs, it stopped short of functioning as an exclusively androcentric genre. While the Puritan suppression of the self appears to foreclose the possibility of agency considered to be crucial to women's recovery of identity, this process of the self's receptivity to grace enacts the relational paradigm of identity-formation that Mary G. Mason attributes to many women life-writers. If female writers, as Mason argues, often define their identities in identification with another, whether a divine being, a family member, or a secular or spiritual community (210), then the Puritan conversion model permitted women to discover their voices and authorize their authorships. Indeed, because Puritan women's subjectivities were repressed and denied in the patriarchal culture anyway, the conversion process's dissolution of self in union with the divine may have
appealed to women rather than disempowered them. Their narratives of conversion freed them to erase their sexual difference, the source of their cultural oppression, under the allegorical ideal of the soul undergoing conversion. In fact, because of the gender-neutral nature of the self-representations of the Puritans' religious relations, scholars have been hard-pressed to identify gender-encoding in their oral performances collected in church records. Since the Puritans believed Christ's grace to be as available to women as to men, and since their narratives render the details of an individual life, including gendered experiences like childbirth and motherhood, as symbolic stages in the soul's conversion, their "experiences of grace," as Charles Lloyd Cohen concludes, "submerge[e] the peculiarities of gender" (223).

Given the cultural prohibitions against women's writing even in the home, the conversion genre also socially sanctioned the rare occasions of women's publishing, as in the cases of Anne Bradstreet and Mary Rowlandson, which occurred only under certain conditions, as set forth by Cotton Mather in Ornaments for the Daughters of Zion (1692), a sermon whose restrictions on female reading and writing were relevant not only to the later period in which it was delivered, but also to the first and second generations of Puritan women. Because of these regulations governing the emergence of female subjects in written public discourse, the possibility for
women authors' inscriptions of gendered identity in their published narratives was stronger than in their oral recitations. In fact, the ideal of representative womanhood, to which Mather expected female writers to comply, is equivalent to what Sidonie Smith characterizes as the self-effacing and virtuous persona projected by female autobiographers who rhetorically identify with the mother in order to construct a subjectivity in phallocentric language. According to Mather, a Puritan woman should read only to study scripture, and if she writes, she must do so without sin, that is, without "lead[ing] the Life which old Stories ascribe to Amazons"; in fact, she must emulate the virtuous women who "have made Laudable use of Pens and have with much Praise, done the part of Scholars in the World" (qtd. in Davis 49). If she writes for publication, she must first demonstrate her piety through sanctification (i.e. leading a holy life), and then compose under the following conditions: she must write only in her spare time so as not to interrupt her domestic responsibilities; she must restrict herself to pious topics; and she must express herself in humility and in deference to her husband or to another male authority (Davis 50-51). As Mather's conditions demonstrate, despite the conversion genre's facilitation of the rare instances of female publishing and its other positive uses for Puritan women, it ultimately functioned as a hegemonic discourse to limit their subjectivities, subjecting them
to the consequences of what Sidonie Smith has described as cultural embodiment: confined to the self-representation of ideal womanhood and to the language of piety, Puritan female life-writers were compelled to erase their sexualities; to reverse their cultures' negative associations with their bodies through their emulations of selflessness and propriety; and to suppress their expressions of their individuality in service to the social roles accompanying their biological destinies. While male spiritual self-writers similarly effaced their sexualities, bodies, and individuality, their repression resulted more from their conformity to the demands of the rationalist process of conversion than from the additional impact of discourses of embodiment, which inextricably linked women's reason, writing, and spiritual authority to their sexual difference.

Indeed, just as Sidonie Smith argues that culturally embodied women who assert independence are often socially constructed as grotesques, so Puritan women who transgressed the rules governing their speech and writing were usually perceived as violating the natural order, a disruption that in turn, was believed to manifest itself in their bodies. Governor John Winthrop's judgment in his journal (1630-1649) that Mistress Ann Hopkins, the wife of the Governor of Connecticut, succumbed to madness because she neglected her domestic responsibilities and gave herself "wholly to reading and writing" (qtd. in White
172) illustrates this common linkage of woman's intellect to her body. In order to protect his daughter, Sarah Keayne, from additional legal and ecclesiastical penalties, Thomas Dudley, Anne Bradstreet's father and Deputy Governor of Massachusetts from 1646-1649, explained her "prophesying," which estranged her from her husband, as a sign of mental instability, and not intentional disobedience. Anne Hutchinson's cultural grotesqueness culminated in Governor Winthrop's remark about her deformed stillborn infant, delivered shortly after her removal to the Isle of Aquiday: in his journal, he links what he denigrates as her "monstrous birth" with her theological "errors", and in much of his rhetoric of the period, he pejoratively associates the Antinomians with female sexuality and with violation of the natural order (Kibbey 112). Like other colonial women, Hutchinson could not escape her body as the sign of her significance in the phallocratic culture; her intellect and vision—in short, her subjectivity—were inextricably yoked to her biological destiny.

The cultural expectations of women to conform to the virtues of submissiveness, modesty, chastity, and piety and to fit into the domestic roles of mother, wife, and daughter within a hierarchically structured family and society revealed an underlying distrust of women's presumed irrational and unruly "natures," a perception bolstered by biblical, especially Pauline, precedents.
Indeed, Paul's organic metaphor for domestic and ecclesiastical order, set forth in I Corinthians 11:3, designating Christ as the head of the church, man as the head of the woman, and woman, by implication, as man's body, justified the binary constructions of gender on which Puritan men's and women's roles were based. While husbands were identified with "lordship, priesthood, ... and public dominance," women were linked with "the body, emotions, and private tenderness" (Leverenz 81). Not only did Puritan theological and socio-political discourse associate women with the body, but also it constructed women's souls as more susceptible to temptation because they were contained in bodies that were considered "weaker vessels." That women were assumed to need governance from their husbands and fathers in theological as well as general matters is illustrated in the magistrates' reactions to Ann Hopkins', Sarah Keanye's, and Anne Hutchinson's self-assertions. Claiming that Ann Hopkins' husband was "very loving and tender of her" and "loath to grieve her," John Winthrop recorded in his journal that Governor Hopkins, blaming himself for her misdirection, "saw his error, when it was too late" (qtd. in White 172). Winthrop similarly held Anne Hutchinson's husband responsible for her independence, calling him "a man of a very mild temper and weak parts (sic), and wholly guided by his wife" (263). After his daughter's ex-communication and her divorce from Benjamin Keanye, which her father, as
the deputy governor, facilitated, Thomas Dudley convinced the colonial court that "what she needed was a strong man to watch over her and control her actions" (White 176).

Yet, while the Puritans maintained a hierarchy in gender roles in domestic, ecclesiastical, and civic matters, they, in seeming contradiction, permitted a flexibility in gender identifications in their language of conversion. Infused with the female and nuptial imagery of the biblical Canticles, Puritan journals, poetry, and public narratives frequently represented Christ as a mother or bridegroom, and converts, both female and male, as nursing infants or ravished brides. In sermons, ministers would align themselves with the feminized Christ, representing themselves with nursing breasts and equating scripture with mother's milk. Using revisions of Freudian theory, David Leverenz explains the social function of this apparent disjunction between language and culture: the maternal imagery allowed men, who were expected to be restrained and strong, to sublimate their dependent needs while it appealed to women, who were socialized to be "tender mothers" and who were assumed to be weak and emotional (86). Indeed, refuting some scholars' arguments that Puritan women suffered a high degree of cultural oppression, historian Amanda Porterfield claims that it is this feminization of God that created "a context of [the] imaginative privileging of maternal love," by which Puritan mothers exercised
their authority and often extended their influence beyond the domestic realm (95). Yet, countering this rhetorical and cultural privileging of maternal love were negative representations of women in Puritan language and culture, an association of femaleness with sin that David Leverenz attributes, from his psychoanalytic perspective, to men's polarized fantasies of the good and the bad mother (139). Indeed, as Leverenz points out, New England sermons, which served to reinforce the need "for strong fathers and good mothering, for social order... for self-discipline and self-transformation," often dichotomized God's Word and sin as polarized female functions, as "breasts of God" and "whores of the heart," respectively (138). At the same time that Puritan language and culture privileged tender mothers, it also associated the natural mother with the sinful nature of the flesh while it identified the father with the "spiritual possibilities of the soul" (Leverenz 154). Since Puritan sermons assumed the self to be equivalent to the selfish desires of the flesh, many variously described the self, in gendered terms, as a conceiving mother, an erring wife, and a whore (Leverenz 155).

It is within this engendered language, used to evoke the conversion experience, that Bradstreet, Hutchinson, and Rowlandson forge self-representations within patriarchal discourse that embodies women's identities and limits their subjectivities.
How do these women resist their embodiment through their autobiographical writings? How do they respond to their cultural identification with flesh as they attempt to assert spiritual authority? How do they negotiate the binarity in Puritan thinking that positions them as man's opposite, as flesh rather than spirit, sensuality rather than reason? Surprisingly, despite her out-spokenness in her historical life, Hutchinson represents the least subversive of these three writers in her response to her embodiment. She chooses spirit over flesh, escaping her embodiment and the phallocentric language she associates with it by retreating into inner mystical experience. Bradstreet, in contrast, represents a more subversive approach to female embodiment than Hutchinson. She parallels flesh and spirit, equating her autobiographical act and her assertion of spiritual authority to childbirth. Thus, she re-writes the maternal body, culturally constructed as the source of the soul's fleshly nature, as a vehicle of grace. Finally, Rowlandson's narrative represents the most subversive of these three works. She foregrounds the female body, culturally associated with disorderly sin, in her descriptions of her transgressive eating and her colonialist representations of the Native Americans, to whom she unconsciously compares herself. Her representation of her body interrogates the binary that links her identity to
corporeality and threatens to destabilize the Puritan rationalist model of conversion.
CHAPTER 2

THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT:
PURITAN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL CONVENTIONS IN
ANNE HUTCHINSON, ANNE BRADSTREET, AND MARY ROWLANDSON

In order to place Hutchinson, Bradstreet, and Rowlandson within a subversive matrilineal autobiographical tradition, one must first understand the generic conventions of the conversion tradition in which they wrote; similarly, in order to examine how these women appropriated in their writings the models of selfhood available to them in seventeenth-century Puritanism, one must first have knowledge of the historical realities of their lives.

These three women's lives span the first two generations of English settlers to the Massachusetts Bay Colony and coincide with some of the earliest socio-political crises defining the Puritan identity in America, specifically, the Antinomian Controversy (1636-1638) and Metacom's War (1676-1677). As contemporaries, Anne Bradstreet and Anne Hutchinson, arrived in America with their families on the Arbella in 1630, the ship on which John Winthrop, soon to be Governor of Massachusetts, delivered his famous sermon, "A Modell of Christian Charity," espousing the ideal community of "a city on a hill." The out-spoken Hutchinson would be banished seven years later for her apparent implication in Antinomianism,
an emotional, elastic pietistic style that posed the threat of religious fragmentation to the new colony controlled by an elite theocracy trying to maintain its power and cultural cohesion. Although the more outwardly compliant Anne Bradstreet was not involved directly in the Antinomian Crisis, she, no doubt, heard first-hand reports of Hutchinson's civil trial from her husband, Simon, and her father, Thomas Dudley, both of whom were involved in the court's proceedings. Forty years later, Mary Rowlandson lived during a time of another socio-political crisis in Massachusetts, during the colony's brief war with Metacom, a Wampanoag chief, a conflict that had as one of its causes the colony's competition with Plymouth, Rhode Island, and Connecticut over land and over control of the Native Americans. Indeed, the war was one symptom of the land hunger of the second generation of Puritans, whose increasing secularization was weakening the power of the theocracy.

While Hutchinson, Bradstreet, and Rowlandson all lived during crisis points in the history of American Puritanism, they exemplified slightly different relationships to public speech and authorship and, in turn, to Puritan autobiographical traditions. While Hutchinson's trial transcripts, as variant forms of autobiography, cannot be easily placed within a literary tradition, Bradstreet's and Rowlandson's narratives exhibit commonalities in their form and content typical of
the Puritan conversion narrative. Because this chapter establishes the identifiable traits of the Puritan conversion genre, it largely devotes itself to a comparison of the works of Bradstreet and Rowlandson. However, in Chapter Three, which focuses on subversions within the conversion genre, Hutchinson and Bradstreet, as contemporaries, invite a more provocative comparison because of their resistances to their period's cultural inscription of the maternal body as defiled in their treatments of the female body. Chapter Four devotes itself exclusively to Rowlandson, who was a generation younger than Bradstreet and Hutchinson, and whose narrative exemplifies a more extreme level of resistance to patriarchal embodiment of female identity.

While Hutchinson's texts cannot be defined easily within a literary framework, her practice of spirituality, conveyed in her transcripts, can be placed within Puritan pietistic traditions. While it is difficult to place Hutchinson's texts within literary traditions, it is more possible to place her practice of piety, as conveyed in her texts, within Puritan conversion traditions. The Antinomianism that Hutchinson was accused of practicing actually represented a revival of an Augustinian mystical strain already existent within the religion. As the first crisis in Puritan identity in the first-generation of colonists, the theological disagreements at the heart of the Antinomian Crisis were
exacerbated by tensions in gender and class relations. While Anne Hutchinson's gender and merchant class status fueled the elitist theocracy's hostility against her, the theological issue debated in the crisis, in general, was the proper balance between duties and grace in the pursuit of salvation, an ongoing and unresolved dilemma for many Puritan ministers. The Antinomians emphasized the "covenant of grace," which assumed the convert's rebirth through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit to be the sign of election, over a "covenant of works," which tended to place more stress on outward holiness as a sign of redemption. Since the Antinomians believed that conversion, which bound devotees to the "laws of grace," exempted converts from reliance on any of the accoutrements of institutional religion, they posed a threat to the power of the elite theocracy, who expected compliance to human law and man's "works" (Hall 3). Indeed, the term "Antinomian," meaning "against the law," was a pejorative word with which the conservative ministry labeled its religious opponents. The immediate issue sparking the Antinomian Controversy was the continuance of John Wilson as pastor of the First Church of Boston, whom the Antinomians accused of degrading gospel promises into

4 Ross Pudaloff gives a succinct summary of the scholarship addressing the three factors, theology, class, and gender, contributing to the crisis. See his "Sign and Subject: Antinomianism in Massachusetts Bay" in Semiotica 54-1/2 (1985), p. 150.
a covenant of works. In the fall of 1636, in an attempt to oust John Wilson, the Antinomians nominated Anne Hutchinson's brother-in-law, John Wheelwright, as a candidate to join John Cotton as second teacher to the church. Wheelwright's fast-day sermon, the pretext for the theocracy's banishment of him in March of 1637, eight months before Hutchinson's first trial, divided the colony into two factions: those who based their assurance of election on sanctification, outward good works, and those who founded their assurance on justification, or the inner workings of the spirit.

Anne Hutchinson was brought to trial in November of 1637 in the middle of this fervor because her growing following in the church of Boston had prompted alarm in the governing ministers. While, like many Boston matrons, she held meetings in her home to summarize the week's sermons, she appeared to over-step the bounds of her gender role by attracting many male followers and by allegedly criticizing the ministry for preaching a covenant of works. While this trial resulted in her banishment to Rhode Island, where she eventually died at the hands of Native Americans in 1643, her subsequent trial in March held by the Boston Church, where she was accused of denying the resurrection of the body on Judgment Day, resulted in her ex-communication.

Because her church and civil trial transcripts do not constitute a conventional genre, they obviously lack the
identifiable formal traits of Puritan conversion narrative. In addition, their placement within such a discursive tradition is complicated by their unusual textual production. Both her civil and church trial transcripts are interdicted texts, each including a polylogue of at least six different voices, besides Hutchinson's, and their content comprises the impressions of an anonymous court recorder, whose reliability and objectivity cannot be made certain. In addition, their original copies are no longer extant. The report of her civil court trial first appeared as an appendix to the second volume of the *History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay* (Boston, 1767), authored by Thomas Hutchinson, the great-great grandson of Anne and a well-known figure in pre-revolutionary Massachusetts. The original manuscript is thought to have been lost in the destruction of Hutchinson's house during the Stamp Act riots of 1765. Current records of Anne Hutchinson's church trial derive from an eighteenth-century copy, made from the original text by Ezra Stiles, a minister in Newport who later became president of Yale University. This copy is collected in the Stiles Papers in the Yale University library.5

5 The records of both trials, as well as other documents pertaining to the Antinomian Controversy, are included in David D. Hall's *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636-1638: A Documentary History* (1968).
With the increased regulation of women's speech in Massachusetts churches after Hutchinson's banishment and with the more general restrictions on female authorship in the colony in the 1600s, it appears paradoxical that America's first poet and its first author of a book-length work of prose were both women. As properly modest "daughters of Zion," neither Anne Bradstreet nor Mary Rowlandson sought publication, yet the former's collection of poetry and the latter's book-length captivity tale enjoyed immediate success in the colony and abroad. Because their writings took as their primary focus the story of the soul's movement from sin to grace, what Shea calls the "ur-narrative" that defines the "autobiographical" in Puritan literature ("Prehistory" 31), Bradstreet and Rowlandson also may be distinguished as the first women in America to publish autobiographical expressions.

Paradoxically, it is not in spite of their gender, but because of it, that they have won these titles of "firsts." If as Patricia Caldwell argues, the female writer's quest for a voice--a defining characteristic of women's literature--served as an effective analogy to the New World's search for an identity ("Why Our First Poet" 28), then Bradstreet and Rowlandson could effectively symbolize the nascent America, attaining a "representativeness" historically attributed to male writers. Because conversion allegory conventionally
ascribed to the soul presumably "feminine" traits, most notably a passive receptivity to grace, it also lent to Bradstreet's and Rowlandson's spiritual pilgrimages a "representativeness" that critics traditionally have placed at the opposite side of the critical spectrum from female authors. Yet, at the same time that their use of gendered styles and imagery made them effective symbols of the emerging New England, it also compelled them to negotiate the ideologies of female identity that shaped their self-images and their audience's expectations. Because of Puritanism's embodiment of their identities, specifically, its association of sin and flesh with femaleness, they shared a similar challenge: to not only establish their literary and spiritual authority but also to forge an affirmative or alternative subjectivity within an essentializing discourse that yoked their minds and souls to their sexual difference.

It is true that Bradstreet's creative gift was fostered throughout her life by her father, Thomas Dudley, who, as a member of privileged English middle-class gentry, also wrote poetry, and by her husband, Simon, to whom she addressed much of her verse. In contrast, Rowlandson's literary production was a single event, precipitated by her captivity and by her and her community's later needs to discover in her extraordinary experience an exemplary sainthood. Although both women initially wrote their works privately, they entered the
world of public letters under the sponsorship of male authorities and conforming to the conditions for female authorship later articulated by Cotton Mather—that they embody ideal Puritan womanhood and restrict themselves to the language of piety.

Because restrictions on women's writing applied to the domestic sphere as well as the public arena, Bradstreet apparently received criticism for simply composing verse at home when she presumably could have been attending more totally to her huswifery duties. Biographer Anne Stanford speculates that Bradstreet's defense of female authorship in "The Prologue," probably composed between 1641 and 1643, may have been a response to possible objections to her writing by Governor John Winthrop, who was Anne Hutchinson's major prosecutor, to whose attention her privately circulated poems may have been brought by way of his son-in-law, Anne's brother, Samuel (64).

In an undisguised protest against the limitations on female authorship, she objects in the fifth sestet of this poem:

I am obnoxious to each carping tongue
Who says my hand a needle better fits,
A poet's pen all scorn I should thus wrong,
For such despite they cast on female wits:
If what I do prove well, it won't advance,
They'll say it's stol'n, or else it was by chance. (Bradstreet 16)
The "carping tongues" of her critics, however, did not prevent her from continuing to write and to share her meditations and elegies in the domestic sphere, a literary vocation that finally led to unsought-for publication.

In 1650, Bradstreet's brother-in-law, John Woodbridge, published her manuscript, copied for private circulation, in London under the title, The Tenth Muse, Lately Sprung Up In America. Although this publication was effected without Bradstreet's knowledge—an indication, in itself, of the limited authority women exerted over their own words--its rarity and transgressiveness were evidenced by the twelve pages of prefatory material introduced by Woodbridge to attest to the poet's character. Woodbridge included not only his own foreword and accompanying poem, but also verse tributes by five friends of his, from whom he had solicited written endorsements of his publishing project, as well as poems by his brother, William, and Bradstreet's friend, Nathaniel Ward.

Anticipating readers' "unbelief" that the book was authored by a woman, Woodbridge extols Bradstreet's piety, humility, deference, and commitment to domesticity, disqualifying her from Cotton Mather's category of "amazons" and crediting her as his ideal of "virtuous scholar":

It is the work of a woman, honoured, and esteemed where she lives, for her gracious
demeanour, her eminent parts, her pious conversation, her courteous disposition, her exact diligence in her place, and discrete managing of her family occasions, and more than so, these poems are the fruit but of some few hours, curtailed from her sleep and other refreshments. (Bradstreet 3)

In his accompanying poem, "To My Dear Sister, The Author of These Poems," Woodbridge praises Bradstreet's accomplishment as "for a woman's work 'tis rare," naming her the tenth of the nine muses, and distinguishing her from other woman authors, whose motives for writing, he suspects, are simply to step out of their place. Their books, he denigrates as "so witless, intricate,/ so void of sense, and truth, as if to err/Were only wished (acting above their sphere)" (Bradstreet 5). Anticipating his sister-in-law's embarrassment and anger about her unexpected publication, Woodbridge also introduces a comparison between childbirth and her literary production, eliciting a dialogue with her, which would not appear in print until the posthumous second edition, about the patriarchal linking of women's intellects to their bodies. In rhyming couplets of iambic pentameter, Woodbridge tells his sister-in-law:

If you shall think it will be to your shame
to be in print, then I must bear the blame;
If 't be a fault, 'tis mine, 'tis shame that might
Deny so fair an infant of its right
To look abroad; I know your modest mind,
How you will blush, complain, 'tis too unkind:
to force a woman's birth, provoke her pain,
Expose her labours to the world's disdain.

(Bradstreet 6)
Embarrassed by the typographical errors and imperfections in her printed poems, Bradstreet corrected them, added to them, and looked forward to a revised collection although this second edition, *Several Poems Compiled with great variety of Wit and Learning, full of Delight*, did not appear until 1678 in Boston after her death. In "An Author to her Book," composed some time between 1650 and 1670 for this second edition, she develops Woodbridge's childbirth comparison into the controlling conceit of her poem, foregrounding biological maternity in a way similar to that in her 1656 autobiography. Her witty reply to Woodbridge's verse, belying an anxiety of authorship that feminists Gubar and Gilbert have identified in many woman writers (48-49), decries what she calls the "ill-formed offspring of my feeble brain,/who after birth didst by my side remain,/till snatched from thence by friends, less wise than true,/Who thee abroad, exposed to public view" (Bradstreet 221). Although she did not live to see the publication of her planned second collection, it was published in 1678 with additional poems, found among her personal papers and included by her editor. Almost a century later, John Harvard Ellis edited and collected the entirety of her oeuvre in *The Works of Anne Bradstreet in Prose and Verse* (1867), adding a number of pieces, including her brief autobiography, "To My Dear Children," which broaches the subject of the relationship between
women's procreativity and writing developed in "An Author
to her Book."

The conditions of Mary Rowlandson's publication are
similar to those of Bradstreet although the event
precipitating her composition--her capture by Native
Americans during the colonists' year-long war with
Metacom, the sachem of the Wampanoags whom the English
called "King Philip."---differs dramatically from
Bradstreet's life-long literary vocation. On February 10,
1675, Rowlandson's home, one of six garrisoned houses in
Lancaster, Massachusetts, was attacked by an alliance of
Wamponoag, Nipmuck, and Narragansett Indians after
Rowlandson's husband, Joseph, a prominent minister, and
his brother-in-law, Henry Kerley, had gone to Boston to
request protection from the Massachusetts General
Assembly. Wounded in the side, Rowlandson was taken
captive by Narragansetts along with her injured six-year-
old daughter, Sarah, who died within their first week of
captivity; captured by Nipmucks were Rowlandson's older
children, 14-year-old Joseph and 10-year-old Mary, with
whom she was able to have brief meetings during their
captivities. A total of thirty-six people in the attack
were killed or captured with casualties including
Rowlandson's sister, Elizabeth Kerley, and two of her
children, as well as several other relatives. Sold by her
Narragansettt captor to his sachem, Quinnapin, Rowlandson,
who was recognized as a valuable hostage because of her
husband's prominence, became a servant of his and his three wives, primarily Weetamoo, a squaw sachem of the Pocassets, who in 1675 had joined the Narragansetts in Nipmuck territory. For almost three months, she endured forced marching over almost 150 miles of wintry terrain as the Narragansetts retreated from the English, scavenging for food because they had been cut off from their supply of corn. Finally, on May 3, 1676, Rowlandson's husband, probably with the help of the magistrate Increase Mather, negotiated her return home, paying a ransom set by her of twenty pounds. After the subsequent release of their children, Joseph and Mary, in late June, the Rowlandsons spent a year in Boston to restore their lives, finally moving to Wethersfield, Connecticut in the spring of 1677, where Joseph Rowlandson was recalled to the ministry and where Mary Rowlandson likely composed her narrative in 1677 or 1678. While Rowlandson's tale was circulated privately among family and friends, it was not published until 1682 by printer Samuel Greene, Jr. in Cambridge, Massachusetts under the likely sponsorship of Increase Mather, who had not only facilitated Rowlandson's release, but who also had pursued an interest in Indian captivity by collecting the stories of former captives and of other survivors of catastrophes for his 1684 book, An Essay for the Recording of Illustrious Providences. In fact, Mather is the probable author of the anonymous preface to Rowlandson's published narrative, which delineates the
role of divine providence in her captivity and in New England's war with Metacom.6 Because of her temporary habitation, however forced, in a culture her community considered forbidden and inferior, Rowlandson, perhaps more urgently than Bradstreet, was compelled to project a persona in her narrative of virtue and deference.

Since Puritan autobiography typically assumes the body to be the site of the soul's struggle for salvation, both Bradstreet and Rowlandson make the body a central image in their works. According to an appendix prepared by Rose Shade and included in Stanford's biography, the human body is the most frequent figure to appear in Bradstreet's works, out of forty categories of recurrent images (133). Such preoccupation with the body, no doubt, not only arose from the centrality of the body in conversion language, but also from Bradstreet's literal experiences of the body: from her lameness, a life-long side-effect of the smallpox she suffered at age sixteen, which she attributes, in her autobiography, to God's loving correction of her; from her chronic illnesses; her eight childbirths, her breastfeedings, and childcare; from the deaths she witnessed or grieved in her family; and from her initial—and probably ongoing—adaptation to the

6 Most Rowlandson scholars agree that Increase Mather was the author of her preface and the sponsor of her publication. For an appraisal of Mather's role in her publication, see Breitwieser's American Puritanism and the Defense of Mourning, p. 10.
climate and the primitive conditions of the New World, which contrasted so sharply with the comfortable, genteel life she led in England as a girl growing up on the Earl of Lincoln's estate, managed by her father. Bradstreet's preoccupation with the body likely also resulted from her consciousness of her culture's inscriptions of the female body with contradictory meanings—-with, on the one hand, an affirmation of tender mothering but on the other, a pejorative identification of the natural mother and of woman, in general, with sin. These experiences of the body, as well as those of the world and nature, Bradstreet transforms into her discursive explorations of the self's conflict between its attachment to the flesh and its yearning for the divine. Bradstreet consistently casts this conflict in the language of the Puritan doctrine of weaned affections, which she explicitly enunciates in segment 38 of "Meditations Divine and morall," a series of prose pieces probably composed in the last decade of her life and published in the Ellis collection in 1867. In its comparison of weaning to the conversion process, it explains the purpose of earthly suffering as God's impetus to re-direct Christians' desires for the temporal world onto the eternal one:

Some children are hardly weaned; although the teat be rubbed with wormwood or mustard, they will either wipe it off, or else suck down sweet and bitter together. So is it with some Christians: let God embitter all the sweets of this life, that so they might feed upon more
substantial food, yet they are so childishly sottish that they are still hugging and sucking these empty breasts that God is forced to hedge up their way with thorns or lay affliction on their loins that so they might shake hands with the world, before it bid them farewell. (279)

A similar epigram in "Meditations Divine and Morall," but one which evokes sexual rather than weaning imagery, describes the insatiability of the soul's appetites, which are satisfiable only by union with the divine, a nuptial metaphor inspired by the Canticles and recurrent in many Puritan sermons. Meditation 51 depicts the body as the mortal container of the soul, whose inner recesses can only be filled with the spiritual plenitude of God:

The eyes and the ears are the inlets or doors of the soul, through which innumerable objects enter; yet is not that spacious room filled, neither doth it ever say it is enough, but like daughters of the horseleach, cries, "Give, give"; and which is most strange, the more it receives, the more empty it finds itself and sees an impossibility ever to be filled but by Him in whom all fullness dwells. (282)

While the comparison of spiritual yearnings to sexual desires is a common trope in Bradstreet's verse, most notably in her addresses to Simon, "To My Dear and Loving Husband" and "A Letter to her Husband, Absent upon Public Employment," the metaphors of weaning and procreativity dominate in her poem dramatizing the Puritan self, "The Flesh and the Spirit" and in her autobiography, "To My Dear Children." While weaning was a common metaphor in Puritan discourse to explain Christians' relationship to
the temporal and eternal worlds, it may have been an especially meaningful trope to Puritan mothers like Anne Bradstreet, who saw in their literal breast-feeding and weaning of infants the figurative process of the soul's progression to Christ; even more significantly, this female imagery permitted Bradstreet to foreground maternal narrative and so to privilege a female subjectivity customarily suppressed in the patriarchal culture.

Biographer Stanford classifies "The Flesh and the Spirit" and "To My Dear Children" within the "Andover Poems," written after the Bradstreets' move from Ipswich to Andover, Massachusetts in the mid-1640s. As she argues, they reflect an increasing emphasis on religion, developing the themes of the Christian battle between spirit and flesh, the reliance on God during affliction, and the appreciation of nature as a manifestation of God (79). While Bradstreet's vision of nature as the creation of a benevolent God, best exemplified in her long poem "Contemplations," differs significantly from Mary Rowlandson's appraisal of nature as a "howling wilderness" (326), her interlocking of the soul and the body as constituents of the self as well as her interpretation of bodily affliction as a sign of election are typically Puritan themes also explored by Rowlandson. These themes were especially resonant for mid-seventeenth-century Massachusetts women who were subject to cultural embodiment.
As scholar Rosamond Rosenmeier suggests, Anne Bradstreet's poetic pursuit was to understand the relationship between contraries (191), as her poetic allegory of the Puritan self, "The Flesh and the Spirit," exemplifies. Her interest in culturally constructed dualisms likely evolved from her negotiations in her life of the paradoxes in Puritan doctrine: of interpreting suffering as divine favoritism, of recognizing one's sainthood in one's uncertainty about salvation, and of living in the world without being of it. This need to comprehend and reconcile opposites also may have evolved from her sense of a dual national identity, of being English, yet of becoming American in a country initially against whose "new world and new manners" her "heart rose" (Bradstreet "To My Dear Children" 241). Finally, her attention to dualisms likely emerged from her awareness of her own alterity in a culture and discourse that positioned her and other women as silent unrepresentable others. No doubt, Bradstreet was aware of the relative privilege she retained as a result of her overall outward compliance to the "law of the father" compared to the disenfranchisements of her more transgressive counterparts, Anne Hutchinson, in whose 1637 trial both Simon Bradstreet and Thomas Dudley had participated, and her "prophesying" sister, Sarah, whose 1647 excommunication had occurred three years before The Tenth Muse's publication.
"The Flesh and the Spirit" dramatizes what Sacvan Bercovitch calls the proverbial "automachia," or "war within the self" (19) that animates most orthodox Puritan autobiographical writings. In it, Bradstreet ultimately presents a reconciled relationship between body and soul, the apotheosis of which is a vision of heaven as the interpenetration of the corporeal and the eternal. Yet the dramatic structure of Bradstreet's poem is not an interior battle within the speaker, as it is in Puritan poet George Goodwin's popular "Auto-Machia" (1607), but a verbal duel between the twin sisters Flesh and Spirit, set in a pastoral environment and overheard by a frame narrator. This allegory epitomizes the rationalist model of selfhood whereby the convert regulates her worldly desires through her reason and the exercise of her will, thus opening her soul to the workings of grace. Based on the conflict between mortality and spirit, between the visible world and the invisible kingdom, described in Chapter 8 of Paul's letter to Romans,—a scripture later introduced in Increase Mather's preface to Mary Rowlandson's tale as a forecast to her story—their dialogue utilizes the martial and alimentary language evoked in many Puritan sermons, journals, and autobiographies to characterize the self. As extensions of the mind of the speaker, the two sisters personify the interlocking body and soul that comprise the Puritan identity. These two figures they derive from seventeenth-century poetic conventions, in particular,
from the contesting sisters in Book II, No. 14 of Francis Quarles' 1639 *Emblemes and Hieroglyphikes*. However, Bradstreet's characterizations differ from Quarles' in that her version of Spirit persuades Flesh, not with threatening images of a "fire and brimstone" hell, but with enticing visions of a heavenly New Jerusalem, anticipated in the Book of Revelation (Stanford Anne Bradstreet 85). As Rosenmeier concludes, it is, in part, through the use of typology, specifically, through Spirit's evocation of the language of promise of the Books of Revelation and Isaiah, that Bradstreet reconciles the gap between soul and flesh (191). While Bradstreet refrains from interrogating this Puritan association of sin with woman, conventionally characterizing Flesh as too "unclean" for heaven, she endows the soul, which was commonly figured as passively receptive to grace, with rationalism and an active moral agency. Although she foregrounds the maternal more directly in her autobiography than in this poem, Bradstreet suggests in the language of the speakers the Puritan doctrine of "weaned affections," of converts' need to transfer their attachment to the world and the flesh onto Christ, the perennial source of sustenance.

Seamlessly divided into two stanzas of iambic tetrameter, whose terminal rhymes are couplets, "The Flesh and the Spirit" depicts body and soul as engaged in a "deadly feud" over the question of where "true substance"
and satisfaction lie. Flesh accuses her twin of "feeding" too much on unearthly contemplation and on placing her hope in invisible "treasures" that exist "beyond the moon," what Flesh denounces as mere "shadows." Tempting her sister with what she considers to be "true substance," with fame, the earthly riches of "silver, pearls, and gold," and with pleasure, Flesh challenges Spirit to:

...Take they fill,  
Earth hath enough of what you will.  
Then let not go, what thou may'st find  
For things unknown, only in mind. (216)

In rebuttal, Spirit silences this "unregenerate part," describing her as a "foe" whose words have often deceived her into becoming a "slave." In a culmination of martial and alimentary metaphors, Spirit finally proclaims:

My greatest honor it shall be  
When I am victor over thee,  
And triumph shall with laurel head,  
When thou my captive shalt be led,  
How do I live, thou need'st not scoff.  
For I have meat thou know'st not of;  
The hidden manna I do eat,  
The word of life it is my meat. (60)

Reversing the familiar Puritan trope for sin as the soul's bondage to flesh, the triumphant Spirit, who thrives on the bread of heaven, subdues her unregenerate part and takes her captive. The "hidden manna," the symbol of God's grace that Bradstreet also uses in her autobiography, is an Old Testament prefigurement of Christ in the form of
the heavenly bread with which God feeds the Jews during their Exodus and an allusion to the mystical manna promised by the Spirit to the Christian in Revelation 2:17 (Rosenmeier 192). Spirit's conquest, however, occurs not in the present but the future tense, for it is the self's unceasing combat between faith and doubt--the last stage in the conversion process--that distinguishes the elect from the damned. Paradoxically, Spirit's vision of the invisible kingdom is replete with a material beauty against which the treasures of the visible world pale. It is by means of the promise of this corporeal heaven that Spirit weans Flesh from her attachment to the world to the source of perpetual sustenance. Typical of Bradstreet, however, persists a lingering attraction to the world, reinforced by the image of Spirit's sibling relation to Flesh and by her hope for their continued co-existence in a lavish eternal paradise. This connection to the world is additionally suggested in the act of Spirit's leading Flesh above, a simultaneous ascent reflecting Bradstreet's orthodox belief in the resurrection of the body with the soul on Judgment Day.

Just as the self in Bradstreet's poem must wean itself of its affections for the world and transfer its earthly attachment to the eternal realm, so the poet in "To My Dear Children," as this dissertation discusses in Chapter 3, represents the mortal maternal body as a bridge to her
own immortality as well as to the regeneration of her children's souls.

Bradstreet composed this private relation addressed to her children in 1656 when she believed she was dying (although she did not die until sixteen years later). More than Rowlandson's account, which is a hybrid of Indian captivity narrative and religious allegory, Bradstreet's autobiography appears to fit the generic conventions of Puritan conversion narrative. Although, as Chapter 3 of this dissertation later suggests, Bradstreet engenders this genre through her use of the common childbirth metaphor to signify her spiritual authority, her autobiography appears to adhere to the mechanistic pattern of most Puritan conversion narratives.

Demonstrating her argument that God sends trials to benefit those he favors and then rewards them with grace, with "abundance of sweetness and refreshment after affliction" (242), Bradstreet organizes her recollection according to the stages of what scholar Edmund Morgan calls the Puritan "morphology of conversion" (68-69). She begins with her awareness of her sinfulness at age six or seven, the years when Puritans introduced religious instruction to their children" (Leverenz 76); then with her growing understanding of faith gained through reading scriptures, and with her suffering of chronic illnesses, which she interprets as God's loving corrections of her for neglected duties or unacknowledged sins. She continues
with her recollections of her religious doubts, manifest in such temptations as her doctrinal questioning of the Trinity and her attractions to Catholicism and atheism. As Shea points out, Bradstreet's autobiography exposes an imbalance in her life between times of despair and spiritual contentment that is not compensated for by the devotional intensity typical of most writers of her period (Spiritual Autobiography 117). She regrets that she has "not found that constant joy in [her] pilgrimage and refreshing which [she] supposed most of the servants of God have" although she qualifies that "God hath not left [her] altogether without the witness of His holy spirit...." (243). Evoking the alimentary language of grace drawn from the Book of Revelations, she confides:

I have sometimes tasted of that hidden manna that the world knows not, and have set up my Ebenezer, and have resolved with myself that against such a promise, such tastes of sweetness, the gates of hell shall never prevail; yet have I many times sinkings and droopings, and not enjoyed that felicity that sometimes I have done. (243)

However, she resolves that she always returns to her faith in "the Lord," conveying the Miltonic idea that damnation is an interior psychological place as she advises her children that "in truth it is the absence and presence of God that makes heaven or hell" (243). Finally reasoning that "even the very elect are deceived" and concluding that "all the Powers of Hell shall never prevail" against
her faith in Christ (243), she appears to have arrived at a "true assurance" of her salvation.

Since both Bradstreet's and Rowlandson's investigations of the self operate as orthodox conversion narratives, they share conventions of the Puritan autobiographical tradition, especially an interest in the representation of the body. Just as the body, whether it is desiring, procreative, or suffering, is a central image in Bradstreet's struggle for salvation, so the captive body becomes Rowlandson's literal and rhetorical means for appraising the status of her election. Just as Rowlandson, like Bradstreet, dramatizes her body as the site of her soul's struggle for immortality, so she organizes her spiritual pilgrimage according to a formulaic morphology of conversion. While Bradstreet's writings arrive at a surety about her election, as much faith as a saint could evince without relinquishing her salvation, much of Rowlandson's narrative vacillates between hope and despair, resonating with uncertainty even after her restoration to her culture. These authors' historical contexts and intended audiences may account for the degree of difference in their tones and self-representations. Since Bradstreet composed "To My Dear Children" for her family when she believed she was dying, her private voice is uninfluenced by a public audience's expectations. Rowlandson, on the other hand, in her composition's transition from private devotional to public document,
constructed herself as an exemplum fidei to her community as well as a typological symbol of New England's historical "errand into the wilderness," evoked through her allusions to the Israelites' escape from captivity to Canaan.

The effect of her self-representations is more complicated than that of Bradstreet's because of the socio-political as well as the devotional purpose of her publication. Because of her reliance on a binary symbolism that casts herself as the representative soul, and the Narragansetts, as Satan, her religious allegory functions as what contemporary post-colonial theorist JanMohamed calls "manichean allegory," a type of colonialist literature in which colonizers exert a sense of moral superiority over the indigenous culture and insist on a "nondialectical and fixed opposition between self and native" (84). Sustaining manichean allegory is, according to JanMohamed, a set of "diverse yet interchangeable oppositions between white and black, good and evil, superiority and inferiority, civilization and savagery, intelligence and emotion, rationality and sensuality, self and Other, subject and object" (82).

Rowlandson's text demonstrates how sexist and racist ideologies of the universal subject collude to position "woman" and "native" in a similar alterity as "other," as key post-colonial feminist studies like Trinh T. Minh-ha's Woman, Native, Other (1989) suggest. As she produces
colonialist images of the Narragansetts, Rowlandson simultaneously relies on the patriarchy's languages of martyrdom, biblical typology, and conversion allegory to produce her own self-representations as the afflicted saint, the Judea Capta, and the unregenerate soul. Critic Lisa Logan claims that Rowlandson's body undergoes a double-violation at the hands of this dominant language that insists on reducing it to an emblem for the sake of her community's spiritual renewal (271). However, as this dissertation argues, in Chapter 4, these cultural inscriptions of the female body, combined with Rowlandson's use of colonialist representations of the Native Americans, provide a means for her tale's destabilization of the hegemonic model of conversion. To understand how these social constructions of the body act as destabilizing dimensions in her narrative, one must first understand Rowlandson's use of the hegemonic models of selfhood that help her sustain the conventional religious allegory and spiritual autobiography practiced by Bradstreet.

First, Rowlandson dramatizes the afflicted body of the saint, a self-representation that permits her to identify with the suffering martyrs of the Old Testament and so to demonstrate her sainthood to both herself and her community and to justify her spiritual and literary authority. At the same time that Rowlandson interprets her experience according to the doctrine of providential
affliction and by means of a discourse of martyrdom—one of the few languages considered appropriate for Puritan women's inscription of their self-worth (Toulouse "'My Own Credit'" 659)—she translates her literal captivity by the Narragansetts into an allegory of the soul's bondage to flesh, creating a more elaborate exploration of the Puritan model of selfhood symbolized by Bradstreet in "The Flesh and the Spirit." The difference between these writers' treatments of this formulaic allegory of conversion arises from differences in the historical circumstances shaping their authorships: As a first-generation Puritan who arrived on the Arbella in 1630, Bradstreet imposes an Elizabethan sense of order on her chaotic experiences of the New World by discursively reconciling contraries, especially the opposition of body and soul, through the metaphor of weaned affections. In contrast, the younger Rowlandson, writing in the 1670s, emphasizes unregenerate flesh more than its sublimation into spiritualized corporeity, in part, to stress the pre-conversion stage of her own spiritual journey and, in part, to conform to the hegemonic intent of her sponsor, Increase Mather: to dramatize, through her self-representation, the younger Puritan generation's sinfulness. This generation's back-sliding ways, Mather claimed, caused God's punishment of New England through Metacom's War, an argument he used to justify the colony's involvement in the conflict. As this dissertation argues
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in Chapter 4, using Julia Kristeva's analysis of the abject and the sublime in the Christian subject, Rowlandson's emphasis on her immersion in sin, more than on the sublimating spirituality to which it is hoped to lead, calls attention to what Elizabeth Grosz calls the abjection that is "the underside of the symbolic" (89). As Chapter 4 demonstrates, Rowlandson's emphasis on her abject defilement more than on its sublimation into spirituality threatens to destabilize the rationalist model of conversion on which the theocracy relied for the consolidation of control and the maintenance of cultural cohesion.

While Rowlandson's composition of her tale served as a private tool for her understanding and recovering from her suffering, its published product functioned as both devotional literature for its audience and as a socio-political instrument for solidifying an already crumbling religious community. So significant were the personal and financial losses incurred by Metacom's, which proved the costliest of any American conflict in terms of human life (Slotkin and Folsom 3), that the theocrats responsible for waging the war, especially Increase Mather, felt accountable for justifying their implication in it and for appeasing the colonists' resentments about it. Just as both generations of Mathers, Increase and his son, Cotton—under whose administration the 1692 Salem witchcraft trials took place—exploited in their sermons the
emblematic potential of redeemed captives' stories (Kolodny 25-27), so the elder Mather sponsored the publication of Rowlandson's tale, in part, because it could usefully present the suffering of New England, symbolized in the figure of the bereft woman, as divinely ordained.

As one of the war's instigators—the colonists' land hunger—reveals, the conflict was one reflection of the political and religious changes marking the decade of the 1670s in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Threatened by the increasingly secular values of the younger generation, who were moving away, both geographically and spiritually, from the center of its authority, the Puritan theocracy strove to attract its members back to its jurisdiction by relaxing the selective requirements for church admission. So problematic was the dwindling of the conversion experiences that served as prerequisites for church membership, for participation in communion, and indirectly, for political citizenship, that the Puritan magistracy, after much controversy, passed the Half-Way Covenant in 1662, three years before the outbreak of Metacom's War. This compromise allowed the children of converted parents, if they exhibited Christian character, to participate conditionally in communion without giving testimonials of their experiences of grace.

To warn their parishioners of their backsliding ways, the Puritan sermons of this decade often equated the
waywardness of the younger generation with female sexuality or victimization. In a sermon dated 1672, for example—about three years before Mary Rowlandson's capture—Thomas Shepherd, Jr. compared New England's disrespect for God and ministerial authority to an adulterous wife. In the same address, he described New England as a victim of the transgressions of her people by alluding to the "poor woman of the wilderness" in Revelation, who is running from the "dragon" of sin (Porterfield 134). Such rhetorical images also reflected the popular characterization of the Puritan wife as a snail who remained so attached to her home that wandering away from it would constitute, in the Puritan imagination, an infidelity (Karlsen 170-171).

This popular cultural association of sin with the figure of a victimized or straying woman both constrained and enabled Rowlandson's creation of the self-representations that were conventional in Puritan autobiography and religious allegory. On the one hand, the cultural identification of sin with errant woman, exacerbated by the Anglo-Americans' real anxiety about miscegenation and transculturation, compelled Rowlandson, like other white women who had been coerced into captivity, to defend her chastity despite the low incidence of sexual assault by Native Americans. In her conclusion, as she credits God, not the Narragansetts, for sparing her of rape, Rowlandson candidly says that
although captors and hostages were "sleeping all sorts together," that the Narragansetts, whom she denigrates as "roaring lions, and savage bears," did not inflict "the least abuse of unchastity to [her], in word or action" (361). Crucially, her comfortable re-integration into her patriarchal Anglo-American culture was contingent on her defense of the purity of her body and by extension, of her national identity—on her disavowal of what would be viewed as any physical or cultural contamination by the Narragansetts.

On the other hand, the popular associations of transgression with victimized or erring womanhood enabled Rowlandson to heighten the effects of her self-representations as an afflicted martyr and as the representative soul progressing from sin to grace. These two self-representations tend to correspond to the two intertwining rhetorical modes structuring her recollection: the first is autobiographical narration, which like Bradstreet's "To My Dear Children," attempts to allay spiritual doubt and to rationalize suffering; the second is religious allegory, like that sustained in Bradstreet's "The Flesh and the Spirit," under which Rowlandson intends to subsume her personal account.

Except for its unusual subject matter, its dramatic narrative pacing and its graphic realism, Rowlandson's autobiographical account appears to trace the formulaic stages of conversion and to adhere to the belief in
providential affliction expressed in Bradstreet's spiritual relation. Just as Bradstreet sees her initial infertility, her chronic illnesses, and other losses in her life as reminders from God of her spiritual strayings, so Rowlandson sees her disruption of her home and her subsequent captivity as divine corrections of her spiritual complacency. In her conclusion, she confides that in order to have a sign of God's favoritism, which he paradoxically would show through afflicting her, she often had wished for a trial:

> Before I knew what affliction was, I was ready sometimes to wish for it. When I lived in prosperity, having the comforts of the world about me, my relations by me, my heart cheerful, and taking little care for anything; and yet seeing many, whom I preferred before myself, under many trials and afflictions, in sickness, weakness, poverty, losses, crosses and cares of the world, I should be jealous lest I should not have my portion in this life, and that scripture would come to mind, Hebrews 12.6. For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. But now I see the Lord had this time to scourge and chasten me. (365)

Although the first sentence of this reflection reveals, in its subordinate clause, Rowlandson's doubts—or even resentment—about the necessity of suffering to gain assurance of God's love, she encloses these unorthodox feelings with a scriptural reference, clinching, in a synopsis, the Puritan doctrine of providential affliction.

Just as Bradstreet makes sense of her trials in life by tracing her soul's movement through predictable stages
of conversion, so Rowlandson proves her sainthood to herself and to her community by tracing her progress from spiritual complacency, to awareness of sin, to despair and hopelessness about her soul's condition, and finally to "true assurance" of her election, which is accompanied, paradoxically, by her unceasing combat against spiritual doubt.

Her captivity compels her to become aware of past religious oversights and so her narrative becomes a vehicle for her confession of sin. In what she calls The Third Remove, she regrets "how many Sabbaths [she] had lost and misspent, and how evilly [she] had walked in God's sight," acknowledging that "it was easy for [her] to see how righteous it was with God to cut off the thread of [her] life, and cast [her] out of his presence forever" (328). In The Eighth Remove, she even repents her overuse of tobacco, what she calls that "bewitching thing" that distracts one from useful employment (337). Her captivity also suspends her in what the Puritans called the stage of "legal feare," or "conviction of sin," an unceasing vacillation between faith in, yet despair about her election. Her emulation of the passive forbearance that Puritanism demanded of those undergoing trials is reinforced by her allusions to such biblical analogues as the stories of Lot's wife (334) as well as those of David throughout, Job (7), Daniel (51), and the Prodigal Son (56). After her ransom and deliverance from her trial,
Rowlandson echoes the messages of the scriptures, Romans 8 and Judges 14, with which the author of her preface theologically frames her story: that she has been a "gainer" from her suffering because it has awakened her to the "extreme vanity of this world" (365) that is "but a shadow, a blast, a bubble" (366). While Bradstreet, at the end of her autobiography, bemoans the absence in her pilgrimage of the "constant joy" possessed by most Christians, Rowlandson marvels at the excess of affliction that God has apportioned her, describing its "full measure" in alimentary language as not "drops, now one drop and then another" but as "the dregs of the cup, the wine of astonishment, like a sweeping rain that leaveth no food" (366). While Bradstreet, on her supposed deathbed, ends her narrative with an arrival at faith, reminding herself that even the elect doubt, Rowlandson concludes with a more haunted religious certainty because of the gap between her theological assurance of her election and her incomplete emotional resolution of her suffering, manifest in her insomnia. If Rowlandson had kept her composition a private exercise, it is possible that her personal story of hardship and redemption would have assumed a structure as straightforward as that of Bradstreet's autobiography. However, with her audience, she intertwines her autobiographical narrative with rich layers of religious and historical allegory. Her captivity and eventual ransom provided a useful literal foundation for constructing
familiar religious symbolism. First, they supported the historical allegory, achieved through Rowlandson's use of biblical typology, of the Puritans' pre-ordained journey to the American Canaan, prefigured in the Old Testament story of the Jews' captivity in and ultimate deliverance from Egypt. Rowlandson evokes the Israelites' encampments in Exodus in the very structure of her narrative: she organizes her recollection not temporally, but spatially according to her twenty "removes" from home into the wilderness. Attesting to her communal obligation to inscribe the Puritans' historical destiny as the chosen people, her tale is steeped in biblical typology, with the majority of her eighty allusions referring to the Old Testament (Downing 253 and 255). Her gender makes her an effective symbol of the *Judea Capta*, David's image of the suffering Jews in captivity, to which she alludes in The Eighth Remove as she remembers shedding tears for the first time in front of her enemies. Her picture of herself weeping on the banks of the Connecticut River, typologically interpreted by her reference to Psalm 137.1-2--"by the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down: yea, we wept when we remembered Zion" (336)--crystallizes her self-representation as the *Judea Capta* that she develops throughout (Kolodny 19-20). Because the stories of female captives were so adaptable to the figure of the *Judea Capta*, Massachusetts ministers of the late seventeenth-century subsumed survivors' personal experiences under it.
to elicit their audiences' identification with this communal symbol of suffering sanctity. Exploiting its hegemonic function, Cotton Mather, for example, over ten years after Rowlandson's publication, adapted the captivity experiences of Hannah Dustin and Hannah Swarton to the *Judea Capta* type, editing their stories to emphasize God's sovereignty over the individual will (Kolodny 25-27).

At the same time that she translates her experience of capture, suffering, and redemption into an historical allegory of New England's destiny, she also transforms it into a religious allegory of the soul's bondage to flesh. Her servitude to the Narragansetts and her subsequent exchange between them and the English functioned effectively as the vehicle for the common biblical metaphor of the soul's purchase by and bondage to Satan and its final victorious emancipation by Christ. Her suffering female body, whose outer affliction enacts the inner trials of the soul, heightens this symbolism of the soul's enslavement to sin. In all, while Bradstreet's poetic version of the battle between flesh and spirit is a formal verbal duel regulated within tight metrical bounds, Rowlandson's dramatization is a manichean war between the temporal and spiritual kingdoms, represented within the intersection of patriarchal and colonialist discourse.

Like Bradstreet's "The Flesh and the Spirit," Rowlandson's allegory is an elaboration, in part, of the
conflict between the mortal body and the invisible spirit described by Paul in Romans 8. the scripture with which the author of the preface introduces her tale (although a typographical error mistakenly attributes it to the Old Testament story of Samson's riddle). Paul casts this battle in authoritarian hierarchical terms, imputing to humanity's lower nature the base pursuits of the body, and ascribing to the spiritual nature a rational obedience to the laws of God. Evoking the metaphors of captivity and transaction that Rowlandson's experience so effectively literalizes, Paul describes the lower nature as the purchased slave and prisoner of sin, doomed to die, while he affirms the indwelling spirit of Christ as an emancipatory gift, a dissolver of the "bondage of corruption" (The Geneva Bible 73). In the preceding chapter of Romans, 7:2-6, he uses the gendered analogy of adultery to distinguish between the service to God that the reborn converts embody and their previous obedience to religious legality. Just as wives are freed from the prohibition against adultery once their husbands die, so converts, he explains, once they achieve a spiritual marriage to Christ, are free from the written code that, by the power of suggestion, had stimulated in their bodies "the motions of sinnes" (The Geneva Bible 72).

While Paul's two-fold purpose is to favor the New Covenant of Christ's grace over the Old Covenant of slavishness to law and to explain how laws intended to
prevent sin inadvertently make it attractive, his gendered analogy perpetuates his association of womanhood with transgressive carnality recurrent in many of his letters. As the biblical precedent for Puritanism's embodiment of women's identities, Paul's letters to the Romans, as well as to the Corinthians, provided Puritan men with a "metaphorical understanding of gender relations," by which to project "their own ambivalence about Original Sin onto women" (Thickstun 4).

While Paul's paradigm of the soul's release from the shackles of mortality gave Rowlandson a metaphorical referent to her personal story of her progress through the stages of conversion, it implicated her in his--and Puritanism's--cultural construction of the female body as the site of disorderly sin. As part of her representation of this Pauline unregenerate soul, she emphasizes her body's hunger and satiation. Just as Bradstreet equates her initial infertility with spiritual sterility, Rowlandson correlates her physical starvation with her spiritual depletion. She figures this Pauline body in her images of eating defiled food and in her colonialist representations of Native American women, to whom she unconsciously compares herself. As Chapter Four of this dissertation will argue, her narrative demonstrates how the culturally inscribed body can destabilize the very discourses responsible for its social construction.
While Bradstreet's allegorical character, Spirit, reverses sin's conquest by leading the defeated Flesh to heaven, Rowlandson represents herself as not an active subject, but as the soul exchanging servitudes between the Devil and God. In the end, she attempts to exert a sense of mastery over her subordination in her own culture and over her former captors by invoking the power of the word and transforming herself into a writing subject.

While Rowlandson's and Bradstreet's narratives are comparable in their common use of generic conventions, they were not contemporaries like Hutchinson and Bradstreet. Thus this dissertation devotes a separate chapter to a comparison of their resistances to cultural embodiment, with a final and primary focus on Rowlandson's later and more subversive narrative.
As contemporaries, Anne Hutchinson and Anne Bradstreet provide a contrast in not only how their first-generation culture represented them but also in how they represented themselves in their autobiographical expressions. While Hutchinson was denigrated by the Puritan theocracy of the 1630s and 1640s as the temptress Eve, as, in Governor John Winthrop's words, "the breeder and nourisher of all these distempers" (262), Anne Bradstreet, in contrast, was extolled by the sponsor of her 1650 publication as a woman revered for "her exact diligence in her place" (Bradstreet 3). Tragically, Hutchinson's image in Puritan histories, so different from Bradstreet's, provides an example of the extremity with which Puritanism embodied women's identities, and in particular, embodied Hutchinson as what psycholinguist Julia Kristeva calls the abject mother, that which represents defiled corporeality and a threat to identity in subjective experience (6). Indeed, Hutchinson's prosecutions and her 1637 banishment to the outposts of Puritan "civilization" dramatize the privileged Puritan subject's abjecting of woman as defiled otherness and its insistence on re-assigning woman to the domain of nature. Unfortunately, Hutchinson's murder in
1643 by Native Americans at the border of Puritan culture-in a place in Long Island called "Hell-gate"—signified in her opponents' imaginations her rightly return to and dissolution by the very forces of unruly nature which, they believed, she and the Native Americans embodied.

Despite the contrasting privilege she enjoyed because of her class and more deferential persona, Bradstreet, nevertheless, had to negotiate in her life and writing some of the same cultural embodiment that afflicted Hutchinson. In part, because of the difference in the severity of their experience of gender oppression and in their methods of reacting to it, Hutchinson and Bradstreet respond very differently in their autobiographical expressions to their awareness of their bodies as the signs of their sexual difference and thus as the sources of the construction of their cultural oppression. Both women must negotiate Puritanism's inscriptions of the female body, specifically, the maternal body, as the site of the sinful mortality of the flesh. Hutchinson refuses the body as a founding identification of her subjectivity. She resists embodiment, along with what Luce Irigary calls patriarchal specularization, this theorist's scopic metaphor for woman's objectification in culture (144), by rendering the body as insignificant in her theology and by escaping into mysticism. Bradstreet, in contrast, foregrounds her maternal body in her assertion of spiritual authority in spite of the way it is socially
inscribed as the origin of the fleshly nature of the soul. By appropriating the childbirth metaphor for ministerial authority so prominent in the sermons of her period, she reinscribes the maternal body as a transmitter of spiritual knowledge. While Hutchinson refrains from questioning the cultural construction of the body as base, instead, privileging spirit over flesh, Bradstreet interrogates the gendered dualism of flesh and spirit by representing her maternal body, culturally identified with defilement in many sermons of her period, as the generator of grace.

In their self-representations, both these writers had to negotiate the gender ideologies of what Rosemary Skinner Keller simply calls "the good woman" and "the bad woman" (132--133), the two opposing Puritan views of woman's nature, which David Leverenz attributes, in his psychoanalytic approach to the "Puritan Family Romance," to women's conformity to or unacceptance of normative maternal roles (152). It is patriarchal culture's fear of "the bad woman" that brings into existence its idealization of "the good woman." While "the pure Mother," represented in Bradstreet, submits to the "pure Father," remaining the "good wife" as long as she limits her expression of her "emotional and assertive energies" to the home (Leverenz 152), the "willful" or "bad woman," represented in Hutchinson, steps out of the domestic sphere without the approval of male authority, aspiring
toward "intellectual and nonmothering identities" (Leverenz 133). These polarized images of female nature, not surprisingly, emerge in Cotton Mather's conditions for public female authorship in his identification of sin with the life of "Amazons" and in his advice to writers to emulate the virtuous women who have "done the part of Scholars in the World" (qtd. in Davis 49).

Puritanism's polar constructions of woman point to the obvious gap between gender ideologies and the synthesis of roles operating in the historical realities of women's lives: Hutchinson was both independent visionary and mother of fifteen children; Bradstreet, who properly wrote her poetry during her spare time between domestic responsibilities, was both artist and "pure Mother."

Conflicting with women's historical experiences, but emerging in social and religious ideologies, Puritanism's polar representations of female nature build on historically persistent dynamics in subjective experience, on what psycholinguist Julia Kristeva identifies as the subject's splitting of the mother into the "abject" and the "sublime" prior to and during its separation from the maternal body. As Kelly Oliver explains in her summary of Kristeva's psychoanalytic paradigm, this splitting allows the male subject to take up his socially prescribed heterosexual identity in the Symbolic Order, which founds the basis of patriarchal culture. In order to separate from the mother, he constructs her as the repugnant
abject, tainted by those bodily processes he associates with defilement and with his own corporeality. Designating the separation stage where the child is not yet the subject, and the mother, not yet the Other (Oliver 57), the abject provokes in him an ambivalent reaction of terror and fascination—for it is paradoxically both nourishment and a threat to autonomous identity. However, in order to acquire a heterosexual identity, he also elevates the mother into an object of love, transforming her image into that of the sublime (Oliver 61).

These split images of the abject and the sublime emerge later not only in the subject's psychological experiences and social discourses but also in religious languages. In Catholicism's veneration of the Virgin Mother, as Kristeva suggests in Stabat Mater (1976), the sublime functions to bring the power of the mother under paternal control, to "cove[r] over the tension between the maternal and the Symbolic" (Oliver 50). On the other hand, as she argues in Powers of Horror: an Essay on Abjection (1982), the Christian construct of sinning female flesh results from the inability of the subject's identification with the sublimity of Christ to transform, entirely, the abject into speech and spirituality. Thus, the identification of sin with female flesh is, as Kristeva concludes, a manifestation of the "nourishing" yet "threatening heterogeneity" of the maternal principle.
"reconciled with--but not entirely rehabilitated by--Christianity" (117).

Kristeva's analysis of the abject maternal body and its manifestation in the Judeo-Christian notion of sin provides a psychoanalytic explanation for the Puritan hegemony's embodiment of female identity. As Smith concludes, the subject's repudiation of its link to the abject body, a bond never entirely repressed, re-emerges in social orders in the subject's consolidation of its dominance through its construction of "others," including women, as essentially body. Just as the child's abjecting of the maternal body begins its development of ego-boundaries, so the patriarchal subject, in social systems, makes the body the "sorting mechanism" by which it assigns those who are "culturally dominant" and "culturally marginalized" to their "'proper' places" (Subjectivity 10).

Kristeva's interest in the stages of identity and difference reflects her political concern with who is excluded or who is honored in the social order. By creating psycholinguistic paradigms that explain the inclusion or rejection of difference in identity, she intends to provide ontological models for re-drawing the boundaries of the Symbolic and the social system (Oliver 150). She envisions how identity and the Symbolic can accommodate alterity without being disintegrated by it (Oliver 151). Just as Kristeva believes that subjects can
change the social order by changing the representation through which they live, so Sidonie Smith proposes the act of autobiography as a means for women to re-imagine female subjectivity. As this male-dominated genre press them into a certain type of subjectivity, many female narrators put pressure on the dominant language, bringing to its surface the difference already inscribed in it. As they revise discourse and re-vision the identities culturally ascribed to them, they also may engage their audiences in a process of re-imagining habitual ways of thinking and knowing.

Anne Hutchinson's Renunciation of Language and Body

Anne Hutchinson's 1637 civil trial serves as a useful paradigm of the Puritan woman's marginalized position in religious discourse and of her voice's capacity for destabilizing the language that founds patriarchal authority. Indeed, her trials exemplify the female subject's attempt to introduce her difference into public Puritan discourse in order to re-map its boundaries to accommodate an alternative religious style, and most significantly, a female spiritual authority. Summoned by the General Court in November 1637 to answer its questions about her presumably unconventional practice of piety, Hutchinson's rhetorical position at her civil trial replicates woman's alterity in Puritan language. Just as the entrance into speech of those embodied others historically excluded from representation brings with it a
"mess and clutter all around" (Smith *Subjectivity* 20)--a surfacing of the repressed heterogeneity of language--so Hutchinson uncovers, before her examiners' eyes, the heterodoxy already existent in Puritanism. In fact, as Andrew Delbanco observes, the theocrats' suppression of the Antinomians, who had revived a mystical strain already existent within Puritanism, was motivated by their fear of the "oldest of charges" against them--that "all Puritans were really [A]ntinomians at heart"; as Delbanco concludes, the Antinomian Crisis was both a threat and an opportunity for New England to exonerate itself of the charge, first voiced in England by such critics as theologian Richard Hooker, that Puritanism's emphasis on an inner experience of grace over an outward obedience to human law, would lead to religious fanaticism (145). Thus, the Antinomian Crisis, and Hutchinson's trial, in particular, brought to the surface those tensions and contradictions already operating in Puritanism, which it attempted to reconcile through a precariously strained synthesis of Biblicalism, rationalism, and mysticism (Maclear 45).

Hutchinson's trial transcripts not only reveal the troubled relationship between the Puritan female subject and patriarchal language, but also the troubled relationship between her and her body that discourses of embodiment exact. Hutchinson does not, like Bradstreet and Rowlandson, make her body a founding identification of her
subjectivity. That her body "drop[s] away as a location of autobiographical identity," however, to use Sidonie Smith's words (Subjectivity 23), is more the result of her practice of a mystical religious style and a theology that stressed the interior experience of Christ's grace over all that could be considered transient: the mortal body, human conduct and law, and even language itself. At the climax of her civil trial, for example, she announces her surrender of her mortal body to her opponents, elevating her spiritualized body and soul to Christ. Comparing herself to the biblical Daniel in the lions' den, she declares, "You have power over my body but the Lord Jesus hath power over my body and soul" (Hall 338). Hutchinson ultimately espouses a disembodied subjectivity that allows her a release from the "social fabrication of female embodiment" (Smith Subjectivity 101). Yet, her erasure of the body also prevents her from discovering in its cultural inscriptions, a vehicle for a subversive autobiographical practice. Indeed, her favoring of a disembodied subjectivity appears to sustain Puritanism's cultural assignment of baseness to the body, which anchors the privilege of the universal subject and its embodiment of women. Unlike Bradstreet and Rowlandson, who interrogate the binaries of man as spirit and woman as flesh by remaining within conversion narrative traditions, Hutchinson finally abdicates from the use of language itself, seeking refuge in mysticism, an affective,
interior religious style that has historically appealed to women. The seventeenth-century documents pertaining to Anne Hutchinson's prosecution in 1637-1638 reflect the search for the "truth" of representation that preoccupies authors and readers of auto/biography. On the one hand, the transcripts from her civil and church trials, although interdicted, preserve her autobiographical voice and remnants of her self-representation. In contrast, the histories composed by Puritan authorities during or after her trials, most notably John Winthrop's *A Short Story of the Rise, reign, and ruine of the Antinomians, Familists and Libertines*, published in 1644, promote hegemonic representations of her, recording not only the events of her trials but also her "monstrous birth" to a malformed still-born infant after her banishment and her later murder on Long Island by Native Americans in 1643.

Puritan authorities' extreme embodiment of Hutchinson's identity, brought to light in their histories after her banishment, replicates the psychological processes of repression and projection that Smith ascribes to the universal subject. Winthrop's famous yoking of Hutchinson's spiritual authority to her bodily difference—most vividly, in his linking of her "monstrous" theological "errors" to her still-birth exemplifies how the Puritan universal subject naturalized its own authority by representing Hutchinson as a violator of the "natural" order, of the hierarchical "body politic" on
which it maintained its power. The extreme to which Winthrop went to record his account of her "monster," first interviewing her attending physician and then having the dead body disinterred so that he could get a first-hand look at its deformities, reveals his perception of Hutchinson as similar to what Kristeva considers the separating subject's construction of the abject mother, of that which provokes a paradoxical terror and fascination. Indeed, he describes her still-birth, identifiable by contemporary scientists as a hydatidiform mole, in a mixed tone of wonder and revulsion:

... she brought forth not one,...but (what was more strange to amazement) 30, monstrous births or thereabouts, at once; some of them bigger, some lesser, some of one shape, some of another; few of any perfect shape, none at all of them...of humane shape. (Hall 214)

That Thomas Weld, in his preface to the second edition of Winthrop's Short Story, compares Hutchinson to a Hydra reinforces the fact that the magistracy constructed her as what Kristeva calls the abject, as that which threatens unified, stable identity, the ontological basis of the theocracy's rationalism and autonomy. The Hydra, like the abject, an intermixture of identity, is, as Amy Schrager Lang points out, the embodiment of contradiction: as "an image of the fearful proliferation of error," it is "associated with unnatural fecundity--losing one head, she produces two in its place"; as the "offspring of Echidna,"
it is "half woman, half serpent," and "the archetypal mother of monsters" (65).

Puritan magistrates' linkage of Hutchinson's identity to corporeality duplicates the psychological processes of repression and projection that Sidonie Smith attributes to the universal subject. As a result of their "banishment of [the] body and its desires to the borders of consciousness," they make Hutchinson "more fully body," abject, exotic, and uncivilized (Smith Subjectivity 9). Having transgressed the expectations of the "body politic" by asserting her own desires and independence, she is constructed as a "cultural grotesque"; for she reminds the privileged Puritan authority of the repressed body, which could return from the margins of subjective experience and "threaten to disrupt the ... places of consciousness and power" (Smith Subjectivity 16).

Hutchinson's murder by Native Americans on Long Island in 1643, a tragedy that may not have occurred if she had not been sent beyond the reaches of the Massachusetts colony, provides additional evidence to Puritan magistrates that she embodied the unrestrained forces that they kept at bay in consciousness and in the paternal order. Thomas Weld's smug speculation that she died by fire--by the same means with which colony forces had slaughtered Pequot women and children six months before Hutchinson's expulsion--demonstrates the extent of much of the magistracy's hostility toward her: her death fulfills
its unconscious wish, never realized in the course of her trials, to commit physical violence against her (Kibbey 108).

While Hutchinson faced impending imprisonment, but not physical threat during her prosecutions, she was likely unconsciously aware of the subliminal threats of violence against her in the theocracy's rhetoric on Antinomianism; indeed, it is in this rhetoric that Ann Kibbey has identified a misogyny that propelled the colony's simultaneous persecutions of the Antinomians and the Pequots, producing a "threat of interchangeability" to Puritan women that implied that they, too, could become, like the predominantly female victims at Mystic, objects of literal violence (107).

Motivating Hutchinson's answers at her civil trial is her awareness that she is caught within this threatening "prisonhouse of language" that embodies her identity and in turn, denigrates her speech. Throughout most of her civil trial, she resorts to using what Audre Lorde calls, in her metaphor for patriarchal language, "the tools of the master's house" (42)--the Puritans' Biblicalism--to attempt to prove scriptural precedents for female spiritual leadership. However, increasingly, her use of scripture becomes less a sincere effort than a linguistic maneuver that verges on parody of her opponents' Biblicalism, which she knew could degenerate, when carried to an extreme, into a myopic bibliolatry and legalism. At
the turning point of her trial, for example, she agrees, in an ironic tone, with the facetious remark of one of her questioners, Mr. Harlakenden, that "the most glorious hypocrite may read [scripture] and yet go down to hell" (Hall 338). While he aims his comment at her, implying that she is the hypocrite, her understated reply to him, "It may be so," deflects his insinuation back to him (Hall 338). Not only does her mildly sarcastic answer suggest that on the contrary, he is the hypocrite, but also that his notion of truth, inferred from the Bible, is not universal, but relative. Indeed, among the Court's allegations against her was that she had accused the ministry of being "legalists" and that she favored an interior, affective approach to piety that threatened to disregard the Biblicalism that undergirded ecclesiastical polity and paternal authority. At the climax of her trial, shortly after her disclosure of her mystical experience of divine voices, she is forced to confront the fact that as Lorde cautions, "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (42). At this later point in her trial, although she clings to remnants of Biblicalism in her comparison of herself to the Old Testament Daniel, she ultimately locates her authority on a spiritual plane transcendent of phallocentric language and the mortal body.

Indeed, the Court's interrogations of Hutchinson dramatize what Luce Irigaray calls the "specular logic of
the patriarchy," the privileged subject's silencing and objectification of woman, which sets up the gendered opposition at the origin of the embodiment of her identity.

As Irigaray argues, Freud bases sexual difference on the visibility of difference; it is the eye that distinguishes between truth and falsity. Thus Freud judges woman, whose visible difference is her lack of a penis, as "absence, negativity, the dark continent, or at best, a lesser man" (Moi 133-134). Motivated by a fundamental narcissism, all patriarchal discourse represents woman as "the negative of its own reflection" (Moi 132). As the object and the mirror of man's specularizing gaze, woman serves to sustain his dominance and his illusion of coherent subjecthood. Ensnared in this specular logic, she is excluded from access to paternal power and from representation; she is granted few options for forging her own subjectivity, voice, and desire. Her typical recourses, as Irigaray points out, are to remain silent; to engage her body in an exaggerated mimicry of her status as object, a form of hysteria; or to retreat into mystical experience, which erases the subject/object dichotomy and dissolves subjecthood. This last option, mysticism, which Anne Hutchinson chooses, has historically appealed to many women, as Irigaray concludes, because their subjectivity is repressed and denied in a patriarchy, anyway. (Moi 136).
Anne Hutchinson's case provides answers to Irigaray's question: what "disaggregation of the subject" would occur if the "woman/object" started to speak, to see, to attain a gaze of her own, to decide the "truth"? (135) The "truth" contested at Hutchinson's civil trial is both the literal truth--what was actually said in Hutchinson's private interviews with six ministers eleven months before her trial, testimony on which the Court based most of its allegations--and the theological questions of what signifies true or false ministry. More broadly, the ontological "truth" at issue is also the question of Anne Hutchinson's character itself. While the ministers represent her as Eve, a "seduce[r] [of] simple souls" (Hall 316) and a woman "of intemperate spirit" (Hall 320), who is misguided by false inner voices, she represents herself as an exemplar of female Puritan piety, who stays within the bounds of biblically sanctioned and socially acceptable conduct for women. In short, the proceedings of her trial enact the Puritans' anxiety over signification itself, exacerbated by their life-long attempt to recognize invisible "truths"--the invisible sainthood of those predestined for election--in outer manifestations. As Hutchinson speaks, she causes what Irigaray calls a "disaggregation" of the patriarchal subject by uncovering the heterogeneous meanings in scripture and so disarming the supposedly homogenous base on which the theocracy founded its authority.
Despite Winthrop's defensive remark to her, "We do not mean to discourse with those of your sex" (Hall 314), the Court's questioning of Hutchinson instigates her "talking back," bell hooks' phrase for marginalized others' reclamation of representation, which Smith equates with women's subversive uses of autobiography (Subjectivity 20). Hutchinson resists the silent stasis allocated to her by Winthrop's specularizing gaze, dangerously upsetting his sense of ontological and metaphysical security derived from her fixity. Indeed, he describes her ideas, in terms of motion, as "erroneous," etymologically suggesting her "wandering," and he attempts to "reduce" her, to "lead her back" to the "truth," as the Latin root of the word denotes (Delbanco 138). In fact, as Ann Kibbey observes, during Hutchinson's civil trial, the test of the validity of her ideas was whether or not they agreed with those of her mentor, John Cotton, and the other members of the Boston theocracy (114). Governor Winthrop even scolds Hutchinson that in her private interviews with the six ministers, "...you clearly shew that the ground of your opening your mind was not to satisfy them but to satisfy your own conscience" (Hall 325). In other words, the narcissistic gaze of the Puritan magistrates demanded that she serve as a "faithful, polished mirror" of their precarious subjecthood, a reproducer of their hegemony, "empty of altering reflections" (Irigaray 136). Yet Hutchinson refuses to be
what Irigaray would call this static "opaque matter which...does not know herself" (133); instead she destabilizes the ontological and philosophical pedestal on which the Puritan theocracy built its dominant and homogenous subjectivity.

Hutchinson's heresy, which historians have found difficult to pinpoint (Delbanco 135) seems less a theological error than a transgression of expected gender roles. Governor John Winthrop accuses her of speaking "divers things...prejudicial to the honour of the churches and ministers thereof" and of holding meetings in her home, for the purpose of summarizing the day's sermons, even after the general assembly has condemned them as a thing "not fitting for [her] sex" (Hall 312). Because he cannot implicate Hutchinson in the Antinomian party's protests against the Court's March 1637 banishment of minister John Wheelwright, Winthrop accuses her of "countenanc[ing]" those he labels as "transgressors of the law" (Hall 313) and, therefore, "put[ting] honor upon them" (Hall 314). Because Hutchinson distinguishes between man-made law and divine law throughout her trial, locating her spiritual authority in the latter, she answers, "I may put honor upon them as the children of God and as they do honor the Lord" (Hall 314). In breaking women's silence in theological concerns, Hutchinson allegedly has broken what Luce Irigaray would call the law of the father, for as Governor John Winthrop rationalizes, she has violated the
Fifth Commandment, the law justifying the Puritans' hierarchical structuring of not only the family, but also the church and state; he denounces her for dishonoring her parents, "the fathers of the commonwealth" (Hall 313-314). In rebuttal to his accusation that she has disregarded respect for her "parents" by "entertaining" the Antinomians and so is "justly punishable," she, once again, elevates the Christians' deference to God over their subordination to their human parents. She asserts, "But put the case Sir that I do fear the Lord and my parents, may not I entertain them that fear the Lord because my parents will not give me leave?" (Hall 314)

As this dialogue suggests, Hutchinson's civil trial dramatizes how a woman speaker participates in discourse as what Paul Smith calls a "heteronomous subject" (qtd. in Sidonie Smith Subjectivity 32)—as not simply an actor who adheres to ideological scripts, but also as an active agent who reads these narratives in order to insert herself—or not—into them. Indeed, John Winthrop's accusation that Hutchinson engaged in theological activities "not fitting for [her] sex" (Hall 312)—compelled her to read, with instant self-reflexivity, the fictions of male and female identity shaping her place in her culture and to make decisions about how she perceived herself and how she would represent herself within these ideologies at the trial. If, as Patricia Caldwell argues, Hutchinson's debate with her examiners called their
attention to the inadequacy of their language for functioning according to their expectations (359), then, conversely, it also forced Hutchinson into confrontation with the failure of that language to accommodate female spiritual authority.

At first, she points to scriptural precedents to inscribe female spiritual authority within the bounds of socially sanctioned gender roles. However, her use of biblical exegesis serves to defamiliarize, rather than valorize Biblicalism, exposing to her questioners its apparent arbitrariness and in turn, the provisional status of their authority. This is exemplified in her dialogue with Winthrop about the permissibility of her holding weekly meetings in her home, one of which was for women only and another of which included men. When Winthrop asks her why she organizes such a meeting in her home on a particular day every week, she answers, "It is lawful for me to do, as it is all your practices and can you find a warrant for yourself and condemn me for the same thing?" (Hall 314). After she denies Winthrop's suspicion that men are present in her meetings for women, she justifies her right to advise women spiritually by resorting to Biblicalism, citing a rule in Titus 2.3,4,5. As she claims, "I conceive there lyes a clear rule in Titus, that the elder women should instruct the younger and then I must have a time wherein I must do it" (Hall 315). In this way, she also takes on a matrilineal rhetorical
identification, inserting herself into an ideological script that justifies "her authority in her religious meetings" by placing it on "a continuum with everyday exercises of maternal authority in Puritan life" (Porterfield 95). By invoking the "model of generational authority" expressed in Titus, she attempts to place her teaching of her female followers "within the conventional Puritan pattern of diffused mothering, in which older women supervised the daily lives and emotional development of young people and servants" (Porterfield 95).

However, Winthrop's supposed point of contention is not so much her right to teach women, which he claims he grants her, but her organization of scheduled meetings for that purpose and the possibility that she would also teach men if they sought her guidance as presumably "a woman that God hath given his grace unto" (Hall 313). In response to these last two concerns of his, Hutchinson poses a question about precedents, or rules, that would decide her role as a spiritual leader. She repeats this question at least three times throughout this particular sequence. She asks,

Will it please you to answer me this and to give me a rule for then I will willingly submit to any truth. If any come to my house to be instructed in the ways of God what rule have I to put them away? (Hall 315)

Her subsequent repetition of her request for a rule is less a sincere submission to the ministers' direction than
a rhetorical strategy for calling attention to the absence of a law, based in scripture, and not social custom, that would limit woman's spiritual authority. The fact that she has already cited a rule in Titus heightens the destabilizing effect of her repeated requests for one; it also exposes the multivalence in biblical texts like Titus, which threatens to subvert the fixed notion of "truth" on which the theocracy attempts to authorize its control. Although Hutchinson claims to have already found a rule sanctioning her teaching, Winthrop advises her that when followers, especially men, come to her home for instruction, she must "shew [her] rule to receive them" (Hall 315). This, in turn, prompts Hutchinson's insistence that the rule she cites in Titus provides a sufficient sanction of her teaching; as she says, "...if you look upon the rule in Titus it is a rule to me. If you convince me that it is no rule I shall yield" (Hall 316). Her invitation to Winthrop to persuade her of the opposite of what she thinks not only places her on an equal level with him, but also daringly assumes her interpretation to be the given frame-of-reference, which will remain unshaken unless her contender offers a convincing alternative view. Her agreement to "yield" to him if he supplies such an argument actually conveys an attitude opposite from the humble one her promise projects: it, indeed, reinforces her current refusal to yield.
By requesting a rule based in scripture, Hutchinson engages her questioners in a deconstruction of the concept of "law," exposing the relative nature of its meaning and the provisional status of the ministerial power that it is supposed to support. Indeed, in rebuttal to Hutchinson's interpretation of Titus, Winthrop attempts to deny the heterogeneity of meaning in biblical texts that Hutchinson uncovers, suggesting that Paul's silencing of women's speech in I Corinthians 14.34, 35 contradicts her rule and insisting, "You know that there is no rule that crosses another, but this rule crosses that in the Corinthians" (Hall 315). Indeed, combining Pauline precedents with his own interpretation of Titus, Winthrop upholds the Puritan hierarchy's elevation of the husband over the wife, advising Hutchinson that the scripture in Titus means that "elder women must instruct the younger about their business" and "to love their husbands" and "not to make them...clash" (Hall 316). Persisting in her own reading of Titus, however, Hutchinson's immediate answer reveals her advocacy of women's exercise of spiritual authority beyond the domestic sphere; she explains, "I do not conceive but that it is meant for some publick times" (Hall 316).

While Hutchinson temporarily abandons biblical exegesis in this section, she returns to her repeated requests for a "rule," a rhetorical ploy that verges on parody of the theocracy's rule-bound epistemology. Indeed, the issue of whose rules are God's and whose are man's
continues to be the point of contention between Winthrop and Hutchinson. In his diatribe against her, Winthrop accuses her of "seduc[ing] many honest persons that are called to [her] meetings," of proffering "opinions being known to be different from the word of God," and of undermining the well-being of the commonwealth by causing "neighbors and dames" to neglect their families; he discredits her attempt at self-authorization through scripture and divine law, concluding, "... we see no rule of God for this, we see not that any should have authority to set up any other exercises besides what authority hath already set up...." (Hall 316).

When he threatens that the Court will restrain her from "maintaining this course," she insists, "if you have a rule for it from God's word you may" and "if it please you by authority to put it down I will freely let you for I am subject to your authority" (Hall 316). Her last statement, although it pretends to defer to the ministers' authority, actually destabilizes their right to power by pointing out the absence of a rule that purportedly sanctions their control of knowledge.

That Puritan discourse, especially its Biblicalism, was experienced as a fetter to Hutchinson is revealed ironically in Winthorp's accusation that she was not "bound [my emphasis] to the ministry of the word" (Hall 341). Among the Court's complaints against Hutchinson was that she was too reliant on the "immediate revelation of
the spirit" (Hall 341), upsetting the delicately balanced reciprocality in Puritan piety between the convert's reading or hearing scripture and her inner experience of the working spirit. Allegedly critical of the ministers for their blindly legalistic approach to biblical interpretation, she emphasized "the spirit of discernment" over "the prescriptive content of scripture" (Delbanco 136). As she suggested, the working spirit had precedence over the agents of its manifestation--the scripture, the words, and even the preachers--and induced a felt experience in converts, which moved them to worship. As Patricia Caldwell concludes, Hutchinson subordinated the word to the work of the spirit to such a degree that she "treated language as one of those 'works' or 'duties'--an external sign, an action, which could not be regarded as evidence of grace" (354).

Hutchinson's privileging of the "covenant of grace" over the "covenant of works" further allowed her to transcend phallocentric language and paternal law. Indeed, the court accused her of criticizing the ministry for not being "sealed in the spirit" and for preaching a "covenant of works," which assumed outward holiness to be a sign of election, over a "covenant of grace" (Hall 321), which emphasized the convert's rebirth through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. That this conversion bound devotees to the "law of grace" exempted them from reliance on any of the accoutrements of institutional religion,
including compliance to moral or human law and to man's "works" (Hall 3).

That the multivalent text of Biblicalism cannot provide a foundation of certain signification for the establishment of either a privileged male subjectivity or a resistant female subjectivity becomes apparent to both Hutchinson and her debaters at the climactic moment of her appeal to mystical voices. Recognizing the "truths" of her opponents as culturally relative and indeterminate in meaning, she founds her spiritual authority on a transcendent truth, in an "immediate revelation," in "the voice of [God's] own spirit to [her] soul"; she warns her interrogators, "Now if you do condemn me for speaking what in my conscience I know to be the truth [sic] I must commit myself unto the Lord" (Hall 337).

By invoking revelatory voices, Hutchinson's access to truth is based not on the sense of sight, on the objectification of an other, but on the sense of sound, on a more interior mystical experience that collapses the oppositions of subject and object. Just as the mystic's "ecstasy," which literally means "outside place," eludes patriarchal specularity (Moi 136), so Hutchinson's espousal of mysticism is her attempt to evade scopic representation.

Shortly before this climax in her trial, she attempts to escape patriarchal specularization by invoking invisible truths, identifying herself with the biblical
Daniel. She warns her questioners, "But now having seen him which is invisible I fear not what man can do unto me" (Hall 338). Like Daniel, she expects to be delivered from calamity "by a providence of God" (Hall 340). In her defiant announcement to her opponents, she reverses their equation of her speech with the malediction of Eve, and aligns it with divine Word. She warns her prosecutors, "...if you go on in this course you begin you will bring a curse upon you and your posterity, and the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" (Hall 338).

Her espousal of the victory of the spirit over the mortal world predicts her alleged unorthodox denial of the resurrection of the body on Judgment Day, debated in her subsequent trial, four months later, at the church of Boston. Her impulse to escape the body, expressed in her figurative identification with Daniel in her previous trial, emerges in her church trial records as a theological belief in the insignificance of the body. As revealed in her civil trial, it is more Hutchinson's unorthodoxy in her gender role than in her beliefs that disturbs her critics; for contrary to her accusers, she has not committed the heresy of denying the body's resurrection. The irony revealed in her church trial's records is that while she and members of the theocracy debate what happens to the human body on Judgment Day, her opponents embody her identity by associating her ideas with sexual promiscuity. This irony is heightened by the
fact that she is visibly pregnant, reminding her prosecutors of her positioning, as a mother, on the boundary of nature and culture. As Kristeva suggests in *Stabat Mater*, the mother is a threat to the Symbolic because her jouissance during sex and childbirth enables her to become a subject rather than the other, and because she represents a "strange fold between culture and nature that cannot be fully incorporated into the Symbolic" (Oliver 50). John Cotton's unjustified predictions about Hutchinson's sexual activity and marital infidelity reveal his anxiety about her reversal of her status as other in discourse and culture. Indeed, this trial, like the previous one, represents the attempt of the theocracy, in part, to bring the power of the mother under control. This effort is crystallized in Cotton's comments to Hutchinson's grown sons at her church trial, in which he directs them away from attachment to their mother and to identification with paternal authority. As he advises them, "Though the Credit of your mother be dear to you, and your Regard to her Name, yet the Regard you should have of Christ's Name and your Care of his Honour and Credit should outway all the other" (Hall 369). As Amy Schrager Lang concludes,

Whereas Hutchinson, as a woman, overturns the order of things when she rejects the authority of men in favor of God, her sons ... because they are men, must put God's credit, as interpreted by the fathers, with whom they are naturally identified, ahead of their mother's. (44)
The examiners' fear of and attempt to control the power of the mother emerges, more significantly, in their allegations that Hutchinson is an advocate of Familism, a mystical strand in Puritanism that believed the souls of the elect were absorbed into God at the moment of their election, but that their bodies, like those of all people, were annihilated at death. Because the Familist sect in Europe organized its followers into "families," presumably emulating the inter-marriage of souls in the afterlife, it was associated in the orthodox Puritan imagination with illicit sex.

Suspected of being a Familist because of her alleged denial of the Resurrection of the body on Judgment Day, Hutchinson clarified in her testimony that she did not doubt the Resurrection, but rather which body would rise: she believed that the "body would rise on judgment day was not the human body, but the spirit body of Christ, which believers were united with immortally at....election" (Porterfield 97). John Cotton's reply to her, at once accusing her of and predicting marital infidelity, suggests his aversion to the abject mother and his consequent yoking of Hutchinson's intellect and spiritual authority to her corporeality. Alluding to both Familist communities and to the meetings Hutchinson held in her home, some of which mixed women and men, he forewarns her:

Yea consider if the Resurrection be past than you cannot Evade the Argument that was prest
upon you by our Brother Buckle and others, that filthie Sinne of the Communitie of Woemen and all promiscuous and filthie comminge togethether of men and Woemen without Distinction or Relation of Marriage, will necessarily follow, and (sic) though I have not herd, nayther do I thinke, you have bine unfaythfull to your Husband in his Marriage Covenant, yet that will follow upon it, for it is the very argument that the Saduces (sic) bringe to our Savour (sic) Christ agaynst the Resurrection....(Hall 372)

Cotton ignores not only Hutchinson's espousal of belief in the Resurrection, but also her reason for suggesting that the mortal bodies of the elect do not rise on Judgement Day. As she offers, "I cannot yet see Christ is united to thease fleshly bodies" (Hall 363-364). This reason reflects Hutchinson's orthodox attitude toward the body, specifically the female body, and ironically appears to be related to her honoring of marital fidelity. As Ann Kibbey explains, Hutchinson's suggestion that "in conversion the soul was united to Christ, but the natural body was not" reflects a theologically correct reply for a woman "who believed she was united to a male mystical body, who honored "the virtue of marital fidelity," and who assigned female sexuality to the natural world (191-192). Hutchinson's perception of her womanliness as an attribute of her natural life, but not of her spiritual life (Kibbey 192), appears to accept the binary thinking that supports the cultural embodiment of women. Indeed, she accepted the orthodox assumption that the body, because of human sin, was the site of mortal suffering, (although also of divine
instruction), a reality she witnessed frequently in her work as a midwife and nurse. One benefit of her general belief in "a radical dualism between body and spirit" and a mystical union with Christ was, as Amanda Porterfield points out, a transcendence of the world of bodily suffering (81). However, Hutchinson's espousal of the eradication of the mortal body also permitted her to erase her sexual difference, the source of her cultural embodiment and oppression. The circumstances of her life, unfortunately, expose the double-bind of the female subject, caught in the alterity imposed by patriarchal culture. In particular, while her mysticism permits her to escape from her discursive status as object, it also fails to allow her to interrogate the cultural constructions that render her as other. Sadly, these social inscriptions of woman as a diabolical and embodied other persisted in the dominant culture's representations of Hutchinson in history. Her trial records demonstrate how the woman subject exposes the destabilizing tendencies already present in a presumably homogenous discourse like Puritanism, only for her to realize that this heterogeneity of meaning can be deployed by the patriarchy to undermine her agency. To escape phallogocentrism, she embraces the mystical strain repressed by the more rationalist approaches to piety that undergird paternal authority. While Hutchinson is represented in most Puritan histories as the "bad woman," the emanation of the abject
mother, her contemporary, Anne Bradstreet, is represented as the opposite in Puritan woman's nature, as the "good woman," the venerated object of love. John Woodbridge, Bradstreet's brother-in-law, who published her manuscript, The Tenth Muse, Lately Sprung Up in America, extolled her, in his preface, as Cotton Mather's ideal of the "virtuous scholar":

It is the work of a woman, honoured, and esteemed where she lives, for her gracious demeanour, her eminent parts, her pious conversation, her courteous disposition, her exact diligence in her place, and discrete managing of her family occasions, and more than so, these poems are the fruit but of some few hours, curtailed from her sleep and other refreshments. (Bradstreet 3)

Although Hutchinson tried to justify her assertion of female spiritual authority by citing biblical analogues and precedents, her pietistic style nevertheless threatened to go beyond the confines of accepted practice. In contrast, Bradstreet expresses her spiritual authority privately within her home as a guide to her children and as an author of devotional poems, composed for and circulated among family and friends. In her spiritual relation, "To My Dear Children," she challenges some of Puritanism's gendered oppositions, especially its association of maleness with the spiritual possibilities of the soul and with the divine word and of femaleness with the sinful flesh. As her narrative reveals, she attempts to challenge not only the binarity of flesh and spirit, but also Puritanism's inscription of the maternal
body as the source of the sinful nature of the flesh. By metaphorically comparing her autobiographical practice and her imparting of spiritual knowledge to childbirth, she revises this cultural association of the maternal body with defilement.

Unlike Hutchinson's public "talking back," Bradstreet's "To My Dear Children" was a private document, probably not intended for publication. Like many of her male counterparts, such as Roger Clap, John Dane and Thomas Shepherd, who addressed their spiritual narratives to posterity (Shea Spiritual Autobiography 111-112), Bradstreet wrote this only piece of autobiographical prose for her children in 1656 in Andover when she believed she was dying. (She, in fact, did not die until sixteen years later, when the narrative was found in her private papers.) It was not published until 1867, when it was included with her series of prose pieces, "Meditations Divine and Morall," and a small number of additional poems in John Harvard Ellis's collection of her entire oeuvre, The Works of Anne Bradstreet in Prose and Verse.

Anne Bradstreet's Re-inscription of the Maternal Body

Unlike Hutchinson, Bradstreet makes the body a site of the formation of her subjectivity. While Hutchinson tries to transcend the body, along with the phallocentric language that defines it, Bradstreet remains within the
conventions of the Puritan language of grace to re-inscribe the maternal body, not as abject, but as sublime.

Arguing that women autobiographers anchor their identities in relation to the consciousness of an other, Mary G. Mason suggests that Bradstreet forms her subjectivity in "To My Dear Children" by identifying with her family and spiritual community (228). Yet while Mason acknowledges Bradstreet's work as a spiritual autobiography, she fails to specify it as a conversion narrative. Indeed, because Mason defines "conversion" solely in terms of Augustine's Confessions, she dismisses the genre as "inappropriate as a model for women's life-writings" (210). She concludes,

The dramatic structure of conversion that we find in Augustine's Confessions, where the self is presented as the stage for a battle of opposing forces and where a climactic victory for one force--spirit defeating flesh--completes the drama of the self, simply does not accord with the deepest realities of women's experience....(210)

By disregarding the conversion genre in general and by overlooking its presence in Bradstreet's autobiography in particular, Mason neglects to consider the differences between Augustinian conversion, modeled after Paul's sudden and blinding experience of God's love on the road to Damascus, and American Puritan conversion. While the Puritans interpreted Paul's transformation from a state of sin to that of grace as unsought by him and as pre-
ordained by God, they expanded this biblical archetype of conversion to balance a belief in predestination with a belief in preparationist theology. Puritans believed that while God predestined one's election, sinners could prepare for the infusion of saving grace by learning to recognize predictable stages of conversion. This preparationist theology, which stressed the sinners' unfolding affective relationship with God, achieved a delicate balance—upset by the Antinomians in the 1630s—between a covenant of grace and a covenant of works. It is within the preparationist, not Augustinian, tradition that Bradstreet wrote her "To My Dear Children," a work that is not only, as Mason suggests, a spiritual autobiography, but also a conversion narrative.

For two reasons, the self in this work does not become, as in Augustinian fashion, a battleground for a struggle between flesh and spirit. The obvious reason is that the battle is over—Bradstreet assumes she is dying. The more compelling reason is that the "auto-machia," or "war within the self" (Bercovitch 19) that animates most orthodox Puritan autobiographies may have been experienced and represented by women in a different way from men. This possibility is not considered by scholar Sacvan Bercovitch in his important conceptualization of the Puritan self undergoing conversion; in his model of a nongendered subject engaged in an ongoing purgation of its bodily and worldly desires (19), he fails to consider the effects on
the female convert of her marginalized position in discourse and in particular, her cultural identification with flesh. That Bradstreet does not stage a conflict between flesh and spirit in her autobiography may have been the result of her identification, as a woman, with the cultural construction of flesh as female and of her consequent interest in reconciling this opposition rather than resolving it in favor of a masculinized spirit over a feminized flesh. As Rosamond Rosenmeier has affirmed, Bradstreet's poetic pursuit was to understand the relationship between contraries (191). In "The Flesh and the Spirit," for example, her poetic allegory of the Puritan self, which was composed during the same period as her autobiography, she presents a reconciled relationship between body and soul, the apotheosis of which is a vision of heaven as the interpenetration of the corporeal and the eternal. While her interest in the possibility of a reconciliation between flesh and spirit is not uncommon in a Puritan writer, it may have been shaped, in part, by her consciousness of woman's positioning as embodied other in Puritan discourse. As her narrative reveals, Bradstreet attempts to reconcile not only the binarity of flesh and spirit, but also the Puritan inscription of the maternal body as the origin of sinful mortality.

Puritan representations of the maternal elaborate on, according to a Kristevan model of psycholinguistics, the patriarchal subject's splitting of the mother into the
abject and the sublime. While Puritan society favored women who were "tender mothers," it also associated the biological mother with the sinful nature of the flesh, as the opposite of the father, who stood for the "spiritual possibilities of the soul" (154). John Cotton's sermon, "Way of Life," for example, includes the kind of imagery of abject defilement associated with the maternal body in much of the rhetoric of first-generation American Puritanism. Cotton cautions, 

we are borne in the goare blood of sinfull defilements, and therefore God hath provided the blood of Christ, to wash and cleanse us from our Mothers (sic) womb, Col.2.11.,12 so that Christ, by his blood and Spirit, cleanses us from the sinfull nature of our flesh. (qtd. in Leverenz 154)

With her imagination shaped by such images of defiling maternal body, how did a committed writer and thinker like Bradstreet represent this body in her conversion narrative?

Bradstreet's "To My Dear Children" demonstrates how a woman author appropriates maternal metaphors to assert her spiritual authority, thereby displacing the binaries between flesh and spirit that keep her identity linked to corporeality. Susan Stanford Friedman's analysis of men's and women's uses of the childbirth metaphor to signify creativity provides a relevant model for understanding Bradstreet's use of this figure of speech to suggest spiritual authority.
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Friedman suggests that since "women's oppression begins with the control of the body," that "many women writers have gone directly to [this] source of powerlessness to reclaim that control through the labor of the mind pregnant with the word" (94). Indeed, women have employed the childbirth metaphor as a "sign representing their own delivery into speech through (pro)creativity" (94). Such a metaphor challenges "the binary oppositions of patriarchal ideology between flesh and spirit, creativity and procreativity, mind and body" (74). In other words, birth provides a trope by which women writers may explore the Symbolic Order as subjects without relinquishing their identification with the mother. While men's use of the birth metaphor shows a "fascination for the Other," women's use of it reveals "conflict with themselves as Other" (985). Friedman classifies women's employment of the birth metaphor into three different uses: (1) to confirm the patriarchal polarization of creation and procreation; (2) to encode the fear of fusing these two creativities; (3) and to launch a celebration of (pro)creation, a "gynocentric aesthetic based on the body" (86-87). Friedman's study helps explain Bradstreet's appropriation of the birth figure of speech. Through this metaphor, Bradstreet attempts to resolve her "conflict with [herself] as Other" and to reconcile the gendered opposition between (pro)creativity and creativity that circumscribes her expression of spiritual authority.
Demonstrating her argument that God sends trials to benefit those he favors and then rewards them with grace, with "abundance of sweetness and refreshment after affliction" (242), Bradstreet organizes her recollection according to the stages of what scholar Edmund Morgan calls the Puritan "morphology of conversion" (68-69). She begins with her awareness of her sinfulness at age six or seven, the years when Puritans introduced religious instruction to their children" (Leverenz 76); then with her growing understanding of faith gained through reading scriptures, and with her suffering of chronic illnesses, which she interprets as God's loving corrections of her for neglected duties or unacknowledged sins. She continues with her recollections of her religious doubts, manifest in such temptations as her doctrinal questioning of the Trinity and her attractions to Catholicism and atheism. As Shea points out, Bradstreet's autobiography exposes an imbalance in her life between times of despair and spiritual contentment that is not compensated for by the devotional intensity typical of most writers of her period (Spiritual Autobiography 117). She regrets that she has "not found that constant joy in [her] pilgrimage and refreshing which [she] supposed most of the servants of God have" although she qualifies this complaint with the consolation that "God hath not left [her] altogether without the witness of His holy spirit...." (243).
However, she resolves that she always returns to her faith in "the Lord," conveying the Miltonic idea that damnation is an interior psychological place as she advises her children that "in truth it is the absence and presence of God that makes heaven or hell" (243). Finally reasoning that "even the very elect are deceived" and concluding that "all the Powers of Hell shall never prevail" against her faith in Christ (243), she appears to have arrived at a "true assurance" of her salvation.

In her autobiography, Bradstreet exemplifies the maternal authority that historian Porterfield attributes to Puritan women, who, she argues, despite their subordination to men, nonetheless enjoyed influential roles as the "guardians, interpreters, and inculcators of Puritan culture" (94). Appropriating the maternal images of God so prevalent in public discourse, Bradstreet equates the impulse to convert and in turn, to write with childbirth. In the only reference to her gender in the entire narrative, Bradstreet appropriates the conventional metaphors of infertility as spiritual sterility and of generativity as spiritual regeneration:

It pleased God to keep me long without a child, which was a great grief to me and cost me many prayers and tears before I obtained one, and after him gave me many more of whom I now take the care, that as I have brought you into the world, and with great pains, weakness, cares, and fears brought you to this, I now travail in birth again of you till Christ be formed in you. (241)
In the symbol of the birth in this passage, both Bradstreet's and her children's spiritual awakenings converge. First, Bradstreet's initial barrenness suggests the soul's emptiness, but once God bestows his favor on her, she becomes fertile, both physically and spiritually. Now that she is dying, she revives her body, in a metaphorical sense, by once again giving birth to her children, not physically, but spiritually by instilling Christ's grace in them. Bradstreet's second, metaphorical giving birth makes her maternal flesh not the threshold of the mortal embodiment of her children's souls, but the impetus of their conversion.

Bradstreet's natal metaphor for her autobiographical self creates effects similar to the maternal trope prominent in her poem "An Author to her Book," which was also composed later in her life, probably between 1650 and 1670, but which, like her autobiography, was not discovered until after her death in her private papers. Included as the preface to her posthumous second collection, this poem elaborates on the analogy between motherhood and female authorship initiated by her brother-in-law and sponsor of her publication, John Woodbridge. Comparing her book to an infant in his prefatory poem, "Upon the Author: By a Known Friend," Woodbridge anticipates his sister-in-law's objections to her publication, which would "...force a woman's birth, provoke her pain,/Expose her labors to the world's
"disdain" (Bradstreet 6). In her twenty-four-line reply of rhyming couplets, Bradstreet develops this conceit, comparing her literary production to an "ill-formed offspring of [her] feeble brain" and to a "rambling brat" (221). The effect of Bradstreet's poem, as Susan Stanford Friedman suggests, is to direct her readers' attention to the vehicle of her metaphor, the literal cares of motherhood, as much as to its tenor, the perfecting of literary composition (82). As Bradstreet metaphorically equates the care of her "offspring" to the work of her "brain," she reconciles the historical patriarchal dualisms of female reproductivity and male creativity, creating an alternative vision of female (pro)creativity (Friedman 73).

Bradstreet's autobiography shows a slightly different thematic emphasis from that of the poem. In her autobiography, Bradstreet is more interested in establishing her spiritual rather than her literary authority and in using childbirth as a comparison to the conversion rather than to the creative process. By comparing her autobiographical act to labor pains, she delivers herself into speech, writing, and the history and the memory of posterity at the same time that she labors at her children's spiritual deliverance. Her use of the childbirth trope, commonly evoked by male spiritual writers to suggest their own and their converts' religious transformations, calls into question the patriarchal
associations of the mind and the Word—the source of spiritual authority in Judeo-Christian religion—with maleness, and the flesh and the body with femaleness. Her gender and maternity influence the effect of this trope, for as Friedman concludes, while male writers' use of the natal metaphor tends to reinforce the dualistic thinking of patriarchal ideology, woman writers' employment of it often calls into question the social constructions of sexual divisions (75).

In her childbirth metaphor for the self, however brief and suggestive it is, Bradstreet reconciles the polarized association of maleness with the Word and the mind, and femaleness with the flesh and the body. By comparing her imparting of her spiritual knowledge to her children to giving birth to them, she reclaims the maternal body as an affirmative source of spiritual awakening, not the origin of defilement.

Bradstreet's brief relation strives to enact a closure of the earthly life so that the author may make her transition to the "King, immortal, eternal, and invisible...." (245). Her adherence to the orthodox belief in the resurrection of the body on Judgment Day, although not mentioned in her deathbed confession, is consistent with her corporealization of spirit in her poetry and prose. In her last poem, "A Weary Pilgrim," completed two years before her death and published in the Ellis collection, she anticipates the union of her soul and body.
as she re-figures her deathbed in sensual imagery as a bridal bed for her and the bridegroom Christ. Bradstreet's impression of what happens to the body on Judgment Day differs from that of Hutchinson, showing the distinction between these two authors' attitudes toward the body. Accepting the Puritan attribution of baseness to the body and relegating her own womanliness and sexuality to the mortal realm, Hutchinson claims she cannot imagine Christ united with "fleshly bodies" (Hall 363-364). Bradstreet, in contrast, accepts the promise of the spiritualization of flesh, including the sublimation of her womanly desires, as the nuptial imagery in "The Weary Pilgrim" suggests. Trusting the orthodox belief that, after death, her body will resurrect and unite with Christ on their flight to heaven, she proclaims, "A corrupt carcass down it lays/A glorious body it shall rise" (295). Readers sense the impending death of her body in the rather abrupt conclusion of the narrative; invoking conventions of humility, Bradstreet cautions, "This was written in much sickness and weakness, and is very weakly and imperfectly done, but if you can pick any benefit out of it, it is the mark which I aimed at" (245).

While Bradstreet claims that her autobiography is intended to give her children "some spiritual advantage by [her] experience" (240), her concomitant motive is to write herself into the memory of posterity and to gain immortality by being "daily in [her children's]
remembrance" (240). Knowing that "the exhortations of parents take most effect when the speakers leave to speak, and those especially sink deepest which are spoke last...." Bradstreet "bequeaths" these last words, which she equates with her maternal body's generativity, to her children.

Anne Hutchinson and Anne Bradstreet provide a contrast in how the Puritan female subject forges spiritual authority in Puritan languages that link her identity with corporeality. Their self-writings demonstrate Kristeva's conclusion that a consideration of woman's place in discourse and culture must necessarily focus on her role as mother. Kristeva re-directs feminist theorists' attention to the maternal because she believes that it is motherhood, (and not "woman," which she considers undefinable), that is repressed in patriarchal culture (Moi 100).

Embodied as the threatening abject mother, Hutchinson is finally expelled from Massachusetts. However, her pietistic practice and her autobiographical narratives in her trial records do not reflect her attempt to re-write the cultural inscriptions of the maternal body. Rather they demonstrate her effort to forsake the language responsible for limiting her subjectivity and to escape her embodiment by rendering the body insignificant. By retreating into mystical experience, however, she gives up the opportunity to interrogate the binarity that maintains
her position as other and that constructs her maternal body as defiled. On the other hand, Bradstreet, writing a conventional autobiography, makes her maternal body central to her self-representation. She displaces the dualism of flesh and spirit by suggesting the possibility of a reconciliation between these presumed opposites. Specifically, she re-writes her maternal body to signify not defilement, but divine impulse. Through this process, she interrogates the patriarchal oppositional thinking that positions her as an embodied other. Bradstreet's brief use of her representation of her body as a subversive vehicle in autobiography anticipates the Rowlandson text's similar, but more radical, strategy. Indeed, Rowlandson's recollection is more subversive, in part, because it served a public communal function for its Puritan readers unlike Bradstreet's autobiography, which was not made public until its inclusion in the 1867 Ellis edition. Rowlandson's narrative demonstrates how the culturally inscribed body can destabilize the very discourses responsible for its social construction. Her representation of her body as disorderly sin interrogates the patriarchal opposition that defines woman as the opposite of man, as flesh rather than spirit. While Bradstreet points to the possibility of a reconciliation between flesh and spirit, Rowlandson is less interested in reconciliation than in calling attention to the permeable boundary between flesh and spirit already existent within
Christian consciousness. Indeed, she constructs the female body as what Kristeva calls the abject through her descriptions of her transgressive eating and her colonialist representations of Native American women. As Kristeva's psycholinguistic interpretation of Christian discourse illuminates, Rowlandson, by foregrounding the abject body, deconstructs the sublime by demonstrating how the sublime depends on the abject.
CHAPTER 4

REPRESENTING THE ABJECT BODY:
MARY ROWLANDSON'S DESTABILIZATION OF THE CONVERSION MODEL

As a hybrid of Puritan conversion allegory and Indian captivity narrative, Rowlandson's recollection places the image of the body at its center, yet few critics have addressed this important subject, and those who have, stop short of engaging the important theoretical questions evoked by her discourse of the body. Indeed, Rowlandson's very use of the genre of spiritual autobiography invites critical attention to her bodily representation since she, like most Puritan life-writers, constructs "the flesh" as the site of the soul's struggle for salvation. Accordingly, she presents her afflicted body as the instrument of divine instruction, and she translates her captivity by the Narragansetts into an allegory of the soul's bondage to flesh. Rowlandson's simultaneous use of the Indian captivity genre similarly invites scholarly attention to her figuring of the body; for the extremity of captivity compelled captives to become acutely aware of their bodies and more generally, of the politics of the body; for as Gary Ebersole points out, they often experienced or witnessed their captors' inscriptions of the body in the form of physical rigors, transcultural dressing, scalpings, and wounds (8), and they could
observe cross-cultural differences in significations of the body. As she later prepared her private narrative for publication—in part, to re-integrate herself into her community as a "visible saint"—Rowlandson likely brought with her this heightened awareness of the body as a symbolic site to which cultures assign meanings, a consciousness most obviously expressed in her defenses of her chastity and her disavowal of what her community would consider miscegenation.

The few critics, such as Nancy Armstrong, Leonard Tennenhouse, and Teresa Toulouse, who have addressed Rowlandson's figuring of her body have stopped short of engaging the theoretical questions posed by it, most specifically: how does her body, culturally inscribed by gender, race, and class markers, serve as the location of a resistant female subjectivity and in turn, interrogate the Puritan patriarchal binary logic that positions women and people of color as embodied otherness? How does her body serve as a source of subversive practice within the hegemonic discourse of Puritan spiritual autobiography, a genre that as Daniel B. Shea explains, suppressed extraordinary religious experiences, heterogeneous beliefs, and the expression of a range of emotions by demanding writers' conformity to a "mechanistic pattern" of organization, content, and form (90)? In fact, Rowlandson's forced culture-crossing prompts her later narrative-crossing of generic boundaries, which, in turn,
permits her to destabilize the model of selfhood on which the Puritan hegemony relied for the consolidation of control and the enforcement of cultural cohesion. Significantly, as Rowlandson symbolizes her body’s captivity as the unregenerate self’s bondage to flesh, a formulaic trope in seventeenth-century conversion narratives, she gives expression to the repressed body at the core of the Puritan rationalist model of the personality. Because this body is associated with the repressed feminine in the structuration of the subject, its disclosure exposes the problem of Puritanism's cultural embodiment of women and in turn, dramatizes the discursive problem that faced Hutchinson and Bradstreet. This challenge is the gendered dualism of body and soul that impeded their assertions of self and of spiritual authority because of the biblical and cultural discourses that inscribed their identities with an essentialized nature.

The few critical interpretations that have addressed the subject of Rowlandson’s body have ranged from denial to acknowledgement of her body as a source of representation. To different degrees, these interpretations have been challenged by the same discursive problems that trouble Rowlandson as a woman writer: the challenges of recovering representation of female identity from patriarchal binary logic and of
understanding the culturally mediated body as a site for a resistant subjectivity.

Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, for example, in identifying Rowlandson as a forerunner of the captive protagonists of eighteenth-century English seduction novels, construct her as a disembodied subject, describing her as first a "wordless object[t] in exchange among men" transformed into a "bodiless subjec[t] of writing" (400). In a Cartesian elevation of mind over body, they conclude that she writes her tale as a way of "individuating consciousness and placing such consciousness in a position of mastery over all that it surveys" (402), that is, an unfamiliar landscape, the Indians, other Englishmen, and even her own body. Armstrong and Tennenhouse's language of conquest, which describes Rowlandson's act of writing as a subordination of her own body and which, in turn, aligns her body with territory alien to her, effectively erases her body as a possible site for the construction of her subjectivity; contingent on her achievement of a transcendent, autonomous consciousness, as they imply, is her denial of her body. At the source of the divided subjectivity they impose on her is the repression of the feminine that feminist thinkers have argued is the consequence of the Cartesian privileging of the conceptual over the corporeal. Armstrong and Tennenhouse's readings leave Rowlandson implicated in patriarchal binary logic, reinscribing the gendered dualisms of language over body,
reason over irrationality, and spirit over flesh that she herself must negotiate in her story of captivity and conversion.

Teresa Toulouse, on the other hand, constructs Rowlandson as an embodied subject, but one whose bodily representation is restricted by the essentializing discourse of female martyrdom. As Toulouse argues, to prove her worth as a female saint, Rowlandson must "show the body in a state analogous not only to the state of the fallen soul but also [in its weakness, passivity, and endurance] to the culturally assumed status of women, the 'weaker vessel'" (660). While Toulouse identifies a subversive resentment in the narrative at this language of martyrdom which requires such self-abnegation (661), she nonetheless reinscribes Rowlandson as a victim, although covertly angry, of not only captivity and but also the patriarchal discourses that thwart her self-representation.

While Armstrong and Tennenhouse's reading does not extend beyond the Cartesian dualism that supports masculinist, hierarchical structures, Toulouse does not pursue the possibility that Rowlandson's culturally mediated body may suggest ways of knowing and writing alternative to these structures. All three critics perceive her bodily representation as suffering helplessness, neglecting to recognize its full subversive possibilities.
The present feminist post-structuralist approach recovers Rowlandson's representation of the body as a subversive vehicle in her autobiography, separating the authorial intentions of Rowlandson, the historical person, from the life of her narrative. Rowlandson's inscription of the body initiates a more extreme degree of narrative subversion than that of Hutchinson and Bradstreet. Hutchinson fails to interrogate the Puritan notion of the female body as sin, choosing to privilege spirit over flesh and to dissolve her subjectivity in inner mystical experience. Bradstreet, in her autobiography, interrogates the imputation of sin to the maternal body by sublimating her flesh into divine speech. Like Anne Bradstreet, indeed like many Puritan writers, Mary Rowlandson recognized the existence of the permeable boundary between flesh and spirit in the Puritan notion of self; in turn, like Bradstreet, who also explored this theme in her poem, "The Flesh and the Spirit," Rowlandson was aware of the possibility of the reconciliation of these closely related and presumed opposites. However, unlike Bradstreet, who uses her consciousness of this permeable boundary to construct a self consisting of a spiritualized corporeity, Rowlandson uses her awareness of this dialectic to call more attention to the self's corporeality than to its flesh's sublimation into spirituality. Like Bradstreet's "The Flesh and the Spirit," Rowlandson's narrative is based on Paul's description of the battle between the
mortal body and the Christian's rational spiritual nature in Romans 8, the biblical text with which Increase Mather introduces her tale. However, unlike Bradstreet's poetic allegory, which, like Romans 8, points to the possibility of a reconciliation between these two divided parts of the self, Rowlandson's narrative dramatizes and emphasizes Paul's notion of the base body, resistant to the spiritual laws of God. As psycholinguist Julia Kristeva claims, in her linkage of the abject in subjective experience to Christian notions of sin, Paul constructs two interdependent notions of the flesh throughout the course of his letters. The first is the flesh as "eager drive confronted with the law's harshness" while the second, into which the first converts, is "a subdued 'body,' a body that is pneumatic since it is spiritual, completely submersed into (divine) speech..." (124). As Kristeva concludes, the second sublimated body is dependent for its existence on the first desublimated body (124). Indeed, it is this desublimated body of eager drive that Rowlandson constructs in her self-representation, especially in her descriptions of eating the vile food on which she and her captors are forced to survive. As she recalls, her captors "would eat that, that a hog or dog would hardly touch," including ground-up bones, horse's guts and ears, wild birds, bear, venison, beaver, tortoise, frogs, squirrels, dogs, skunks, rattlesnakes, and the bark of trees (7). In the Seventh Remove, for example, as well as throughout her
narrative, she equates eating this defiled food with the hungers of the unregenerate soul. Her representation of her hungers is in keeping with the Puritan doctrine of "weaned affections," whereby the unregenerate soul must transfer its desires for the world and the flesh onto Christ, considered the perennial source of sustenance. In the Seventh Remove, for example, Rowlandson assigns typological meaning to her devouring half-cooked horse liver by enclosing her description of her eating with a biblical reference to Proverbs 27.7. As she remembers the blood left about her mouth after she consumed this meat, she adds, "for to the hungry soul, every bitter thing is sweet" (335).

As this example suggests, the most obvious reason for her emphasis on this body of "eager of drive" (Kristeva 124) more than on the spiritualized body, is her interest in portraying the pre-conversion stage. Indeed, the rhetorical focus of her narrative is her captivity, which she intends to symbolize as the soul's bondage to flesh; she devotes only the last Remove to her ransom and return home, which she intends to represent as the convert's assurance of salvation. However, her narrative foregrounds her sinful flesh more than its promised sublimation to such a degree that her tale threatens to destabilize the model of conversion to which it attempts to adhere.

The subversive dimensions of Rowlandson's representation may be understood in terms of Julia
Kristeva's notion of the abject, what she defines as the impure corporeality that reminds the subject of its repugnant connection to the maternal body, and in terms of Kristeva's interpretation of the abject's manifestation in language and in Christian thought. According to Kristeva, the abject is never entirely excluded from consciousness as the subject enters the symbolic, and so it is a kind of residue, unable to be entirely assimilated by language. The abject is the "underside of the symbolic" (Grosz 89); it is a threat to stable identity because of its association with the subject's pre-separation stage, and so it is that which the symbolic must "reject, cover over, and contain" (Grosz 89). Indeed, because of the abject's relation to the maternal body, Kristeva associates the abject with the marginalized feminine in the symbolic system and conceptualizes it as a threat to the paternal, hierarchical order. Kristeva identifies this construct of the abject in the Christian identification of woman with sinning flesh; it is the "nourishing," yet "threatening heterogeneity" of the maternal principle, reconciled with-but not entirely rehabilitated by--Christianity (117).

Rowlandson represents her body as this construct of sinning female flesh, the manifestation of what Kristeva considers the abject. Rowlandson heightens the effect of this image of transgressing female flesh by combining it with the colonialist representation of sin with "savagery" prominent in the public discourses interpreting Metacom's
War, specifically, in Increase Mather's 1676 sermon, "An Exhortation: to the Inhabitants of New-England" (181), preached shortly after her ransom. Her recollection in The Nineteenth Remove of an anecdote by a Praying Indian, whose fastidious converted brother had given up eating horse meat, ironically suggests how her image of savage carnality may be understood as Kristeva's notion of the abject. As the first item in her catalog of accusations against Christianized Indians, this story expresses an irony that Rowlandson's judgmental tone attempts to disguise, the irony that she--"with any Indian of them all" (353)--had violated cultural taboos and had transgressed Christian prohibitions against eating heathen foods. That Rowlandson interrupts her description of her negotiation of her ransom with this story suggests her need, as she recalls her return home, to restore Puritan order to her narrative, to "reject, cover over, and contain" (Grosz 89) the abject, the "underside of the symbolic" (Grosz 89), to which her tale, until now, has called attention. As she recalls,

There was another Praying Indian, who told me, that he had a brother, that would not eat horse; his conscience was so tender and scrupulous (though large as hell, for the destruction of poor Christians). Then he said, he read that scripture to him, 2 Kings, 6-25. 'There was a famine in Samaria, and behold they besieged it, until an ass's head was sold for fourscore pieces of silver.' He expounded this place to his brother, and showed him that it was lawful to eat that in a famine which is not at another
Rowlandson intends this story to expose the presumed unpredictable nature of the native and so to bolster her and her culture's illusion of belonging to a superior civilization. However, the converted Indians' hybrid identities, comprising both the Christian and the Heathen, fail to serve for her as what post-colonial theorist JanMohamed calls the "mirror that reflects the colonialist's self-image" (84). Instead, the converted Indian's scriptural justification of his transgression of food taboos creates a parody of the Puritans' bibliolatry and Rowlandson's own reliance on scriptural references throughout her narration to explain her violations of Puritan prohibitions. At this turning point in her tale, when Rowlandson recalls her impending exchange between the two cultures, her attempt to show a division between herself and the native other is not entirely successful; nor is her narrative's corresponding attempt to impose boundaries around the abject; her own composite identity during her captivity, reflected back to her in the Indians' hybridity, is similar to Kristeva's construction of the abject. While religions and cultures define the abject in terms of corporeality and unclean substance, in the signifying system, the abject also comes to mean that which defies "purity" or rules of classification, taxonomy, and hierarchy; the abject is, as Kristeva
proposes, composite, heterogeneous and "perverse" because it disturbs identity, disrupts boundaries, and resists laws (4).

Because the abject, according to Kristeva's psycholinguistic model, exists on the border of the unconscious and the conscious, it "skirt[s] the somatic symptom on the one hand," which Kristeva calls "a language that gives up, a structure within the body," and "sublimation on the other"; as symptom, the abject "permeates the subject"; conversely, through sublimation, the subject "keep[s] [the abject] under control" (11). Thus, as Kristeva concludes, "the abject is edged with the sublime," for although "it is not the same moment on the journey, ... the same subject and speech bring them into being" (11). As she argues in her analysis of Christianity, this osmosis between the abject and the sublime in subjective experience re-appears in Paul's notion of the dialectical relationship between the base body, "perverse" because it challenges the law (124), and the sublimated body. This apparently paradoxical link between the abject and the sublime also appears in Christian discourses of martyrdom, for as Kristeva argues, "only after having sinned does the mystic topple over into holiness, and his holiness never ceases to appear to him as fringed by sin" (126). As she suggests, in Christian mysticism, abjection is "the most propitious place for
communication--as the point where the scales are tipped towards pure spirituality” (127).

Composed within Christian allegory and the language of martyrdom, Rowlandson's narrative exploits these apparent paradoxes that affliction is the sign of election, that abjection is the means to spirituality, and that, as Kristeva points out, sin is an "evil whose power is in direct ratio to the holiness that identifies it as such, and into which it can convert" (123). In her self-representation, Rowlandson conforms to the conventions of Puritan conversion allegory, yet calls attention to what Kristeva identifies as the "osmosis" in Christian consciousness "between the spiritual and the substantial, the corporeal and the signifying--a heterogeneity that cannot be divided back into its components" (120). As Rowlandson represents and foregrounds her body as the corporeal dimension of this Christian self, she deconstructs the sublime by showing its dependence on the abject. Since her tale serves a public communal function as an exemplum fidei, its representation of the abject, contained within socially sanctioned conversion allegory, invites her audience's vicarious identification with what Mitchell Breitwieser calls the "social unconscious" of Puritan theory, with those heterogeneous feelings that were usually "purged from public discourse" by a "hegemonic doctrinal exegesis" that controlled the "means of textual production and social legitimation" (20).
Rowlandson's use of Puritanism's social constructions of sin as female flesh and "savagery" provides an answer to the question posed by AnnLouise Keating in her comparative analysis of the body-writings of Helene Cixous and Gloria Anzaldua: "Can culturally inscribed bodies--despite, or perhaps because of the way they are marked by gender, class, ethnicity, and sexuality, provide us with alternative ways of knowing and writing?" (122-123). As Rowlandson represents her body as transgressive carnality, her narrative interrogates the gendered binaries of flesh and spirit, sin and spirituality, and nature and language that position women as embodied others in Puritan discourse and culture. By calling attention to this "social unconscious" of Puritan theory (Breitwieser 20), her hybrid tale exposes what may be understood as the abject, the "underside of the symbolic" (Gross 89); indeed, her representation of the abject body threatens to destabilize the model of conversion on which the Puritan hegemony relied for its maintenance of a paternal hierarchical order.

Rowlandson's public autobiographical act, the symbolic culmination of her return from captivity to the body politic, suggests the female subject's marginalized, yet potentially disruptive presence, within Puritan religious discourse. Because colonialist and patriarchal discourses intersect to corporealize the identities of women and indigenous peoples, her entrance into the
"official" language of the universal subject, accompanied by her new experiential knowledge of a native culture, introduced the possibility for discursive destabilizations by the embodied others historically excluded from representation because of their gender and race. While her admission into Puritan public discourse was doubly challenged by her gender and by her eleven-week-long association, (however unwilling), with "racial others," Rowlandson may have been aware--as was her sponsor--of the potential disruption her body could symbolize in the patriarchal social order.

Among the effects of discourses of embodiment on women autobiographers, as Sidonie Smith observes and as Anne Hutchinson's trials verify, is the "contamination" of their "relationship to the word," which results from the devaluation of women's intellects and the cultural identification of femaleness with irrationality (15). To mitigate Puritanism's negative identification of her speech with the forces of cultural disorder, Rowlandson had to justify her public authorship, which was also made more legitimate by the appeals of Increase Mather in his preface.

First, because discourses of embodiment render racially and sexually "othered" bodies as repugnant, she disavows what her fellow Puritans would consider any cultural or physical contamination by the Narragansetts, a repudiation she bases, most fundamentally, in her defense
of her body's purity. Since her body symbolically functioned in her late-seventeenth-century discursive community as the boundary between the "pagan" and the Christian, the Other and the self, the abject and the symbolic, the impenetrability of her hymen, in particular, signified New England's inviolate identity and the Puritan language's transparency of meaning by which the theocracy attempted to maintain its hegemony. Just as the Levitical abominations in the Old Testament, in particular, those regarding leprosy and the decaying body, compelled the body to be "clean and proper in order to be fully symbolic" (Kristeva 102), so Rowlandson defended the chastity of her body to prove the purity of her words and in turn, the purity of the national identity they inscribed. As Smith explains, it is because discourses of embodiment make anatomy "the irreducible granite at the core of a woman's being" that the hymen, "the material and symbolic boundary of the female body," acquires such significance in patriarchies; for it represents the border of "integrity and violation," an "inside/outside boundary" that disrupts the fiction of "autonomous individuality" on which the universal subject founds its authority (Subjectivity 12-13). Thus, in the same passages where Rowlandson invites sanctioning of her public authorship by projecting the "feminine" virtues of self-effacement and humility, she also defends her chastity. In the Twentieth Remove, immediately after she clarifies that not one of
the Narragansetts "offered [her] the least abuse of unchastity to [her], in word and action," she demonstrates the purity of her motives for publishing her story, claiming, "though some are ready to say, I speak it for my own credit; but I speak it in the presence of God, and to His glory" (361). Similarly, in his defense of her publication, Mather refers to the New Testament story of the ten lepers cleansed by Christ, implying links between the cleanness of the body and Rowlandson's example of faith and her spiritual redemption. Justifying her public appearance as an expression of gratitude toward God, he forewarns readers that if any "cast reflection upon this gentlewoman, on the score of this publication of her affliction and deliverance," they should recall "the nine lepers [in Luke 17:11-19], of whom it is said, Were there not ten cleansed, where are the nine? but one returning to give thanks" (320). By paralleling Rowlandson's tale with the grateful words of the one leper whose faith, Christ assures him, has cured him, the author not only suggests, as Kristeva has described, how Christian conversion attempts to release the divided subject of its abjection and ease it into symbolic relations, but he also removes the social and theological stigma from the female author's speech.

To fulfill Puritan criteria for public female authorship as well as to display her endurance of her tribulation, Rowlandson is obligated to project a persona
of the self-restrained saint who, as Kristeva would describe it, conforms to "the straitest paths of Superego spirituality" (122); yet, because of the permeable boundary between abjection and holiness that Kristeva identifies in Christian mysticism and which manifests itself in the paradox in the Puritan doctrine of providential affliction--that one's Christic journey necessarily requires one's immersion in flesh--Rowlandson conversely presents herself as a carnal sinner seized with desires of self-gratification.

Rowlandson's apparently paradoxical self-representation as both sinner and saint contributes to the apparently paradoxical cultural function of her narrative, which, on the surface, is to serve as a public example of faith. Mather sponsored its publication because he hoped it would act as an exemplum fidei, which would consolidate Massachusetts' collective identity by solidifying the relationship between the individual believer and the community of the elect. This identificatory practice of the exemplum fidei served to contribute to the cohesiveness of Puritanism, which, unlike other intellectual movements of the Renaissance, ambivalently suppressed the individualism emergent in its emphasis on the personal conversion experience for fear it might lead to its denomination's fragmentation (Bercovitch 10). The restoration of communal unity was especially important to Mather at the end of Metacom's War because it would also
bolster the ministerial authority that was threatened by colonists' anger about the personal and financial costs of the conflict.

In his preface, Mather invites readers' identification with Rowlandson's example of faith by framing her story with the biblical hero Samson's riddle, "Out of the eater has come forth meat" (Judges 14:14), an oral-dietary scriptural metaphor common in Puritan life-writing for not only the spiritual benefits of enduring affliction but also Christian communion and collective regeneration. This scripture refers to the story of Samson's eating honey, made from bees, out of the carcass of the lion he has slain, distributing this sweet meat, which Puritans would identify as a prefiguration of Christ, to his parents for consumption, and then presenting his fiancee's countrymen with the riddle. Mather intends this scripture, also the epigraph for John Bunyan's autobiography, to equate Rowlandson's words with spiritual meat to be consumed by her reading public in a symbolic act of communion, an equation of sacred text and sustenance common in Puritan rhetoric. Accordingly, he urges the audience, in his closing injunction to "read therefore, peruse, ponder, and from hence lay by something from the experience of another against thine own turn comes, that so thou also through patience and consolation of the scripture mayest have hope" (Rowlandson 322). Thus, through the biblical type of Samson's partaking and
sharing the honey, Mather attempts to establish for the audience the "nutritive opening up to the other, the full acceptance of archaic and gratifying relationship to the mother" that Kristeva attributes to Christ's transformative power and which, she argues, is the "condition for another opening--the opening up to symbolic relations, true outcome of the Christic journey" (115). However, if, as Richard Slotkin suggests, the "eater" foreshadowed in the prefatory biblical text is ironically Rowlandson herself, who devours the "Indians' world, their bread and wine" as "it would devour her" (112), then Mather also paradoxically encourages readers to identify with her feasting on what Slotkin calls a "Black Eucharist" as well as its inversion, the bread of Christian grace.

Although laden with religious sacramental imagery, the language of romantic primitivism with which Slotkin characterizes Rowlandson’s contact with the "native" invites comparison to bell hooks' notion of white cultures' commodification of race and ethnicity as "primitive" resources for pleasure in contemporary American popular texts. Although hooks' contemporary commentary, "Eating the Other: Desire and Resistance," is not entirely applicable to seventeenth-century Indian captivity tales, her analysis of white dominant cultures' conflation of otherness and pleasure in popular media nevertheless helps explain the covert cultural function of
Rowlandson's narrative. As Slotkin argues, Rowlandson "became for a while Indian-like in her behavior; she gained insight into the Indian heart and lived intimately with the Indians" (112). Her story of her unwilling cohabitation with the Narragansetts safely engaged her readers in a vicarious transgression of ethnic boundaries and in an experience of those forbidden feelings projected onto the other that were repressed in a religion that privileged rationality. Yet because her initiation into the wilderness is only partial and because she re-integrates herself into her Euro-American community, her story of contact with the "native," in the end--despite its engagement of feelings considered counter-hegemonic in conventional Puritan autobiography--attempts to re-assert white Christian identity against the contrasting darker landscape of the "pagan" ethnic other.

As hooks explains, white cultures' desires for the "primitive" and fantasies about the other, expressed in film representations of inter-racial relationships and in print advertisements' cross-cultural imagery, are rooted in the longing for pleasure in a society plagued by a pervasive anhedonia. In popular media, white subjects' encounters with "primitive" otherness are "marked as more exciting, more intense, and more threatening"; their experience of this intermixture of pleasure and danger allows them to break through their anhedonia and to enjoy emotional and spiritual renewal (hooks 26). In particular,
as hooks explains, quoting Marianna Torgovnick's study *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellects, Modern Lives* (1990), Westerners' fascination with "primitivism" originates in their need to overcome "alienation from the body, restoring the body, and hence the self, to a relation of full and easy harmony with nature and the cosmos" (32). Torgovnick's study does not account for the kind of forced captivity to the "primitive" undergone by Rowlandson, nor for her experience of the wilderness as threatening. However, that Rowlandson's contact with the "primitive" is unwilling may have removed guilt from the consciousnesses of her readers, as they vicariously enjoyed identification with her description of her gradual metamorphosis into what she calls a "brute creature" (339). What hooks questions--and what becomes relevant to the cultural significance of Rowlandson's tale--is to what extent these "potentially revolutionary longings" are exploited by a white dominant patriarchy to reinscribe the status quo, or to what extent they are used as "a critical intervention challenging and subverting racist [or more generally, hegemonic] domination" (22). Rowlandson's drama of her forced encounter with the "primitive," particularized in her descriptions of what bells hooks calls "eating the other" in her adaptation of the Narragansetts' eating practices, does both: while it forces a reinscription of the status quo in the end, its commodification of racial difference engages, in the process, Puritan readers'
longings to break through the regimented personality their religion demanded of them and to feel the pleasure and danger associated with acute bodily experience.

Staying within the conventions of conversion allegory and using the colonialist constructions of sin as savage, Rowlandson constructs her hunger and eating as what Kristeva calls the "brimming flesh of sin," which is represented in Christianity, as she reminds us, as "feminine temptation" (126). Rowlandson intends her recollection of her literal hungers to suggest Paul's notion of sin as implanted in flesh and as unleashing an "overwhelming release of drives, unrestrained by the symbolic" (Kristeva 124).

In The Fifteenth Remove, she summarizes her ensuing spiritual and bodily condition in her evocation of Micah 6:14, "Thou shalt eat and not be satisfied," the prophet's denouncement of the Israelites for their sins, the prefigurement in Puritan typology of God's punishment of his Chosen people. Commenting on "what a wolfish appetite a person has in a starving condition," she remembers:

for many times when they gave me that which was hot, I was so greedy, that I should burn my mouth, that it would trouble me hours after, and yet I should quickly do the same again. And after I was thoroughly hungry, I was never again satisfied. For though sometimes it fell out, that I got enough, and did eat till I could eat no more, yet I was as unsatisfied as I was when I began. And now I could see that scripture verified (there being many scriptures which we do not take notice of, or understand till we are
Within the convergence of Christian allegory and Old Testament typology, her appetite signifies the unregenerate soul's longings as well as the hunger and the thirst of the Jews in exodus. However, if, as Mitchell Breitwieser argues, the "realism" in Rowlandson's narrative is not simply a duplication of real events, but an account of experience that breaks through or outdistances her own and her culture's dominant means of representation (10), then her realistic renderings of her hunger express experience resistant to sublimation in language sanctioned by social, theological, and political structures. Indeed, from a psycholinguistic perspective, they suggest those pre-symbolic heterogeneous desires that are repressed only partially by the signifying system and that threaten to destabilize the subject's sense of a homogeneous identity, the ontological foundation for the establishment of a univocal religion and of a collective national consciousness.

Rowlandson's insatiable appetite, as Breitwieser mentions in his brief only peripheral attention to her images of hunger, is equivalent to her mourning for the death of her six-year-old daughter Sarah, an emotion that is unsatisfiable and arrested by a theology that prohibits its natural expression (143). Indeed, Breitwieser links Rowlandson's desire to violate Puritan prohibitions
against excessive grieving to her transgression of prohibitions similar to those in Leviticus regulating impure or abject substances, including eating certain foods, contact with corpses, and other abominations (214).

Rowlandson's yearning for satiation, stimulated by the loss of Sarah, who died of wounds within the first week of her and her mother's captivity, is a correlate to the archaic loss, the separation from the mother, the origin, according to Kristeva, of the structuration of the subject. Although Rowlandson is the mother in this circumstance, the mother's giving birth to a child, as Kristeva observes, always reminds her of her own lost bond with her mother (Oliver 24), and so one may infer that Sarah's death also re-enacts Rowlandson's loss of her connection to her mother's body.

Sarah's death and the circumstances of her burial prompt the emergence of the abject in Rowlandson, which Kristeva defines as "the violence of mourning for an 'object' that has always already been lost" (15). As Kristeva continues:

The abject shatters the wall of repression and its judgments. It takes the ego back to its source on the abominable limit from which, in order to be, the ego has broken away--it assigns it a source in the non-ego, drive, and death. (15)

After her recollection of her first week of captivity, during which she carried the dying Sarah in her arms, Rowlandson records the day of her daughter's death,
February 18, 1675, in The Third Remove. It is Sarah's death and her night-long holding of her daughter's body that propel her into the zone of the abject, her confrontation with and her acknowledgement of her own--and humanity's--mortality, animality, and materiality.

As waste, the dead body, according to Kristeva's interpretation of Old Testament texts, is a pollutant, not to be touched (109). In spite of these biblical designations of the corpse as abject, as impure, and as untouchable, Rowlandson remembers, "I cannot, but take notice, how at another time I could not bear to be in the room where any dead person was, but now the case is changed; I must and could lie down by my dead babe, side by side all the night after" (329). Rowlandson's transgression of biblical taboos against contact with corpses anticipates her subsequent transgression of food prohibitions. As Kristeva remarks:

Worshiping corpses, on the one hand, eating objectionable meat on the other; those are the two abominations that bring about divine malediction and thus point to the two ends of the chain of prohibitions that binds the biblical text and entails...a whole range of sexual or moral prohibitions. (110)

Although Rowlandson is not an example in any sense of the "corpse fanciers" to which Kristeva refers (109), her night-long embrace of her daughter's dead body recalls the subject's archaic connection to the maternal body, the memory of which is neither entirely excluded from
conscious experience nor entirely sublimated. If, as Kristeva claims, the corpse, as waste, is "above all the opposite of the spiritual, of the symbolic, and of divine law" (109), then Rowlandson's prolonged contact with the body of her daughter suggests her self-representation as the abject, as inhabiting the boundary between the unconscious and the symbolic, paganism and Christianity, and perversity and law. The burial of her daughter's body, in contrast, re-enacts the archaic separation from the maternal body and reinstates the processes of division and differentiation that preoccupy subjective experience and religious practices. Since, as Kristeva's analysis of Old Testament scripture suggests, the corpse, as a "body without soul, a non-body, disquieting matter," must be kept out of God's territory as well as his speech, its burial is the means of its purification (109). Rowlandson's dyadic bond with her daughter's body is interrupted by the Narragansetts' burial of Sarah on the morning after her vigil. She recalls:

In the morning, when they understood that my child was dead they sent for me to my master's [Quinnapin's] wigwam....I went to take up my dead child in my arms to carry it with me, but they bid me let it alone: there was no resisting, but go I must and leave it. When I had been at my master's wigwam, I took the first opportunity I could get, to go look after my dead child: when I came I asked them what they had done with it? Then they told me it was upon the hill: then they went and showed me where it was, where I saw the ground was newly digged, and there they told me they had buried it: there I left that child in
the wilderness, and must commit it, and myself also, in this wilderness condition, to Him who is above all. (329)

In her concluding line, Rowlandson attempts to sublimate her natural grief, as regulated by Puritanism's prohibition against excessive mourning, into a spiritual resignation to God's divine will. Accompanying this effort is her similar attempt to assign allegorical meanings to Sarah's death and to her own captivity: she represents Sarah's literal "pagan" burial as a symbol of her own--and the allegorical Christian's--spiritual "wilderness condition" (Rowlandson 329). However, because the gap persists between her real experience and her allegorical mode of interpretation--between her raw feelings and their sublimation (Breitwieser 9)--her irreversible loss of Sarah catapults her into an abjection--a realization that propels her narrative of the impossibility of transcending corporeality and mortality. Indeed, Sarah's burial does not successfully exclude her body, suggestive of the abject, from the symbolic, for her death continues to trouble her mother's heart and, in turn, the signifying process by which Rowlandson represents her experience. Although the catalyst to Sarah's separation from her is not birth or individuation, but death, Rowlandson's reaction exemplifies what Kristeva cites as an effect of abjection:

[it] preserves what existed in the archaism of pre-objectal relationship, in the immemorial violence with which a body becomes separated
If Rowlandson's hunger, like her mourning, suggests her unsatisfiable desire for the severed maternal bond, then her voracious eating of impure food, which she begins to record in the Fifth Remove shortly after her recollection of Sarah's death, suggests the archaic oral relation to the mother. While she intends her devouring orality to function as a symbol within her religious and historical allegories, it also has implications in terms of subjective experience. Compellingly, her hunger and eating suggest the effects on the ego of the abject's shattering of repression. As Kristeva argues, the abject "takes the ego back to its source to the abominable limits from which, in order to be, [it] has broken away [and] assigns it a source in the non-ego, drive, and death" (15). Like her mourning, her insatiable hunger resists sublimation into the discourses sanctioned by Puritan theology; it constitutes an alternative material language, corresponding to Puritanism's identification of woman with materiality and corporeality.

As Breitwieser confirms, in his brief reference to Kristeva's *The Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection* (1982), some of the foods Rowlandson eats, such as hooves and fawn fetus, are similar to the abominations in Leviticus. Indeed, since Kristeva sees in religions'
demarcations of the profane and the sacred the same processes of separation that she identifies in subjective experience, she interprets Judaism's food prohibitions as its attempt to impose division between itself and the repugnant abject, which it considered an external threat (100). As she suggests, Judaism developed these prohibitions while it was engaged in the process of defining itself as a monotheistic religion, separating itself from the "paganism" that accompanied many matrilinear societies and in which the maternal principle remained prominent (94). Judaism's distinction between impure foods and behaviors later evolved into a division between conformity to the law and resistance to it, a demarcation that attempted to hold intact Judaism's sense of autonomy, univocity, and paternal authority (94).

Rowlandson's abjection is represented in her increasing carnivorousness, which may be understood in terms of a violation of Judaic taboos against eating meat containing blood. According to Kristeva's interpretation of Genesis, after Noah's Flood and after the first dietary trespass (eating the apple), God gives humanity permission to forsake vegetarianism and to eat meat, not as a reward, but as an acknowledgement of the human propensity toward evil and murder, as a recognition of "that ineradicable 'death drive,' ...[in] its most primordial or archaic aspect--devouring" (96). Yet later in the Bible, the previous distinction between vegetable and animal, used to
differentiate between humanity and God, is reinstated, with bloodless flesh designated for humanity and with blood considered impure because it is only suitable for God (Kristeva 96). As Kristeva argues, just as the maternal body in the signifying system suggests an admixture of nourishment and threat, so blood, associated with not only murder but also women and fertility, becomes a "semantic crossroads, the propitious place for abjection where death and femininity, murder and procreation, cessation of life and vitality all come together" (96).

From the Fifth Remove and throughout most of her narrative, much of the food Rowlandson eats fits into the category of Judaic abominations, including meat containing blood and the flesh of carnivorous animals. While the bloody meat she consumes symbolizes her sinfulness within her conversion allegory, it also suggests her own female flesh, since sin is represented as feminine temptation in the Judeo-Christian tradition and since the taboo of the mother is at the origin of Judaic prohibitions. Thus, her suggestion of her transgression of food prohibitions contributes to the subversive dimensions of her figuring of her body; indeed, her representation of her abject body suggests what Kristeva calls the dreaded repressed feminine, on which the symbolic attempts to impose boundaries in order to protect the conscious subject from confrontation with it (7).
Most scholars who have traced food as a controlling metaphor in her narrative have interpreted it from the traditional perspective of Rowlandson's Calvinism rather than from a feminist point of view that links women's relationship to food to their experience of self and to their reactions against the social order. As Teresa Toulouse suggests in her Calvinistic approach, the "loathsomeness" of the food Rowlandson eats is an extension of her sinful flesh and a manifestation of her soul's depravity (661). Significantly, Toulouse overlooks the jouissance Rowlandson depicts in her descriptions of her gradual relishing of the food of her affliction, which she at first denigrates as "filthy trash" but eventually enjoys as "sweet and savory to [her] taste" (333). Indeed, woman's jouissance, as many French feminist theorists, including Kristeva, have suggested, constitutes an alternative female language even if it risks reinscribing essentialist notions of womanhood that perpetuate patriarchal modes of thinking.

Rowlandson's initial aversion to this food suggests the subject's reflexive revulsion at the abject. In the Fifth Remove, her description of her gradual adaptation to the food of her affliction suggests her initial repulsion at, but eventual embrace and enjoyment of the prohibited abject. She recalls:

The first week of my being among them, I hardly ate anything; the second week, I found my
stomach grow very faint for want of something; and yet it was very hard to get down their filthy trash: but the third week, though I could think how formerly my stomach would turn against this or that, and I could starve and die before I could eat such things, yet they were sweet and savory to my taste. (333)

Rowlandson's jouissance is common to the experience of the mystic, for whom a permeable boundary exists between abjection and holiness and for whom, sin acts as "the point of departure where the scales are tipped toward spirituality" (127). Rowlandson's depiction of her pleasure in consuming these defiled rations is not masochistic, for as Kristeva warns, the jouissance of the Christian mystic is independent of an institutional or symbolic power and displaces itself into a discourse that resorbs the subject, through grace, into the divine Other (127). Just as a woman's (more precisely, a mother's) jouissance "threatens to make her a subject rather than the Other against which man becomes a subject" (Oliver 50), so Rowlandson's pleasurable eating allows her to assume an active subject position.

Indeed, recent scholarship on women's literature has taken into consideration contemporary psychological theories that connect women's relationship to food to their assumption of power in the social and symbolic order. As psychologist Sally Cline suggests, because women have historically been associated with food, they often appropriate it in their lives as a language; since patriarchal languages lack the capacity to accommodate
female experience, it is logical "that women choose [food] as an alternative, non-verbal form of communication" (qtd. Parker 358). Scholars, such as Emma Parker and Lillian R. Furst, have applied these psychological theories to literary representations of women's relationship to food. In her study of food and power in Margaret Atwood's fiction, for instance, Parker suggests, "For women, eating and non-eating articulate that which is ideologically unspeakable" (358). Similarly, in her introduction to her collection of critical essays on literary portrayals of deviant eating behaviors, Furst observes that extreme consumption or nonconsumption of food derives from the "desire to exercise the power of self over an uncongenial social system"; she concludes that "disorderly eating can...represent the last protest left to the socially disempowered, and at the same time, paradoxically, a means for them to attain a kind of domination" (6).

In fact, Rowlandson's representations of her disorderly eating and excess appetite forge a counternarrative against the calls to fasting and ministerial control in other important public documents of Metacom's War, most notably in Increase Mather's history and in the images of spiritual deprivation in her husband's 1678 fast-day sermon, "The Possibility of God's Forsaking a People that have been Visibly Near and Dear to him," appended at the end of her published narrative.
In his "A Brief History of the War with the Indians in New England," published in 1676 more than a year before Rowlandson's composition, Mather records Massachusetts' repeated observances of days of fast, prayer, and humiliation throughout the year of the war, communal rituals appointed by the theocracy in New England to either ask for God's mercy during times of sinfulness or civic distress or to ask for God's blessing on a noteworthy undertaking. During periods of socio-political turmoil, church and civil authorities designated fast days, on which participants abstained from food and nonessential liquids until mid-day, for public repentance, collective rebirth, and the consolidation of social cohesion. Attesting to the urgency with which Massachusetts magistrates attempted to impose social order on the colonists during the waging of Metacom's War, the greatest number of fast-humiliation days occurred in New England during 1675 and 1676, the years spanning the conflict (Bosco xxiv). Yet, as Mather suggests in his records, so great were New England's sins during the time of Metacom's War, that fasting and the conviction of sin accompanying it were not enough to stave off God's wrath and the enemy's onslaughts; on October 7, 1675, for example, he records that "this day of Humiliation appointed by the Council [at Boston], was solemnly observed yet attended with awfull testemonyes of divine displeasure." As he continues,
The very next day after this Fast was agreed upon by those in civill Authority, was that dismal and fatal blow, when Captain Lothrop and his company ...were slaughtered, whereby the Heathen were ... triumphing and saying, that so great slaughter was never known...." (103-104)

Mather's references to fasting anticipate Rowlandson's representation of her own "feeble carcass" (354), which she intends her Puritan audience, many of whom participated in fast days during the war, to recognize as a symbol of repentance and spiritual emptiness. Rowlandson's starvation suggests the "want" that as Kristeva claims, is the biblical definition of sin, a "debt" that motivates the believer to adopt a behavior of conformity, self-restraint, and obedience. However, this notion of sin as lack, as Kristeva observes from her dialectical perspective, is combined in the Bible with its counterpart, the notion of sin as "lust" or "greed," as an overflowing, a profusion, even an unquenchable desire" (123). That the Bible constructs this overweening power of sin as transformable into the sublime accounts for this recognition in Christian thought of the permeable border between abjection and holiness. As Kristeva explains,

Far from advocating solely a doctrine of limitation and conformity to divine speech, the Christian conception of sin also includes a recognition of an evil whose power is in direct ratio to the holiness that identifies it as such, and into which it can convert. Such a conversion into jouissance and beauty goes far beyond the retributive, legalistic tonality of sin as debt or iniquity. (123)
Like Kristeva's dialectical notion of sin, Rowlandson's starvation stimulates its opposite, an insatiable appetite, and impels her surrender to the sinful food of her affliction. Her narrative invites her Puritan readers to await the transformation of her sinful greed into holiness, a process engaging her in the jouissance that characterizes the mystic's immersion in affliction. Her tale, then, invites her readers to await the sublimation of her base body into a spiritualized body submersed into divine speech. However, by foregrounding the pre-conversion abject body, her recollection forges a material counter-narrative within the patriarchy's "official" histories of Metacom's War; indeed, her tale exaggerates representation of the gendered and racialized body that these histories link to cultural disorder and that the theocracy's fasting rituals attempt to regiment into a collective sublimation.

Although Rowlandson casts her descriptions of her eating as transgressions of Judaic prohibitions, she intends these representations to promote her narrative's Christian purpose: to enact the disobedience and the immersion in evil paradoxically necessary for the sinner's eventual conversion and assurance of salvation. As Kristeva points out, unlike temptation in Levitical texts, where the subject protects itself against revulsion and abjection by obeying dietary prohibitions and eschewing abominations, "Christian sin, tying its spiritual knot
between flesh and law, does not cut off the abject" (Kristeva 127). Rowlandson intends her images of her transgressive eating to point her readers to the promise of Christianity's sublimation of the abject body into spirituality; yet, in part because the realism with which she documents her real experience of her body outdistances the dominant modes of representation with which her religion expects her to convey her ordeal, her tale contains a counter-current against her intentions. Indeed, her narrative discovers and exposes the tension between the dreaded repressed maternal and the symbolic, which originates in subjective experience and emerges in religious discourse. This tension is produced by the symbolic's attempt to maintain boundaries around the abject in order to protect the conscious subject from confrontation with it.

Her description of her eating the fetus out of a killed doe, for example, in The Fourteenth Remove, dramatizes a commingling with the maternal body that threatens to dissolve the ontological division in subjective experience. Further suggesting the disruption of the concept of autonomous individuality on which the privileged male subject and the Puritan hegemony found their authority, the doe's pregnancy blurs the notion of a univocal identity, disrupting boundaries between inside and outside. Rowlandson's relishing of the unborn fawn's flesh resembles the abnormal relationship between mother
and child, in short, the incest taboo, which Kristeva identifies as underlying food abominations in Deuteronomy and Exodus. Among these Old Testament rules, made to enforce the processes of separation and differentiation, are prohibitions against seething a kid in his mother's milk and sacrificing the cow or ewe on the same day with its young (Kristeva 105). Rowlandson's violation of the spirit of such prohibitions against incest is suggested in The Fourteenth Remove as she recalls eating the fetus from a slaughtered doe. Having described her faintness from hunger and her only recourse for nourishment—moldy corn cake crumbs—she remembers:

As we went along, they killed a deer, with a young one in her, they gave me a piece of thefawn, and it was young and tender, that one might eat the bones as well as the flesh, and yet I thought it very good. (347)

The Narragansetts' killing the pregnant deer and then eating the fetus suggests a transgression of the Judaic rules that attempt to impose a separation between the subject and the maternal body. Although Rowlandson later abstains from drinking the blood of the deer, boiled in its paunch, her pleasurable consumption of the fawn's flesh suggests her identification with what Kristeva identifies as the taboo female body. She does not end this passage with the biblical citations with which she encloses many of her representations of hunger, which rationalize or sanction her transgressive eating. Indeed,
these biblical frames attempt to circumscribe her disorderly eating within a rational paradigm of God's providential universe. That these rhetorical borders are inconsistently imposed suggests the tension in her narrative between the symbolic's attempt to contain the abject and the abject's potential threat to its hierarchical order. Rowlandson concludes this segment with a beratement of the Narrgansetts for being apparently barbaric enough to drink deer's blood yet fastidious in other matters. She remarks, "And yet they were so nice in other things, that when I had fetched water, and had put the dish I dipped the water with, onto the kettle of water which I brought ..., they said, it was a sluttish trick" (347). Her harsh judgment, besides showing ignorance of the Native Americans' customs, belies her unconscious identification with their "savagery" and her guilty awareness of her own merging with the maternal, an "unclean and improper coalescence," an "undifferentiated power and threat, a defilement to be cut off" (Kristeva 106).

Her taking meat from a hungry English child further demonstrates her increasing carnivorousness and her representation as the abject. After she recalls begging food from wigwam to wigwam, she explains, in The Eighteenth Remove:
Then I went to another wigwam, where there were two of the English children; the squaw was boiling horse's feet, then she cut off a little piece, and gave one of the English children a piece also. Being very hungry I had quickly eaten up mine, but the child could not bite it, it was so tough and sinewy, but lay sucking, gnawing, chewing, and slobbering of it in the mouth and hand, then I took it of the child, and ate it myself, and savory it was to my taste. Then I may say as Job, 6.7. The things that my soul refused to touch, are as my sorrowful meat. Thus the Lord made that pleasant refreshing, which another time would have been an abomination. (350)

Rowlandson's description of this child's eating is clearly not only an argument against any good the meat was doing the child but also a projection of her own excess desires. Her taking of the meat is not simply an allegorical symbol of her soul's utter debasement (Slotkin 110). Its justification by her biblical reference also suggests the perversity to which Kristeva imputes her construction of the abject. Kristeva claims, "Corruption is [the abject's] most common, most obvious appearance"; it is perverse "because it neither gives up nor assumes a prohibition, a rule, or a law; but turns them aside, misleads, corrupts, uses them, takes advantage of them, the better to deny them" (15). "Perversely," Rowlandson uses the biblical rational paradigm of God's affliction of the male hero Job to emphasize and sanction her disorderly eating, which defies Puritan social mores, including gender ideologies defining proper womanhood.
Her taking food from the English child further implies her reversal of the gender roles marking her place in the Puritan hierarchy as well as her disregard of her national affiliation. This act, the antithesis of self-sacrificing maternity, contrasts with her practices of Puritan good-wifery and mothering described in her previous passages, especially in The Thirteenth Remove. In the previous scene, she demonstrates her conformity to her maternal gender role and her national loyalty in her description of helping an ill English youth to a fire, a risky act that subsequently endangers her life and for which her captors confine her to a wigwam (3). However, in The Eighteenth Remove, her disorderly eating characterizes the opposite of the nurturing mother--the devouring mother, suggesting the paradoxical facets of the maternal that as Kristeva claims, provoke in the subject a contradictory terror and fascination.

Rowlandson's use of the image of the mirror in The Twentieth Remove, when she knows of her imminent ransom and return home, encapsulates her positionality as the marginalized feminine in the symbolic system and the extent to which this marginality can empower her formation of subjectivity. Rowlandson intends her gaze into a glass to suggest the self's transformation in the conversion process, a common trope in Puritan autobiography, based on Paul's scriptural metaphor for the imitation of Christ. Celebrating the convert's emulation of the sublimation of
Christ, Paul declares, "We all with open face beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image" (2 Cor. 3:18). The Puritans applied this Pauline trope to their conceptualization of the convert's struggle for salvation as located in the body. As Sacvan Bercovitch explains, believers sought to purge themselves of their tainted humanity in order to become clean surfaces on which to radiate the unstained image of the Christ; in fact, the less they saw of themselves in the mirror, the better, or even more ideally, their reflections should disappear (14-15). This common metaphor for the divided Christian subject's conversion from abjection into holiness appears in the popular and prototypical Puritan autobiography John Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*. Bunyan cautions the unregenerate, "first, take a glass and see where it is dirty: labour to discern your every crime, experimentally persuade yourself that you are the biggest sinner in the world...." (qtd. in Bercvitch 15). Rowlandson's reference to her washing herself and then looking into the glass is certainly an allusion to Bunyan's injunction, well-known to her Puritan readers. Shortly after Metacom informs her of her upcoming ransom and of her imminent restoration, in two weeks, to her Christian community, Rowlandson remembers:

he [Quinnapin, her Narragansett master] asked me, when I washed me? I told him not this month, then he fetched me some water himself, and bid
me wash, and gave me the glass to see how I looked....(351)

Interpreted according to Bercovitch's theory of the Puritan subject, which is based on Calvinistic doctrine, Rowlandson's uncleanliness allegorically suggests the depravity of the unregenerate soul, and her gaze into the glass signifies the self-examination required for conversion. Since this look occurs, according to Rowlandson's religious allegory, at the stage of conversion where the soul, utterly hopeless, experiences a kindling of faith, then one would expect it to precede and anticipate her successful self-purgation, her mirroring of the sinless body of Christ, and her redemption. That Rowlandson refrains from giving a description of her reflection in the mirror appears to be in keeping with the Calvinistic concept of conversion--that one should see in the glass not the self, but the promised ideal of Christ. However, onto the blank mirror, her readers may have imposed their own visions of her reflection, which may have split into two opposing possibilities: her Puritan audience, on one hand, may have seen the hoped-for face of their redeemer, or as Ralph Bauer speculates, the image of "savagery," of the "Indianized" European, propagated in hundreds of New World narratives (674).

These two possibilities suggest the split image of the mother as the sublime and the abject that Kristeva identifies in patriarchal discourse. That Rowlandson
foreshortens her description of her gaze into the mirror allows a continuing interest in the abject maternal that, though a cultural construction, also permits her an active subjectivity.

Abjection is, as Kristeva observes, a pre-condition of narcissism. Invoking the image of the mirror to explain the subject's exclusion of the maternal once it traverses the mirror stage and enters symbolic relations, she explains: "the more or less beautiful image in which I behold or recognize myself rests upon an abjection that sunder[s] it as soon as repression, the constant watchman, is relaxed" (13). While this abjection, from a Calvinistic perspective, is the impure corporeality that the convert suppresses in order to imitate Christ, it also suggests the subject's revulsion at its ineradicable connection to the maternal body. Although Rowlandson does not describe her reflection in the glass, she fills this narrative gap with the subsequent image of Weetamoo, the Wampanoag mistress she "served" during her captivity, onto whom she projects her own denied vanity. As she prepares for her transition to Christian civilization, changing her self-representation as the abject to that of the spiritually redeemed, she constructs Weetamoo as an alter-ago, as the embodiment of the abject. Instead of describing her own reflection in the mirror, she subsequently gives her impression of Weetamoo as:
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a severe and proud dame..., bestowing every day in dressing herself neat as much time as any of the gentry of the land: powdering her hair, and painting her face, going with necklaces, with jewels in her ears, and bracelets upon her hands....(351)

Whereas Weetamoo's bodily decoration, in her own culture, signifies her political stature as a sachem, from the Puritan perspective it reveals feminine vanity, not "pagan" female power.

In her judgmental impression, Rowlandson adopts colonialist and patriarchal representations promoted in Increase Mather's 1676 "An Exhortation: To the Inhabitants of New-England." Mather's condemnation of Puritan women's vanity, decrying it as one of the causes of God's infliction of the war, may be understood as his projection of his repugnance at his own corporeality, at his connection to the defiled maternal body. As he essentializes both female and native identity, Mather invokes a language of disease and impurity to describe Puritan women's haughtiness and their resultant punishment--their capture by Indians, their reduction to nakedness, and their imprisonment within dirty wigwams. Indeed, constructing woman as a pollutant, he suggests that Puritan women's vanity has "infected" the entire land, even being transmitted to men. Similar to Rowlandson's later detailed indictment of Weetamoo's appearance, he exclaims:
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A proud Fashion no sooner comes into the Country, but the haughty daughters of Zion in this place are taking it up, and thereby the whole land is at last infected. What shall we say when men are seen in the Streets with monstrous and horrid Perriwigs, and Women with their Borders and False locks, and such like whorish Fashions, whereby the anger of the Lord is kindled against this sinfull Land! (177)

Later, he attributes women's Indian captivities to their sin of vanity, merging patriarchal and colonialist images into a picture of the defiled feminine body:

Moreover, the Lord saith, ...because the Daughters of Zion are haughty, therefore he will discover their Nakedness. Hath not the Lord fulfilled this threatening, when the Indians have taken so man and stripped them naked as in the day the born. And instead of a sweet smell there shall be a Stink, Is not this verified when poor Creatures are carried away Captive into the Indians filthy and stinking Wigwams, yea when so many English are faign to crowd together, till it becomes loathsome and unsavoury? (177)

Similarly yoking both female subjectivity and native identity to the body, Mather reduces sinning Puritan women down to their nakedness, to their "natural essence," to the stink, filth, and cavernousness associated with the dreaded maternal, the abject. Although Rowlandson's attitude toward Weetamoo is less repulsed than Mather's judgements of women and the Indians, it nonetheless is shaped by a similar intersection of sexist and racist constructs; it reflects her implication in the narcissism of the colonizer. In fact, her interpretation of Weetamoo's ornamentation overlooks the native woman's
assertion of an active subjectivity founded in the body and, instead, turns the sachem into an object of her ethnocentric gaze. Indeed, by projecting her own reflection in the glass onto her "ethnic other," thereby disowning her own sin, Rowlandson makes Weetamoo what postcolonial theorist JanMohamed calls "a mirror that reflects [by means of contrast] the colonialist's self-image" (84). While this narcissistic impulse of colonialist literature, expressed in Rowlandson's gaze at Weetamoo as well as in Increase Mather's sermon, serves to maintain the European's sense of moral superiority by establishing an opposition between self and Other, at the same time, it reveals the colonizer's unconscious identification with the native. In fact, underlying Rowlandson's description of Weetamoo is her unconscious awareness of their shared place as embodied others in Puritan discourse, a position vividly manifest in the intersection of racist and sexist images in Mather's "Exhortation."

As she recalls her imminent ransom and re-entry into her patriarchal culture, Rowlandson's positioning of herself before the mirror, accompanied by her description of her alter-ego, Weetamoo, calls attention to her reliance on her rhetorical identification with the pre-symbolic abject. As she prepares to re-enter Puritan culture, she represents herself as arriving at the "mirror stage," as residing on the boundary between the abject and
the symbolic. Her self-representation as the abject, although a cultural inscription, nevertheless has allowed her to discover an active subjectivity based in the body, incompletely governed and sublimated by paternal agency. As the "pre-identity," "presubject," and "preobject" (Oliver 57) of the psychoanalytic stage where the child is not yet the subject, and the mother, not yet the Other, the abject "calls into question the boundaries upon which [subject and society] are founded" (Oliver 56). Her identification with the abject has permitted her to enact and exaggerate her positionality as the marginalized feminine in patriarchal discourse, a dissidence through which she tests the Cartesian mode of thinking on which the Puritan hegemony establishes its sense of stable subjecthood. Because she is identified with the maternal that poses a threat "from beyond the borders of the Symbolic" (Oliver 57-58), she represents that which must be repressed by the signifying system in order to bring into existence the subject and society.

Rowlandson's ransom in May of 1676, described in The Nineteenth Remove, suggests her crossing over from the zone of the abject to the symbolic order and the consequent subsumption (although incomplete) of her agency and subjectivity by paternal law. Her position on the margin of the symbolic suggests woman's construction in patriarchal discourse as the limit or borderline of the phallocratic order. This positionality, according to
Kristeva, generates two opposing images of woman in religious discourse: on the one hand, she is darkness and chaos, Lilith and the Whore of Babylon; on the other hand, she is the representative of "a higher and purer nature," a Virgin or Mother of God (Moi 167). In the former example, the patriarchy sees this borderline as "part of the chaotic wilderness outside [of it]"; in the latter instance, it sees this limit as part of the inside of its domain--"the part that protects and shields the symbolic order from the imaginary chaos" (Moi 167). Indeed, the veneration of woman as a spiritual ideal, especially through the cult of the Virgin Mother, as Kristeva argues in "Stabat Mater," serves to "cove[r] over the tension between the maternal and the symbolic" (Oliver 50).

While this feminine ideal allows the patriarchy to reconcile with the maternal principle and to fulfill unconscious identification with the mother, it also is a result of male-dominated society's attempt to abolish "the remnants of matrilineal society" (Oliver 50). Such an effort becomes necessary in a patrilineal culture whose economic processes of exchange and production require "the contribution of the superego and rely on the Symbolic paternal agency" (Kristeva qtd. in Oliver 50). Indeed, this symbolic paternal agency founds itself on "the exchange and control of women and children" (Oliver 50).

Rowlandson's re-integration into her community, first in Boston where she was re-united with her husband,
Joseph, and their two surviving children, and then a year later, in Wethersfield, Connecticut, where she likely composed her story, appears psychologically incomplete. Scholars have attributed this lack of resolution to the tension between Rowlandson’s expression of her individual feelings and her obligation to subsume them under Puritan ideology. Kathryn Zabelle Derounian, for example, in her discussion of Rowlandson’s post-traumatic symptoms, which include insomnia, nightmares, and hypermnesia, concludes that while “Rowlandson considers her orthodoxy to be genuine, evidence of the survivor syndrome keeps breaking into the work’s otherwise consistent tone to suggest the emotional strain of maintaining an ideologically required position” (“Puritan Orthodoxy” 93). This “clash of codes between Rowlandson’s psychological and religious interpretations of her experience” (Derounian “Puritan Orthodoxy” 83) appears in one of the last few paragraphs of her narrative. As she reflects,

I can remember the time, when I used to sleep quietly without workings in my thoughts, whole nights together, but now it is otherwise with me. When all are fast about me, and no eye open, but his who ever waketh, my thoughts are upon things past,, upon the awful dispensation of the Lord towards us; upon His wonderful power and might, carrying of us through so many difficulties....the thoughts of these things in the particulars of the, and of the love and goodness of God towards us, make it true of me, what David said of himself, Psalms 6.6. ‘I watered my couch with my tears.’ Of the wonderful power of God that mine eyes have seen, affording matter enough for my thoughts to run
This passage demonstrates Rowlandson's turmoil, which is perhaps as much exacerbated by as allayed by her attempt to rationalize her suffering in terms of God's providence. Like Derounian, Mitchell Breitwieser similarly links the sense of irresolution in her narrative to her unresolved suffering, especially to her conflict between Puritanism's prohibition against excessive grief and her sadness over her loss of her daughter Sarah. As he surmises, "Puritanism was "an attempt to sublimate mourning, to block and then redirect its vigor to various social purposes" (8). As he argues, in her recollection of her return to Boston, where she is re-united with her husband but not yet with her still captive son and daughter, she exhibits a lack of re-integration into her community, in part, because of her difficulty with sublimating her mourning into social rituals designed to channel it (121). For example, in the same sentence where Rowlandson acknowledges the Council's appointment of a public day of thanksgiving to honor the redeemed captives, she implies her unwillingness to sublimate her grief into such a communal occasion, remarking, "...I thought I still had cause for mourning" (362). At the same time that she recognizes herself "in the midst of love," as a recipient of the hospitality of her friends, she also expresses the "heaviness of heart" that outweighs this attempt at
communal consolation. Remembering her dead daughter Sarah, she reflects, "That which was dead lay heavier upon my spirit,...thinking how it suffered with its wounds...and how it was buried by the heathen in the wilderness from among all Christians" (362). As Breitwieser proposes, her anguish about Sarah's non-Christian burial suggests the sense in her narrative that there "is no site of Sarah but rather an afflicting everywhereness, a consciousness that is a haunted maze, which Rowlandson labels [in the Third Remove] her 'wilderness condition'" (113).

As Breitwieser remarks, since Rowlandson's mourning is incomplete at the time of her composition, which probably occurred in Wethersfield between 1677 and 1678, her writing becomes "part of the work of mourning" and reflects her narration's desire to launch an argument in favor of God's divine providence, but one which, at times, lacks persuasiveness because of the inability of Puritanism's ideology to accommodate the intensity of her experience (9).

While Derounian and Breitwieser offer plausible reasons for the lack of resolution in Rowlandson's narrative, other explanations, compatible with these critics' perspectives, are possible. Indeed, the apparent lack of resolution in her tale not only has psychological implications but also may be explained in terms of her construction of the abject. Just as Rowlandson never entirely sublimates her mourning into speech, she also
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cannot entirely sublimate her abjection into the symbolic. Even in her concluding sections, where she attempts to signify her return home as her assurance of election, her narrative threatens to deconstruct the sublime by showing its dependence on the abject. Indeed, Rowlandson's conscious recollection of her physical symptoms of nightmares, insomnia, and hypermnesia, intermixed with her appeals to divine providence, suggests Kristeva's picture of the abject as "skirt[ing] the somatic symptom on the one hand" and "sublimation on the other" (11). Through sublimation, like Rowlandson's use of divine speech, the subject "keep[s] [the abject] under control"; but as symptom, the abject "permeates the subject," making it become abject, similar to Rowlandson's melancholia (11).

Although Rowlandson's narrative, throughout, calls attention to this permeable boundary between the abject and the sublime in subjective experience and Christian discourse, it especially emphasizes the picture of the abject in the first nineteen Removes because of her representation of her captivity as the pre-conversion stage of conviction of sin. Now, in the Twentieth Remove, as her narrative turns to a focus on her restoration and her symbolic assurance of election, her self-representation as a type of the spiritually redeemed is, nevertheless, still haunted by abjection.

This lingering abjection is part of the Christian confessional conversion mode in which Rowlandson writes.
As Kristeva suggests, since Christianity conceptualizes the abject as an inner evil or guilt, it assumes sin to be "inherent in speech and slated for release" (120); in order for converts to achieve the sublimation of Christ, they must "confess the part of themselves that rebels against divine judgment, a part that is innerly impure" (120). But as she cautions, in her interpretation of Christian rituals, it is impossible for sin, the only sign of difference between the human subject and the sublimity of Christ, to be resorbed through an identification with Christ. As Kristeva suggests, although its absolution is promised, sin is the "rock where one endures the human condition as separate [from Christ]: body and spirit, body jettisoned from the spirit, as a condition that is impossible, irreconcilable" (120).

Through her public confession of sin and faith, Rowlandson intends to demonstrate her conversion from flesh to spirituality and to present herself as a representative of the spiritually redeemed. As Rowlandson asserts, "when God calls a person to anything, and through never so many difficulties, yet He is fully able to carry them through and make them see, and say they have been gainers thereby" (366). Indeed, in one of her concluding paragraphs, she revives the imagery of food that has been so prominent in her narrative in order to suggest her redemption. Her use of the familiar Christic image of honey in this passage is similar to Increase Mather's
allusion to Samson's riddle, "Out of the eater comes forth meat, and sweetness out of the strong"; it is this scripture with which he prefaces her exemplum fidei and by which he invites her readers to ingest her story as spiritual sustenance. In the bread and honey imagery in her conclusion, she suggests this conversion process, the successful transference of the unregenerate soul's desires for flesh onto Christ. Recalling her soul's "wilderness condition" (329), in which she thought she would never be "satisfied with bread again," she now remarks, "but now we are fed with the finest of the wheat, and as I may say, with honey out of the rock: instead of the husk, we have the fatted calf" (365).

However, this use of redemptive imagery occurs in the same passage where she appears to overly assert her belief in God's providence as she copes with her post-traumatic symptoms. Abjection, which infuses many Puritan conversion narratives, continues to permeate her tale; it is what Kristeva calls the subject's realization of the necessity-but impossibility--of transcending its own corporeality and mortality (Gross 89).

In his preface, Increase Mather has invited Rowlandson's audience to identify with her example of faith. Indeed, he intended this identificatory practice of her exemplum fidei to restore communal unity in the post-war colony and to inspire collective spiritual regeneration. As Kristeva proposes, in Christian
discourses of conversion and martyrdom, abjection "is the point where the scales are tipped towards pure spirituality" (127). In particular, in Puritan conversion narratives, it is the convert's temporal desires that must be weaned from the world and the flesh and transferred onto Christ. Accordingly, as Rowlandson engages her readers' identification with the promise of her redemption, she also elicits their identification with abjection, the "source of evil," which is mingled with sin" (Kristeva 127).

Just as abjection becomes "the requisite for a reconciliation, in the mind, between the flesh and the [spiritual] law (Kristeva 128), Rowlandson's readers would expect her narrative to point towards such a reconciliation between flesh and spirit. Instead, her confession continues to call their attention to the irreconcilable human condition of being mortal, not divine, of being "body and spirit, body jettisoned from the spirit; as a condition that is impossible, irreconcilable" (Kristeva 120). By eliciting her Puritan readers' identification with abjection--even in the conclusion when they expect psychic integration and spiritual resolution--her narrative engages their identification with those heterogeneous feelings that the hegemonic genre of public Puritan autobiography sought to repress. In this way, it destabilizes the rationalist model of conversion on which the Puritan hegemony relied
for the consolidation of control and the enforcement of cultural cohesion.
CONCLUSION

Anne Hutchinson's, Anne Bradstreet's, and Mary Rowlandson's spiritual autobiographies raise challenging questions that have preoccupied feminist theorists in their ongoing debates about the female writer's formation of subjectivity and her concomitant relationship to her body, the mark of her sexual difference and the source of her cultural construction. The most general and proverbial question is how does a writer like Hutchinson, Bradstreet, or Rowlandson, restricted by Puritanism's regulations of women's speech and authorship, claim authority over her own story and forge a subjectivity in patriarchal discourses that position her as the silent object?

The solution of the proponents of l'écriture féminine, that she deflect her alterity by affirming a gynocentric vision and foregrounding her body's pleasures, appears to exclude the bodily suffering undergone by a writer like Rowlandson and in turn, points to a question raised by her tale: is it, in fact, possible for writing from the body to encompass painful as well as pleasurable experiences, and if so, how does such writing empower the female subject? This question must also address the problems and paradoxes at the heart of such theories as l'écriture féminine: that this literary practice inadvertently reinforces an essentialist female nature, simply reversing, rather than interrogating, the binary
opposition that defines woman as man's other; and more relevant to these three Puritan writers, that it mistakenly assumes, as Anne Rosalind Jones contests (367), that the body can be experienced as essential when, in reality, it is inscribed by culture. If the female body, like female identity, is not essential, but culturally inscribed, then the next question is a crucial one presented by the autobiographical practices of Hutchinson, Bradstreet, and Rowlandson: as AnnLouise Keating asks in her comparative analysis of the body-writings of Helene Cixous and Gloria Anzaldua, "Can culturally inscribed bodies--despite, or perhaps because of the ways they are marked by gender, class, ethnicity, and sexuality, provide us with alternative ways of knowing and writing?" (122-123)

Since autobiography is one of those occasions when the cultural "history of the body intersects with [an author's] subjectivity" (Smith Subjectivity 23), then the life-writings of Hutchinson, Bradstreet, and Rowlandson provide varied answers to Keating's question. Since Hutchinson experiences the body as the culturally constructed site of her oppression, she refuses it as a founding identification of her subjectivity. On the other hand, Bradstreet foregrounds her maternal body in her assertion of spiritual authority in spite of the way it is socially inscribed as the origin of the mortality of the flesh. Rowlandson, finally, forges a resistant female
subjectivity in her tale by means of the way her body is culturally marked as the site of disorderly sin.

These writers find different ways of negotiating Puritanism's binary logic, which positions them in opposition to man as flesh instead of spirit, as sensuality instead of rationality, and as nature instead of language and culture. Hutchinson chooses spirit over flesh; Bradstreet parallels flesh with spirit; and Rowlandson foregrounds flesh, but also calls attention to its inextricable link to spirit.

To evade her cultural embodiment, Hutchinson rejects the body as a location of her identity and espouses a disembodied subjectivity founded in the mystical laws of grace rather than in paternal ecclesiastical laws. Her escape from the physical body, however, prevents her from interrogating, like Bradstreet and Rowlandson, the patriarchal binarity of body and soul that supports her cultural embodiment; in fact, she leaves this alterity in place, choosing sides by privileging spirit over flesh. Thus she does not question the Puritan imputation of corruption to the body, especially the female body. Although Hutchinson's dialogue at her trials opens up and calls attention to the ideological slippages in Puritan language, she ultimately renounces language, because like her body, it is subject to phallocentric law.

In contrast to Hutchinson, Bradstreet and Rowlandson remain within the constraints of Puritan language, writing
more generically conventional conversion narratives. Just as the body is a founding identification in most Puritan spiritual autobiographies, so Bradstreet and Rowlandson make the body a location of their formations of subjectivity. While Bradstreet re-writes the social construction of the female body as sin, Rowlandson's narrative uses this cultural inscription as a source of subversive autobiographical practice. In her private relation to her children, Bradstreet, unlike Hutchinson, reverses her culture's construction of the female body as abject by appropriating the common childbirth metaphor used by ministerial authorities to instill spiritual regeneration in converts. Instead of privileging spirit over flesh, like Hutchinson, she interrogates the binarity that perpetuates her position as embodied other in language by representing her maternal body as not the source of mortal defilement but the transmitter of grace.

Each of these women, to different degrees, is forced to confront Puritanism's essentializing of female identity because she approaches the scene of writing or speaking during an historical moment when the stability of the Massachusetts theocracy is threatened by either religious fragmentation, as in the Antinomian Crisis, or increasing secularization, as in the period of Metacom's War. Since such cultural embodiment serves to reinforce the authority of the universal subject, it is especially felt by those excluded others during times of socio-political turmoil;
for as Helen Carr points out in her analysis of the colonialist and misogynistic rhetoric of the 1690 Salem witch trials, when social cohesion is challenged, those in marginal positions often "become feared as sources of pollution" (51).

This project on female subjectivity and body in early American women's autobiographies contributes to several fields of study: early American literature, autobiography, feminist literature, and pedagogy. It continues the current trend in early American scholarship to deconstruct the myth of the "New England Mind" as a monolithic ideology. Indeed, it demonstrates, in particular, how female subjects call attention to the destabilizing tendencies already present in Puritanism. Because of the scarcity of published autobiographical accounts by Puritan women, a life-writing tradition by colonial women has been difficult to establish. Broadening the definition of "autobiography" to include variant narrative forms, this project takes a step in that direction. Finally, this project answers some of the questions raised by feminist theorists as they consider the female subject and her relationship to her body. It demonstrates that the body can act as a source of an active subjectivity in women's writings, even if—or perhaps because—it is culturally inscribed. At first, this study's theoretical approach may appear to make its insights inapplicable to the classroom. However, its grouping of three canonical American women
writers within a matrilineal autobiographical tradition is useful for undergraduate courses in American literature, and its engagement of issues of interest to women students—the body, maternity, and political resistance—make it a source of ideas for teaching women's literature.
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